SALVATOR ROSA AS *"AMICO VERO"*:
THE ROLE OF FRIENDSHIP IN THE MAKING OF A FREE ARTIST

by

Alexandra Carol Hoare

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Art
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Alexandra Hoare 2010

Salvator Rosa as "Amico vero": The Role of Friendship
in the Making of a Free Artist

Alexandra Carol Hoare

Doctor of Philosophy, History of Art

Department of Art
University of Toronto

2010

Abstract

The seventeenth-century Neapolitan painter and satirist Salvator Rosa (1615-1673), long regarded as a harbinger of the ideals of professional independence that characterize the artists of the Romantic era, is here returned to the social circumstances of his own time. This dissertation argues that Rosa's personal and professional identity of autonomy and his pursuit of an original, distinctive persona were facilitated by male friendship. A key component of the philosophical ideal to which Rosa and his friends subscribed, friendship is defined by a standard of egalitarianism that permits its practitioners to be at once dependent and independent. In his adoption and cultivation of the rituals and discourses of friendship – especially academic friendship – Rosa found a strategy for navigating the obligatorily socially-delineated parameters of self-fashioning in *seicento* Florence and Rome. Friendship permeated the most vital elements of Rosa's career: his early theatrical practice in Rome, his private academy in Florence, and his business tactics as a painter and printmaker in Rome. This dissertation aims to open up an area of insight into Rosa as both unique among and representative of his contemporaries, and to expand upon the existing scholarly knowledge of an artist on the cusp of an important development in the history of the visual artist's identity.

Acknowledgements

This project owes its genesis first and foremost to my supervisor, Philip Sohm, who encouraged me to take a second look at Salvator Rosa. His work – in particular, his interest in art biography and his careful analysis of early-modern language – has also exerted a profound influence on my own, and I continually endeavour to emulate it in its nuance and lucidity. I am especially grateful for his direction, his generosity, and his patient review of the onerous drafts of my chapters.

I also wish to express my gratitude and considerable debt to Evonne Levy for showing me a different way of thinking about autonomy and friendship, and for supporting my project throughout its long development. The final product was greatly improved by her meticulous reading of the text and suggestions for editing.

My work has also profited significantly from the advice, encouragement and expertise of Alexander Nagel, Helen Langdon, Wendy Roworth, Caterina Volpi, and Luigi Spezzaferro, whose insights into Rosa and the social experience of the artist opened up new vistas for me. Both of my external readers, Elizabeth Cropper and Nicholas Terpstra, cast fresh light on many issues and offered invaluable suggestions for future study. I am extremely grateful for their participation and their contributions in the final stages of my degree.

The archival research for this dissertation would not have been possible without the generous financial support of the Department of Art and the School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto, travel funding from the Italian Embassy in Ottawa for study in Rome at the British School in 2006, a grant from the Fondazione Lemmermann in Rome in 2007-8, and a fellowship at the Fondazione Longhi in Florence in 2007-8. I am particularly indebted to the Fondazione Longhi for the opportunities they offered for travel to exhibitions and for gaining access to private collections throughout Italy. The support of the Italian Art Society, who funded my travel

to the 2008 CAA conference in Dallas, and an invitation to participate in the 2009 international *convegno* on Rosa hosted by the Biblioteca Hertziana in Rome also allowed me to share my research and receive helpful feedback during the critical final stages of research and writing.

This project has thrown into sharp relief the value of friendship in my own life, and I am sincerely appreciative for the assistance and support of friends and colleagues at the University of Toronto and elsewhere, especially Betsy Purvis who selflessly and patiently helped me with the long, laborious translation of Rosa's letters and endured many a moment of frustrated angst with sympathy and encouragement. Sarah Guérin, Carolina Mangone, Rose Logie, Elena Napolitano, Heather Diack, Christine Kralik, Rebekah Carson, Therese Forgacs and John Gagné are among the many who also offered much-needed moral support during periods of self-doubt, and acted collectively as an obliging sounding-board for ideas. Eve Straussman-Pflanzer kindly introduced me to the Archivio di Stato in Florence, and Marco Simone Bolzoni helped me to navigate the Gabinetto dei Disegni at the Uffizi; both offered moments of sanity during the long, hot days of writing and researching at the Kunsthistorisches Institut and the Biblioteca Nazionale.

I reserve a special gratitude, however, for the support of my parents and my brother. Without their unfailing encouragement, tolerance and patience I would never have finished what I started. It is to them that I dedicate this text.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Table of Contents v
List of Illustrations viii

Prologue: *An Introduction to Rosa as a Friend* 1

Rosa and his Friends: A Cast of Characters 29

Chapter I *The Self Performed: Reputation and Sociality in the Making of Rosa's Identity, and the Crafting of an Academic Ritual* 40
I.1 Self-Performance as a Strategy of Celebrity 41
I.2 Acting *all'Improvviso*: The Individuality and Interdependency of the Performed Self 48
I.3 Rosa as Coviello and Pascariello: The Performance and the Mask as Modes of Self-Fashioning 49
I.4 "Stage-Fighting" with Bernini: A Turning Point in the Crafting of an Antagonistic Persona 67
I.5 Concluding Thoughts 74

Chapter II *Rosa and the Accademia dei Percossi: Academia as the Enterprise of Friendship* 76
II.1 A Tale of Two Cities: Florence as a City of Court and Academy 77
II.2 Rosa as *Virtuoso*: Academic Friendship and the Making of Rosa's Identity as a "Painter-Philosopher" 82
The Members of the *Percossi* and their Influence 83
II.3 The *Accademia dei Percossi* as a "Place Apart": The Ideal of *Academia* as Refuge, Retreat and Rebellion 99
Rome is not Florence: Rosa's Nostalgia for the *Percossi* 101
Reconciling Rebellion with Conformity: The Function of the Private *Conversazione* 104
The Imagery of Philosophical Salvation: The Academy and Villa as Utopia 109
Solitude in Friendship 121
II.4 The *Percossi* as a Place of Friends 129
Academia and *Amicitia*: A Historical Context for the *Percossi* 131
The Friendly Activities of the *Percossi* 135
Theatrical Performance: "The Play's the Thing" 136
The *Symposium* – A Fare of Friends, Food, Verse and Inspiration 142
Conversation and Poetic Recital 144
II.5 *Percossi*: What's in a Name? 147
II.6 Friendship in the Academy and Flattery at Court: An Allegorical Discourse in Two Paintings by Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi 159
II.7 Concluding Thoughts 174

Chapter III *Words and Gestures: Writing and Speaking as the Rituals of Friendship* 177
III.1 Rosa's Letters as Social Documents 177
The Letter as the Self and the Friend 180
"*Amico Vero*": Friendship and Sincerity in the Making of an Epistolary Identity of Autonomy 185
III.2 The Letters of Rosa's Friends 190
Ricciardi 190
Florentine Friends 194
III.3 The Panegyric Poetry of Friendship and the Social Sustenance of Identity: Rosa in the Eyes of his Friends 195
Poems for Rosa 198
Poems by Rosa for Friends 212
Poems among Rosa's Friends 213
III.4 The Art of Conversation: Speaking, Silence and Recitation 215
Academic *Conversazione*: Making Selves of Words 216
Conversation and Solitude: Solitude as a Social Space 221
III.5 Rosa's Visual Rhetoric: Speaking and Silence in Rosa's Art 226
Rosa and the Theatrical Poetics of the Image 228
Striking Poses and Making Faces 231
III.6 Concluding Thoughts 248

Chapter IV *A Portrait for Giovan Battista Ricciardi: The Friend as a Second Self* 249
IV.1 Rosa and Ricciardi: An Introduction 250
IV.2 The Question of Identity 250
IV.3 The Question of Dating 256
IV.4 Symbolic Self-Portraiture: The Self Performed in Paint 262
Humorology and Physiognomy: A Portrait of the "Melancholic" Poet-Philosopher 269
Poetic Melancholia: A Visual Source for Rosa's Portrait 279
IV.5 "*La metà di me sono io e l'altra meta è il mio Amico*": A New Reading of Rosa's Portrait for Ricciardi as Self and Friend 282
The Portrait as a Memorial to Friendship 287
Rosa's Portrait as a *Freundschaftsbild* 294
The (Self-)Portrait as a Gift: A Homage to Friendship 303
The Gift as Self and Other 306
Making Absence into Presence: The Portrait-Gift as a Strategy of Spatial Reunion 307
The Gift as *Paragone*: Equivalence and One-upmanship in the Exchange of an Image for Words 314
IV.6 Melancholia as Bane and Blessing: Friendship and the Creative and Destructive Power of Melancholy 320
The *Concetto* of "Writing on a Skull" 325
The Night and the Moon 334
IV.7 Concluding Thoughts 344

Chapter V *The Business of Friendship: The Fundamental Sociality of Rosa's Professional Strategies for Autonomy* 346
V.1 The Value of the Artist: Rosa and the Tenuous Link between "Fortune", Fame and Self-Worth 348
The Artist and Money: A Thorny Relationship 350
V.2 The Art of Mixing Business with Pleasure: Rosa and the New Economy of Art 357
"*Amico et Padrone*". The Sincerity of Friendship versus the Flattery of Servitude, or Flattery will (Still) Get You Everywhere 358
V.3 Rosa's Professional Paradox 363
Rosa as a "Pittore del dissenso" 365
Rosa as "Purveyor of the Court" 368
"Will Work for Food": Rosa as a Some-Time Artist for Hire 372
V.4 Friends in High Places: Rosa and his Clientele 375
Rosa and his Two Cardinals 378
Commissions, Clients and Dealers 381
The Utility of Friendship: Girolamo Mercuri, Niccolò Simonelli, Don Mario Chigi, Carlo de' Rossi, Francesco Cordini and Ricciardi 382
V.5 Making a Brand. The Art Market, The Exhibition, the Gift and other Individualizing Strategies of the "Free" Artist's Professional Practice 398
Finding a Middle-Ground: The Contentious Practices of the Art Market and the Public Exhibition 401
Printmaking, Performance and Propaganda 405
"*Né tocchi mai da nessuno*": Novelty, "Originality" and the Practice of Copying 416
The Advice of Friends: A Communal Source for Rosa's Distinctive Professional Identity 446
Other Tools for Crafting the Image of the "Free" Artist 452
V.6 What Price Freedom? Rosa's Valuation Strategies 456
V.7 The Economics of the Friendly Gift 468
Liberality and Magnanimity as Keys to Rosa's Economic Performance 473
The Discourse of Gift-Giving: *Donare* as "Give and Take" and Other Oxymorons 475
The Gift of the Self: Self-Portraits and Drawings as Gifts 479
Other Gifts for Friends 485
Prints as Gifts: Affection and Self-Interest in the Practice of Dedication 493
V.8 The Reality of Rosa's Financial Situation 505
V.9 Concluding Thoughts 513

Epilogue 515

Appendices 517

Bibliography 564

Illustrations 635

List of Illustrations

1a. Salvator Rosa, *The Incredulity of St. Thomas* (c. 1639, Museo Civico, Viterbo)
1b. Salvator Rosa, Detail of self-portrait in 1a.
2a. Salvator Rosa, *The Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew* (date uncertain, Harrach collection, Rohrau)
2b. Salvator Rosa, Detail of possible self-portrait on far left in 2a.
3a. Salvator Rosa, Caricature of a *Young Boy Defecating* for Niccolò Simonelli (c. 1635-40, private collection)
3b. Salvator Rosa, verso of caricature in 3a.
4. Salvator Rosa, *St. Jerome* (1639?, San Venanzio, Fabriano)
5. Ferdinando Gregori, engraving of after Rosa's *Tityus* (c. 1638-9, now lost)
6. Salvator Rosa, *Landscape with Travellers asking the Way* (c. 1641, Denis Mahon collection, National Gallery, London)
7. Salvator Rosa, *Seaport* (*Marina del Faro*) (1641, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
8a. Salvator Rosa, *Seaport* (*Marina del Porto*) (1641, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
8b. Salvator Rosa, Detail of lower right register of 8a, with possible self-portrait.
9a. Salvator Rosa, *Battle Scene* (*Battle Between the Turks and Christians*) (1642, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
9b. Salvator Rosa, Detail of the self-portrait on far left in 9a.
10. Salvator Rosa, *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* (early 1640's, National Gallery, London)
11. Salvator Rosa, *Lucrezia as Poetry* (early 1640's, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford)
12. Salvator Rosa, *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* (mid-1640's?, Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit)
13. Salvator Rosa, *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* (mid-1640's?, Palazzo Chigi-Saracini, Siena)
14. Salvator Rosa, *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* (mid-1640's?, Palazzo Chigi-Saracini, Siena)
15. Salvator Rosa, *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* (1640's?, private collection, UK)
16. Salvator Rosa (copy after?), *Self-Portrait as an Artist* (early-mid 1640's, Uffizi (Corridoio Vasariano), Florence)
17. Salvator Rosa (attributed), *Penitent Magdalen* (early 1640's?, Collezione Koelliker)
18. Salvator Rosa, *Music* (1640's, Palazzo Barberini, Rome)
19. Salvator Rosa, *Poetry* (1640's, Palazzo Barberini, Rome)
20. Salvator Rosa, *Peace Burning the Arms of War* (c. 1640-45, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
21. Salvator Rosa, *The Return of Astraea* (*Justice Among the Peasants*) (c. 1640-45, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna)
22. Salvator Rosa, *The Philosopher Crates Throwing his Money into the Sea (*c. 1642-44, private collection)
23a. Salvator Rosa, *The Philosophers' Grove* (*Diogenes Casting Away his Cup*) (c. 1642-44, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
23b. Salvator Rosa, Detail of the likely self-portrait in 23a.
23c. Salvator Rosa, *A three-quarter length man facing right, the upper half of the composition enclosed in an oval* (drawing, Holkham (Norfolk), Lord Leicester collection)
24. Salvator Rosa, *A landscape with two seated persons and a dog in the foreground plus a ruined building on a hill in the middle distance* (drawing, 1640's, Uffizi, Florence, 6533 Santarelli)
25. Salvator Rosa, *Two Friends in a Landscape* (*Allegorical Portrait of Salvator Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi*) Drawing on verso of letter by Lorenzo Lippi (?) to Ascanio della Penna (1640's?, Albertina, Vienna)
26. Salvator Rosa, *Lo Spavento* (*The Fright*) (1640's, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
27. Salvator Rosa, *An Allegory* (drawing, 1640's, Uffizi, Florence, 6569 Santarelli)
28. Salvator Rosa, *Fortune* (1640's, formerly Gerini collection Florence; now in a private collection, UK)
29. Salvator Rosa, *Alexander and Diogenes* (c. 1640-5, Collection of Lord Spencer, Althorp)
30. Salvator Rosa, *The Temptation of St. Anthony* (mid-1640's, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
31. Salvator Rosa, *Moral Philosophy* (c. 1643-5, Palazzo Enzelberg a Campan, Caldaro (Bolzano))
32. Salvator Rosa, *Cincinnatus called from the Plough* (c. 1640-5, Collection of Lord Spencer, Althorp)
33. Salvator Rosa, *Ponte Rotto* (c. 1645-8, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
34. Salvator Rosa, *La Menzogna* (c. 1645-48, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)

35. Salvator Rosa, *Seated Philosopher with a Book* (*Allegory of Study* or *Portrait of a Poet*) (1640's?, John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota, Florida)
36. Salvator Rosa, *Marina delle Torri* (c. 1645-8, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
37. Salvator Rosa, *Pan and Syrinx* (second half of 1640's, private collection, Caldaro (Bolzano))
38. Salvator Rosa, *Democritus and Heraclitus* (c. 1646, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna)
39a. Salvator Rosa, preparatory drawing for the *Democritus and Heraclitus* (Teylers Museum, Haarlem, E9)
39b. Salvator Rosa, Detail of 39a.
39c. Salvator Rosa, Detail of 39a.
40. Salvator Rosa, *Arion on the Dolphin* (c. 1648, private collection, Milan)
41. Salvator Rosa, *Scene of Witchcraft* (c. 1646, National Gallery, London)
42. Salvator Rosa, *Caricature of Reginaldo Sgambati* (1640's?, drawing)
43. Salvator Rosa, *Prometheus* (mid-late 1640's?, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Corsini, Rome)
44. Salvator Rosa, *Philosopher Contemplating a Skull* (1640's, Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford)
45. Salvator Rosa, *Three small male figures crawling up the nose of a bearded man* (1640's?, drawing, Paris, F. Lugt Collection, 176)
46a. Salvator Rosa, *Allegory of Vanity* (Sotheby's, present location unknown)
46b. Salvator Rosa, *Allegory of Vanity* (1640's?, formerly the Paul Frantz Marcou collection; recently sold on the Paris art market)
47. Salvator Rosa, *Allegory of Vanity* (1640's, Teylers Museum, Haarlem)
48. Salvator Rosa, *Singing Skull* (1640's?, harpsichord lid, Collection of Major David Gordon, Haddo House, Aberdeenshire)
49. Salvator Rosa, *Allegory of Fate* (1640's, Teylers Museum, Haarlem)
50. Salvator Rosa, *Study of Skulls* (1640's?, drawing)
51. Salvator Rosa, *Allegory of Painting Begging for Charity* (mid-1640's?, Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, 6124)
52. Salvator Rosa, *A Satire on Painting* (Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich, 34923 recto)
53. Salvator Rosa, *Bacchanal* (1640's-early 1650's, Christie's Images, formerly Di Castro collection, Rome)
54. Salvator Rosa, *The Parable of St. Matthew* (1651, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples)
55. Salvator Rosa (attributed), *Self-Portrait* (1650's?, Musèe des Beaux-Arts, Strasburg)
56. Salvator Rosa, *Head of a Man with a Turban* (early 1650's?, Denis Mahon collection, London)
57. Salvator Rosa, *Portrait of a Man* (*Portrait of a Bandit*) (early 1650's?, Hermitage, St. Petersburg)
58. Salvator Rosa, *Portrait Head* (early 1650's?, Grassi Studio, New York)
59. Salvator Rosa, *The Death of Socrates* (early 1650's, private collection)
60. Salvator Rosa, *Heroic Battle Scene* (1652, Louvre, Paris)
61. Salvator Rosa, *Diogenes Casting away the Bowl* (1651, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen)
62. Salvator Rosa, *Democritus in Meditation* (1651-2, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen)
63. Salvator Rosa, *Vanitas of the Arts* (c. 1652?, Alte Pinakothek, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich)
64. Salvator Rosa, *Portrait of a Poet-Philosopher for Giovan Battista Ricciardi* (c. 1656?, Metropolitan Museum, New York)
65-73. Salvator Rosa, details of Fig. 64.
74. Salvator Rosa, *Study for a self-portrait: a man leaning on his elbows contemplating a rectangular object resting on a skull* (drawing, Teylers Museum, Haarlem, E31)
75. Salvator Rosa, *Study for a Self-portrait: a wreathed figure, seen three-quarter length and seated facing right, leans upon his elbow and holds a skull in his lap* (drawing, South African National Gallery, Cape Town)
76. Salvator Rosa, *Study for a self-portrait* (drawing, Louvre, Paris, 9730 recto)
77. Salvator Rosa, *Study for a self-portrait* (drawing, Louvre, Paris, 9730 verso)
78. Salvator Rosa, *Study for a Self-Portrait* (drawing, Uffizi, Florence, 12093F)
79. Salvator Rosa, *A seated woman writing on a skull* (drawing, Uffizi 2222F recto)
80. Salvator Rosa, *A man with long hair seated on a rock beneath a tree and contemplating a skull (or perhaps a sphere) that he holds in his lap* (drawing, Uffizi, Florence, 2230F)

81. Salvator Rosa, *A contemplative female figure seated by a block on which is a book and a skull* (drawing, Uffizi 899 Esp.)
82. Salvator Rosa, *A man facing left with his head lowered* (drawing, Uffizi 890)
83. Salvator Rosa, *Young poet with a crown of leaves, seated beneath a tree writing* (drawing, Toronto, AGO)
84. Salvator Rosa, *A Poet Seated Beneath a Tree with a Putto* (drawing, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen)
85. Salvator Rosa, *Seated Poet with a Book* (drawing)
86. Salvator Rosa, *Portrait of Lucrezia* (c. 1656?, Palazzo Barberini, Rome)
87. Salvator Rosa (copy after?), *Portrait of the Artist's Son Rosalvo* (c. 1656?, Palazzo Barberini, Rome)
88. Salvator Rosa, *Bandits on a Rocky Coast* (1656, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York)
89. Salvator Rosa, *Philosopher in Meditation* (c. 1656, private collection, Rome)
90a. Salvator Rosa, *Frontispiece* to the *Figurine* series (etching, 1656-8)
90b. Salvator Rosa, *Figurine* ("*Invenzione*") (etching, 1656-58)
91-95. Salvator Rosa, *Figurine* (etchings, 1656-58)
96. Salvator Rosa, *St. Philip Baptizing the Eunuch* (c. 1657, Chrysler Museum, Norfolk)
97. Salvator Rosa, *Umana Fragilitas* (c. 1657-8, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge)
98. Salvator Rosa, *Allegory of Fortune* (1659, J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu)
99. Salvator Rosa, *The "Genius" of Salvator Rosa* (etching, c. 1660-64)
100. Salvator Rosa, *Joseph Interpreting Dreams* (c. 1657-60, Palazzo Altieri, Rome)
101. Salvator Rosa, *Christ among the Doctors* (1660's, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples)
102. Salvator Rosa, *St. John the Baptist Preaching in a Landscape* (1660's, Galleria Colonna, Rome)
103. Salvator Rosa, *Christ Saving Peter from the Waves* (c. 1661?, S. Felice, Florence)
104. Salvator Rosa, *St. Paul the Hermit* (c. 1661, Brera, Milan)
105. Salvator Rosa, *Jonah Preaching to the Ninevites* (1661, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen)
106. Salvator Rosa, *Madonna del Suffraggio* (1661-2, formerly Brera, Milan)
107. Salvator Rosa, *Democritus in Meditation* (etching, 1661-2)
108a. Giovan Battista Ricciardi, Letter to Salvator Rosa, August 1661, recto (private collection, Parma)
108b. Salvator Rosa, Presumed drawing for a "Judgment of Paris," verso of Ricciardi's letter in Fig. 108a.
109. Salvator Rosa, *Alexander and Diogenes* (etching, c. 1662)
110. Salvator Rosa, *The Academy of Plato* (etching, 1662)
111. Salvator Rosa, *Pythagoras and the Fishermen* (1662, Staatliche Museen, Berlin)
112. Salvator Rosa, *Pythagoras Emerging from the Underworld* (1662, Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth)
113. Salvator Rosa, *The Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus* (etching, 1662)
114. Salvator Rosa, *The Rescue of the Infant Oedipus* (etching, c. 1663)
115. Salvator Rosa, *Alexander in the Studio of Apelles* (etching, 1662)
116. Salvator Rosa, *The Fall of the Giants* (etching, c. 1663)
117. Salvator Rosa, *Phryne and Xenocrates* (1662-3, private collection)
118. Salvator Rosa, *Job and his Comforters* (c. 1663, Uffizi (Corridoio Vasariano)
119. Salvator Rosa, *Christ Casting out Devils* (c. 1662, private collection, Rome)
120. Salvator Rosa, *The Crucifixion of Polycrates* (after 1662, Art Institute of Chicago)
121. Salvator Rosa, *The Conspiracy of Catiline* (1663, Casa Martelli, Florence)
122. Salvator Rosa, *Democritus and Protagoras* (or *The Calling of Protagoras to Philosophy*) (1664, Hermitage, St. Petersburg)
123. Salvator Rosa, *Mercury and Argus* (c. 1664, private collection, Rome)
124. Salvator Rosa, *Sketch for a Portrait (?); a man seated with a book in front of an easel with a portrait* (Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig, 8764 (formerly 7457.25.41A))
125. Salvator Rosa, *Jonah and the Whale* (c. 1665, Sotheby's)
126. Salvator Rosa, *Pan and Pindar* (1666, Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia)
127. Salvator Rosa, *The Death of Empedocles* (late 1660's, Lord Somers collection, Hampshire)
128. Salvator Rosa, *Philosopher in Meditation* (late 1660's, Fondazione Horak, Piacenza)
129. Salvator Rosa (spuriously attributed), *Vanitas* (late 1660's ?, private collection, Naples)
130. Salvator Rosa, *Saint Torpè* (1670, Museo d'Arte, Pisa)

131. Giovan Battista Bonacina, *Portrait of Salvator Rosa* (engraving, 1662)
132. Francesco Fracanzano (attrib.) *Rosa and Friends* (drawing, Christie's Images)
133. Francesco Fracanzano (attrib.), *Rosa and Friends* (drawing, British Museum, London)
134. Lorenzo Lippi, *Orpheus* (c. 1648, private collection, Florence)
135. Lorenzo Lippi (and Rosa?), *The Flight into Egypt* (1642, Sant'Agostino, Massa Marittima)
136. Lorenzo Lippi, *Allegory of Simulation* (early 1640's, Musèe des Beaux-Arts, Angers)
137. Baldassare Franceschini ("Il Volterrano"), *A Sibyl* (c. 1671?, Collezione Conte Gaddo della Gherardesca, Florence)
138. Baldassare Franceschini ("Il Volterrano"), *A Sibyl* (c. 1671?, Collezione Conte Gaddo della Gherardesca, Florence)
139. Jacques Callot, *Pasquariello Trunno* (etching, from the *Balli di Sfessania* series, early 1620's)
140. Jacques Callot, *Coviello* (etching, from the *Balli di Sfessania* series, early 1620's)
141. *Coviello*, from Francesco Bertelli, *Carnavale Italiane Mascherato* (1642); image from Nicoll, *Masks Mimes and Miracles*, p. 261)
142. Emblem of the Ant and Elephant (image from Hall, *Illustrated Dictionary of Symbols in Eastern and Western Art*, p. 8)
143. Jan Miel, *The Charlatan* (c. 1645, Hermitage, St. Petersburg)
144. Karel Dujardin, *A Party of Charlatans in an Italian Landscape* (1657, Louvre, Paris)
145. Cristofano Allori, *Christ Saving Peter from the Waves* (c. 1608-10, Collezione Bigongiari, Pistoia)
146. Cristofano Allori (finished by Zanobi Rosi after 1621), *Christ Saving Peter from the Waves* (Cappella Usimbardi, S. Trinità, Florence)
147. Lodovico Cardi ("Il Cigoli"), *Christ Saving Peter from the Waves* (1599/1607, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
148. Albrecht Dürer, *St. Jerome in his Study* (engraving, 1514)
149. Albrecht Dürer, *Melencolia I* (engraving, 1514, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York)
150. Giambattista della Porta, "Servio Galba – Aquila," from the *Fisonomia dell'huomo*, 1598
151. Luca Giordano, *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* (c. 1650-53, Capesthorne Hall, Collection of Sir Walter Bromley-Davenport, Macclesfield)
152. Pier Francesco Mola (formerly attributed to Rosa), *A Poet* (date uncertain, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
153. Jusepe de Ribera, *The Poet* (etching, c. 1620-21/1630's, British Museum, London)
154. Pier Francesco Mola, Caricature with self-portrait and portrait of Niccolò Simonelli, urinating in the grounds of the Villa Pamphilj, Rome (1649, pen drawing, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam)
155. Quentin Metsys, *Diptych Portrait of Erasmus and Pieter Gillis* (1517, now divided between the Royal Collection at Hampton Court and Longford Castle)
156. Raphael, *Self-Portrait with a Friend* (c. 1518, Louvre, Paris)
157. Raphael, *Double-portrait of Andrea Navagero and Agostino Beazzano* (c. 1516, Galleria Doria-Pamphilj, Rome)
158a. Jacopo da Pontormo, *Two Friends* (1520's, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice)
158b. Jacopo da Pontormo, Detail of 158a.
159. Hans Holbein, *The Ambassadors* (Jean de Dinteville and Georges de Selve) (1533, National Gallery, London)
160. Peter Paul Rubens, *Self-portrait with Mantuan Friends* (1602-3, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne)
161. Maso da San Friano (Tommaso Manzuoli), *Double Portrait* (1556, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples)
162. Sofonisba Anguissola, *Self-Portrait as a Portrait by Bernardino Campi* (c. 1559, Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena)
163. Peter Paul Rubens, *Justus Lipsius and His Pupils* (with self-portrait on the far left) (1611-12, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
164. Michelangelo Cerquozzi, *Garden Party of a Circle of Roman Artists* (c. 1650, Gemaldegalerie, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel)
165. Rembrandt, *Paired Portraits of Jacques de Gheyn III and Maurits Huygens* (1632, Dulwich College Gallery, London and Kunsthalle, Hamburg)
166. Anthony Van Dyck, *Portrait of Thomas Killigrew and an Unknown Man* (1638, Royal Collection)
167. Nicolas Poussin, *Self-Portrait for Jean Pointel* (1649, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin)
168. Nicolas Poussin, *Self-Portrait for Chantelou* (1650, Louvre, Paris)

169. Titian, *Portrait of Pietro Aretino* (1545, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
170. Anthony Van Dyck, *Self-Portrait with Endymion Porter* (c. 1635, Prado, Madrid)
171. Luca Cambiaso, *Self-Portrait Painting the Artist's Father* (c. 1570-9, Museo di Palazzo Bianco, Genova)
172. Raphael, *Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione* (1514-15, Louvre, Paris)
173. Jacques Courtois ("Il Borgognone"), *Self-portrait* (private collection)
174. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Self-Portrait as a Young Man* (c. 1623, Galleria Borghese, Rome)
175. Bernardino Licinio? (previously attrib. to Giovanni Battista Paggi), *Self-portrait with an Architect Friend* (1580's, Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg)
176. Titian, *Portrait of a Man with a Quilted Sleeve* (c. 1512, National Gallery, London)
177. Anthony Van Dyck, *Self-Portrait with a Sunflower* (c. 1633, Collection of the Duke of Westminster)
178. Rembrandt, *Self-portrait at the Age of Thirty-Five* (1640, National Gallery, London)
179. Padovanino, *Self-Portrait* (c. 1625-30, Museo Civico, Padua)
180. Luca Giordano, *Self-Portrait* (*Portrait of Salvator Rosa*?) (c. 1664?, Matthiesen Gallery, London)
181. Titian, *Self-Portrait* (early 1550's, Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin)
182. Titian, *Self-Portrait* (c. 1565-70, Prado, Madrid)
183. Jusepe de Ribera (copy after?), *Philosopher with a Mirror* (c. 1629-31, location unknown)
184. Master of Candlelight (?), *Vanitas* (c. 1630-33, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Rome)
185. Madeleine Boullogne, *Vanitas Still-Life* (late 17th century, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Mulhouse)
186. Domenico Feti, *Melancholy* (c. 1622, Louvre, Paris)
187. Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione ("Il Grechetto"), *Melancholy* (etching, c. 1645-6)
188. Francesco Curradi, *Portrait of a Young Man* (1611, Staatsgalerie, Stockholm)
189. Lucas Van Leyden, *Young Man (Self-Portrait?) with a Skull* (engraving, 1519, Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam)
190. Michael Sweerts, *Portrait of a Young Man (Self-Portrait?)* (1656, Hermitage, St. Petersburg)
191. Albrecht Dürer, *St. Jerome* (1521, Museo Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon)
192. Robert Walker, *Portrait of John Evelyn* (1648, National Portrait Gallery, London)
193a. Unknown British painter (George Gower?), *Portrait of Lady Philippa Coningsby* (c. 1612, whereabouts unknown)
193b. Detail of 193a.
194. Giovanni Martinelli, *Allegory of Astrology* (c. 1640, Collezione Koelliker)
195. Jusepe de Ribera, *Heraclitus* (1635, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, Genova)
196. Guido Cagnacci, *Allegory of Astrology* (c. 1650-55, Museo San Domenico, Pinacoteca Civica, Forlì)
197. Jusepe de Ribera, *An Astronomer* (*Ptolemy or Anaxagoras?*) (1638, Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts)
198. Jusepe de Ribera, *Democritus* (1635, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, Genova)
199. Caravaggio, *St. Jerome* (c. 1605-6, Galleria Borghese, Rome)
200. Hans Sebald Beham, *Melancholy* (1539) (from Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy*, plate 115)
201. Jusepe de Ribera, *St. Jerome* (1651, Certosa e Museo di San Martino, Naples)
202. Pieter Claesz, *Still-Life with a Skull and Writing-Quill* (1628, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York)
203a. Andreas Vesalius, Melancholic skeletal figure from the *De humani corporis fabrica librorum epitome* (1543)
203b. Detail of 203a.
204. Andreas Vesalius, Skeletal figure from the *De humani corporis fabrica librorum epitome* (1543)
205. Georg Thomas, "*Inevitabile Fatum*," from Johannes Eichmann's *Anatomiae* (1537)
206. Hendrick Goltzius, *Young Man with a Skull and Tulip* (drawing, 1614, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York)
207. Battistello Carracciolo, *Saints Cosmas and Damian* (c. 1618-19, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin)
208. "Malinconia," from Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia* (1611)
209. "Capriccio", from Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia* (1611)
210. Jacopo da Pontormo, *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* (c. 1534-5, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia)

211. Anthonis Mor, *Self-Portrait* (1558, Uffizi, Florence)
212. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Saturn* or *The Melancholic Temperament* (engraving, c. 1595-6, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York)
213. Gregor Reisch, *Geometry* (*Margarita philosophica*) (woodcut, 1504, Strasbourg) (from Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy*, plate 104)
214. Galileo Galilei, *The phases of the moon* (drawing, c. 1610, Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence)
215. Nicolas Poussin, "*Self-Portrait*" (c. 1630, British Museum, London)
216. *Saturn and his Zodiacal Signs.* Zürich, Zentralbibliothek (from Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy*, plate 30)
217. Gesture of the "manu pantea" (from J. A. V. Bates, "The communicative Hand," in *The Body as a Medium of Expression.* Ed. J. Benthall and T. Polhemus. NY: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1975, p. 178)
218. John Bulwer, Chirogrammatic plate (from Bulwer, *Chirologia: or the Natural Language of the Hand, and Chironomia: or the Art of Manual Rhetoric.* (London, 1644) Ed. James W. Cleary. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, p. 115)
219. *Demosthenes before the mirror*. William Marshall, Frontispiece to John Bulwer, *Chironomia*, 1644 (The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut)
220. *Demosthenes*, (1st-century Roman copy of a bronze original by Polyeuktos of 280 BCE, Vatican Museum, Rome)
221. *Aeschines* (1st-century Roman copy, National Archaeological Museum, Naples)
222. Giovanni Cariani (attrib.) *Portrait of a Young Man* (c. 1520, Collezione Etro, Milan)
223. Frans Hals, *Portrait of a Man Holding a Pair of Gloves* (1637, Sotheby's)
224. Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Portrait of Mary Throckmorton, Lady Scudamore* (1614, National Portrait Gallery, London)
225. Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Portrait of Catherine Killigrew, Lady Jermyn* (1614, Paul Mellon Collection, Yale Center for British Art, New Haven)
226. Frans Hals, *Portrait of a Man* (1648-1650, National Gallery of Art, Washington)
227. Frans Hals, *Portrait of a Man* (c. 1655, Liechtenstein Museum, Vienna)
228. Frans Hals, *Portrait of a Man* (1634, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest)
229. Anthony Van Dyck, *Portrait of a Bearded Man* (1615, Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, Ohio)
230. Anthony Van Dyck, *Portrait of Pieter Bruegel the Younger* (from the *Iconography* series, begun c. 1630; pen drawing, Teylers Museum, Haarlem)
231. Giovanni Bernardo Carbone, *Portrait of a Gentleman* (c. 1675, Indianapolis Museum of Art, Indiana)
232. Carlo Maratta, *Portrait of Robert Spencer* (1702, Althorp, England)
233. Francesco Albani, *Portrait of Andrea Calvi* (1636, National Museum of Wales, Cardiff)
234. Rembrandt, *Portrait of the Printseller Clement de Jonghe* (1651, etching, Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam)
235. Jusepe Ribera, *St. Andrew* (Museo de Belas Artes, La Coruña (in deposit at the Prado, Madrid)
236. Diego Velazquez, *Aesop* (c. 1640, Prado, Madrid)
237a. Achille D'Orsi, *Salvator Rosa* (terracotta, 1867, Certosa e Museo di San Martino, Naples)
237b. Achille D'Orsi, Detail of 237a.
237c. Achille D'Orsi, View of the statue from behind, as in 237a.
238. John Hamilton Mortimer, *Salvator Rosa* (engraving, 1778)

Prologue
An Introduction to Rosa as a Friend

At the 2006 Biennale Antiquariato in Florence I encountered a painting in the collection of a private gallery, recently attributed to Rosa as one of the *teste* or generic "portrait heads" he painted in Rome in the early 1650's. Upon speaking with one of the gallery's dealers, I discovered he shared my own enthusiasm for the artist and his reputation. But when I mentioned the subject of my research, he was puzzled: "Rosa had friends?" His surprise at the prospect that an artist famed for his "anti-social" proclivities could be studied in the context of friendship only reinforced, in my mind, the need for my project.

The dealer's impression of Rosa is one I have often encountered: an image that owes its genesis more to the Romantic mythology of the artist than to Rosa's own design. This lingering perception of Rosa also prompted my own initial attraction to the artist and his work.[1] His eighteenth- and nineteenth-century admirers constructed an identity for Rosa that, while founded on certain truths about his person and art, presented him as a harbinger of qualities that defined the artists of their own time, in particular the ideal of the fully independent and self-directed artist. They removed Rosa from the unique (and vital) social context that defined the ideals and subjectivities of his generation. In particular, they promoted a vision of Rosa as a misanthropic rebel, eager to undermine the socio-political norms of his day in a manner that uncannily foreshadowed later persons and events. This is the Rosa of the Neapolitan biographer Bernardo de' Dominici (1683-1759), the Irish novelist Lady Sydney Morgan (c. 1783-1859), the artist and

[1] Rosa's Romantic persona endures in spite of the attempts of scholars like Benedetto Croce to dismantle it in the late nineteenth century. See Croce, "Recenzione dell'opera del Cesareo *Poesie e lettere* ecc.," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* xxi (1893): 139-141; and *idem*, *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del seicento* (Bari: Laterza, 1911), 326-7. Recent publications like Almo Paita's *Salvator Rosa. La leggenda del pittore maledetto* (Firenze Libri, 2007) and Marcello Perelli, Egisto Bragaglia and Teresa Grossi's book on a set of drawings dubiously attributed to Rosa, *Salvator Rosa: L'uomo, l'artista, l'antesignano. 32 tavole di schizzi e studi inedite* (Treviso: Antiga Edizioni, 2006), describe Rosa as a "precursor" to the Romantics, and argue for an "exuberant, but melancholic" Rosa, an interpretation based in large part on the highly fictionalized study of Rosa by Irene Cattaneo, *Salvator Rosa* (Milan: Casa Editrice 'Alpes', 1929). Ottilie G. Boetzkes' fanciful biography of Rosa, *Salvator Rosa: Seventeenth-Century Italian Painter, Poet and Patriot* (New York: Vantage Press, 1960) also sustained the various eighteenth-century myths of Rosa's life of banditry and revolt.

clergyman William Gilpin (1724-1804), and the painter and critic Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792). Their whimsical biographical impulses placed Rosa among the *banditti* of the Abruzzi and amid the fray of the Neapolitan revolt of Masaniello in 1647,[2] extolling his "roving disposition"[3] and "savage and uncultivated nature"[4] – qualities superimposed onto his landscape paintings which were perfectly suited to the Romantic taste for the "picturesque" and "sublime".[5]

The Romantics conceived of the artist as a free individual, a "man (or woman) apart", distinctive for his irrational and eccentric behaviour or appearance, for a reliance on his own imagination, originality and "genius"; an artist who saw the creative process as a form of self-expression in which one was free to choose one's own novel subject-matter, unshackled by the constraints of the older patronage system. He or she was a non-conformist or rebel, an advocate for radical social and moral change, an anti-academic, an exhibitionist, and a martyr frequently persecuted for his or her cause.[6] There are many close parallels between the seventeenth-century and the Romantic "Rosas". The image of Rosa as a rebellious brigand or thief, for example, finds

---

[2] Bernardo De' Dominici, *Vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti napoletani* [1742] (Bologna: Forni, 1971), 3: 225; Lady Sydney Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa* (London: Colburn, 1824), 1: 108-9. On the revolt and Rosa's purported involvement in it see Wendy Roworth, "The Evolution of History Painting: Masaniello's Revolt and Other Disasters in Seventeenth-Century Naples," *Art Bulletin* lxxv: 2 (1993): 219-234, and Bernard Barryte, "History and Legend in T. J. Barker's 'The Studio of Salvator Rosa in the Mountains of the Abruzzi', 1865," *Art Bulletin* lxxi: 4 (1989): 662.

[3] John Sunderland, "John Hamilton Mortimer and Salvator Rosa," *Burlington Magazine* 112: 809 (1970): 523.

[4] Joshua Reynolds, *Discourses on Art*, ed. Robert R. Wark (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1959), esp. 84-7; cited by Harold Acton in *Painting in Naples 1606-1705. From Caravaggio to Giordano*, ed. Clovis Whitfield and Jane Martineau (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1982), 17.

[5] See John Sunderland, "The Legend and Influence of Salvator Rosa in England in the eighteenth century," *Burlington Magazine* 115: 849 (1973): 786; David Cordingly, "Claude Lorrain and the Southern Seaport Tradition," *Apollo* 103: 169 (1976): 208-213; Helen Langdon, "Salvator Rosa and Claude," *Burlington Magazine* 115: 849 (1973): 779-785; Langdon, "Claude and the Roman Landscape, 1630–1690," *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* 73: 3 (2004): 130-2; and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*: *A Study of Salvator Rosa As Satirist, Cynic and Painter* (New York: Garland, 1978), 377.

[6] On the image of the Romantic artist, see Geraldine Pelles, "The Image of the Artist", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 21: 2 (1962): 119-37; Sunderland, "The Legend and Influence of Salvator Rosa," 785-9; Haig Khatchadourian, "Artistic Freedom and Social Control", *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 12: 1 (1978): 23-32; Jane Kneller, "Imaginative Freedom and the German Enlightenment", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51: 2 (1990): 217-32; and L. P. Chambers, "Moral Freedom and Artistic Creativity", *International Journal of Ethics* 42: 2 (1932): 163-170. On the distinctions between the "autonomy" of the early-modern and Romantic artist, see Claudia Moscovici, "Aesthetics after Romanticism: On Originality, Individuality and Autonomy in Art", in *idem*, *Romanticism and Postromanticism* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007).

some basis in his earlier, seventeenth-century reputation,[7] and Rosa's disdain for the rituals of the ruling courts of Florence and Rome finds a distant echo in the socio-political ideals of the Romantic and Enlightenment era. But the nature of Rosa's "rebellion" is a far cry from the libertarian and revolutionary objectives of his followers. Rosa's Romantic enthusiasts were also right in seeing in him something of their own passion for the awe-inspiring qualities of nature, but the "*orrida bellezza*" (horrid beauty) that Rosa identified in one of his letters should be understood specifically in relation to *seicento* currents of Neo-Stoicism and natural science rather than Romantic conceptions of the Sublime.[8] Rosa's love of solitude also finds a reflection in the ideals of his Romantic admirers, but their misanthropic ideal belies the reality of Rosa's desire for and experience of a distinctly social brand of seclusion. Rosa was not as gregarious as many of his contemporaries, and he is certainly not the absurdly jolly character depicted in Achille d'Orsi's patriotic life-size terracotta statue of the artist of 1867, on display in the Museo di San Martino, Naples [Figs. 237a-c]. Yet neither is he the solitary, acrimonious rebel of John Hamilton Mortimer's print of 1778 [Fig. 238], which puts Rosa in the guise of one of his own images of isolated figures with little discretion about the fundamental distinction between the two. As I argue

---

[7] De' Dominici's and Morgan's image of Rosa as a "bandit" finds an earlier reflection in Passeri's account of Rosa's public critique of Bernini in Rome in 1639. Ottaviano Castelli's counter-attack on Rosa (launched on behalf of himself and Bernini) included spreading lies about Rosa having "stolen under-pans and silver candlesticks, to have aided in robberies, infamies, and dishonorable actions", all of which Passeri immediately dismisses as "improper, false and fraudulent" accusations. Passeri, *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti che hanno lavorato in Roma* [1772] (Arnaldo Forni Editore, 2002), 423. In a letter of 1654 Rosa refers to a similar accusation of theft in the context of the aftermath of his satire *Invidia*, for which he was berated by his critics in Rome. See Gian Giotto Borelli and Lucio Festa, *Salvator Rosa: Lettere* (Naples: Società editrice il Mulino; Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici, 2003), letter 177. All subsequent references to Rosa's letters are to this volume.

[8] In a letter to Giovan Battista Ricciardi of 1662 (Borelli, letter 265), Rosa described the landscape on his return to Florence from Ancona: "Vidi a Terni (cioè quattro miglia for di strada) la famosa cascata dei Velino, fiume di Rieti, cosa da far spiritare ogni incontentabile cervello per la sua orrida bellezza: per vedere un fiume che precipita da un monte di mezzo miglio di precipizio et inalza la sua schiuma altretanto." On Rosa's relation to the "Sublime", see Sunderland, "The Legend and Influence of Salvator Rosa," 785-9; Sybille Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità. Le iconografie di Salvator Rosa," in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*. Exhibition catalogue. (Naples: Electa, 2008), 69; Langdon, "A Theatre of Marvels: the Poetics of Salvator Rosa," *Kunsthistorisk Tidskrift* 73: 3 (2004): 179-192; Susan Jenkins et al., *Salvator Rosa: Wild Landscapes*. Exhibition catalogue. (London: Wallace Collection; Compton Verney House Trust, 2005); James Patty, S*alvator Rosa in French Literature: From the Bizarre to the Sublime* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 2005); Barryte, "History and Legend in T. J. Barker," 661-2.

at points throughout this study, the remote nature of Rosa's hermits and philosophers represents an ideal of intellectual solitude rather than the true nature of selective sociability that he sought for himself.

Rosa's Romantic admirers were also justified in seeing in him a spark of the same desire for professional autonomy that was only fully achieved and exercised in their own time. But here, too, there are elementary differences between Rosa and his followers in method, contextual circumstances, and relative degree of actualization. Rosa remained bound by the conditions of the *seicento* artist's experience, played out on the stages of Spanish-occupied Naples, Medici Florence and papal Rome. Each of these settings shared and perpetuated an ideal of artistic-professional practice that continued to subject the artist and his identity to the jurisdiction of patrons and clients. The Romantics, conversely, attained a "greater fluidity of social strata" and consequent "lack of fixed identities" in their practice, no longer bound as they were to their "social utility".[9] Their self-presentation consisted in a "wholly self-determined" individualism.[10] The control exerted by the institutional structures of the *seicento* was especially strong in papal Rome, where Rosa lived for the majority of his career. Here, the artist's success, reputation, and economic survival remained (in spite of a growing market of alternative clients) largely determined by the achievement of noble favour or the receipt of a papal commission. Rosa's liberating mission, too, was fundamentally different in its goal from that of his later enthusiasts. For the latter, this endeavour was directed at maintaining an entitlement to a free space of experimentation;[11] for Rosa, it was aimed at attaining the initial, essential privilege of recognition that would produce that very right in the first place. The "mythical, free individual" that became both a political and intellectual ideal from the mid-

---

[9] Pelles, "The Image of the Artist", 122 and 130; and Moscovici, "Aesthetics after Romanticism: On Originality, Individuality and Autonomy in Art", 59-61.

[10] Natalie Zemon Davis, "Boundaries and the Sense of Self in Sixteenth-century France," in *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, ed. Thomas C. Heller et al. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), 58.

[11] Bram Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage. The Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance* (London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1987), 316

eighteenth century onward was for Rosa simply not yet conceivable.[12] Rosa's desire to break free from the constraints of court patronage or the dictates of client contracts and the restrictions they imposed on his practice (which he regarded as a self-determined enterprise), and his achievement of what Luigi Spezzaferro identifies as a "substantial autonomy,"[13] found their resolution in a very particular form of sociality that was simultaneously bound to the older code of the artist-patron relationship and permissive of a sense of independence from it: friendship.

Rosa's claims for professional autonomy (better understood as a multivalent form of "freedom" than a self-governance in the later, Kantian sense[14]) appear in specific, shifting contexts: they consist in comments made in the safety of letters to close friends, in declarations attributed to him by biographers eager to assert their own agendas, and in proclamations to patrons at a relatively mature stage in Rosa's career. His frequent epistolary use of the term *libertà*, which he applied to a broad range of types of personal and professional "freedoms", suggests that he conceived of freedom as a fluid, multivalent and inclusive concept. Rosa uses the word primarily to refer to a notion of familiarity and intimacy: for example, he repeatedly stakes his claim to "speak freely" to his friends and urges them to do likewise. In these instances, Rosa intends that this "freedom" of mind and of speech is the prerogative of true friendship.[15] To speak freely in epistolary writing was to be sincere, informal and devoid of artefice (all important measures of friendship), but also to be bold, forthright and even audacious.[16] (Indeed, Rosa frequently implied that his "free" manner of

---

[12] Pelles, "The Image of the Artist", 131.
[13] Luigi Spezzaferro, "Le contraddizioni del pittore. Note sulle trasformazioni del lavoro artistico nella prima meta del '600," *Quaderni Storici* 16: XXXIX (2004): 332.
[14] On Kant and the introduction of "autonomy" to moral philosophy, see J. B. Schneewind, "The Use of Autonomy in Ethical Theory," in *Reconstructing Individualism*, ed. Heller et al., 64.
[15] In a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1651, Rosa writes, "io sopra ogni altro amico che voi habiate vi son tenuto nelle parti dell'oblighationi e dell'affetto; però vi dico adesso per sempre che in qualsivoglia occorrenza nella quale vi potete prevalere della mia attitudine, che lo facciate con quella libertà che fra dui veri amici deve in ogni occorrenza adoprarsi." Borelli, letter 102. In a much earlier letter to Giulio of 1646, Rosa had already referred to his "freedom" of speaking to friends in seeking their assistance, writing "Con la solita libertà me ne vengo a pregarla d'un favore…" Borelli, letter 16. Also see Borelli, letters 45, 87, 117, 118, 216, 329.
[16] On various occasions Rosa described his "freedom" as "excessive". See Borelli, letters 24, 45, 137, 144, 195, 246, 252, 295, 301, 302, 303, 305, 316, 329, 336, 343 and 389.

speaking revealed a daringly self-assured personality.[17]) To speak at liberty with friends was also to exist "on par" with one's interlocutor, and to experience a sense of authority and individual agency in the process. On other occasions, Rosa uses "*libertà*" to refer to other forms of freedom: a space opposed to the requirements and challenges of hard work, slander and accusation, illness, imprisonment, or socio-political restraint; an ideal realm of friendship; a state of being opposed to misfortune (another central theme in Rosa's writings); a right to choose his own subject matter; and a claim for independence and self-governance in artistic practice.[18] Rosa asserted on more than one occasion that his claims for freedom (in both a personal and professional context) were an integral aspect of his "philosophy" – his state of being, temperament, or identity.[19]

The socially-ratified ideals of sincerity, equality and bravado that characterize and permit epistolary freedom also facilitate the professional autonomy that Rosa desired to exercise on the world stage. In this regard it is noteworthy that Rosa included both *Sincerità* and *Libertà* among the allegorical personifications of his self-celebratory etching *The "Genius" of Salvator Rosa* (c. 1660-64) [Fig. 99]. Wendy Roworth has argued that the "liberty" to which Rosa refers in his print promotes a vision of independence that is not merely a "simple freedom from slavery" but "liberty achieved through knowledge and virtue"[20] – both skills that are, importantly, achieved and endorsed in the context of a network of intellectual friends and

[17] See, for example, Borelli letters 46, 305 and 316.
[18] Borelli, letters 150, 363; 214; 309, 363; 177, 272; 358; 48, 117, 131, 246; 156; 303; 306.
[19] See Borelli, letters 306, 308 and 321.
[20] Both sincerity and liberty are vital pursuits for the satirist, who "must be completely honest, frank, and open, saying all that is in his heart and mind, holding back nothing." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 83-89. Rosa's own conception of his freedom as "virtuous" is apparent in his frequent protestations to Ricciardi that his intentions are "free and innocent". See, for example, Borelli, letter 336.

colleagues.[21] Rosa's professional autonomy was intimately bound to the practice and discourse of *libertà* that defined the personal bond of true friendship.

My intention is to contribute a new category of identity to the existing register, taken up in earnest by Roworth in her significant dissertation on Rosa of 1978.[22] She presents Rosa as a satirist, taking her cue from the signatory-inscription in Rosa's "*Genius*" etching where the artist identifies himself as *Pictor Succensor*, or the "Candid, Free, Indignant and Equitable" painter and poet. I offer another piece of the puzzle by starting from Rosa's habitual epistolary epithet, "*Amico vero*": Rosa as a "true friend". Even a cursory reading of Rosa's almost four-hundred extant letters reveals the significance of this soubriquet as an imperative category of identity for Rosa and his work. The extant letters, written between 1641 and 1673, were addressed almost entirely to two of Rosa's closest friends: the Pisan poet, playwright, and eventual reader in moral philosophy Giovan Battista Ricciardi (1624-1686), and the Volterran merchant Giulio Maffei (?-d. 1654).[23] Numbering among the most important biographical testimonies of the Italian *seicento*, Rosa's letters provide a contextual nucleus for my project, around which to situate the broader, richer range of his and his friends' textual and pictorial production.

Much of the incongruity of Rosa's claims and the volatility of temperament and conduct that accompanied it can be explained as a result of his position as caught between the realities of the social parameters of his time and the ideal of professional freedom that he sought: he wanted both

[21] On the masculine ideal of "virtue", its connection to rising notions of autonomy, and the (homo)social basis of that development in the early-modern period, see Susan Amussen, "'The part of a Christian man': The Cultural Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England," in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe. Essays Presented to David Underdown*, ed. Susan Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), esp. 214-227.
[22] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*.
[23] Rosa's letters are in the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli, the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Fitzwilliam Library in Cambridge, and a private collection in Florence. Previously dispersed among a number of separate publications, the letters were gathered together in a new comprehensive edition by Gian Giotto Borelli and Lucio Festa in 2003. The Borelli edition omits a few letters, some of which are not certainly by Rosa, in the manuscript collection of the Biblioteca di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, Palazzo Venezia, Rome (hereafter BiASA). Some of these letters have been published elsewhere. See Ozzola, *Vita e Opere di Salvator Rosa: Pittore, Poeta, Incisore. Con Poesie e Documenti Inediti* (Strassburg: Heitz & Mündel, 1908), 62, and Lucilla Mariani, "Un album di appunti di Salvator Rosa," *Accademia e Biblioteche d'Italia* XVII: 6 (1943): 340.

solitude and fame; he craved distinction and inclusion; he disdained wealth but flaunted ostentatious dress; and he was hostile toward noble patronage yet desired the recognition (and financial support) it conferred.[24] Friendship offered a path through this forest of conflict, presenting the opportunity to carve out and enact a persona of independence that was not yet fully available to Rosa or his contemporaries. It permitted Rosa to display alternatively conformist and rebellious attitudes. For an artist bound to the existing social structure of power relations that governed his professional success, friendship offered an alternative practice that could operate both within that realm and offer a real sense of independence from it.

Friendship was an ever-present association in the lives of ambitious early-modern men. As a vital component of philosophy and its practice (implicit in the affective prefix "*philia*"), friendship was actively pursued by intellectuals with humanist aspirations as an ideal and professional prerequisite as much as a desired and necessary psychological or emotional bond. Early-modern friendship, in the mould of its ancient model, was conceived as a fundamentally male enterprise, denied to women who were deemed incapable of the requisite masculine *virtù*. (One of many signs that this homosocial ideal was already changing in the *seicento*, however, is the use of the term "*amico*" between Rosa and his life-long partner Lucrezia Paolini.[25]) In this study I argue

---

[24] Francis Haskell similarly observed the contradiction inherent in the nature of Rosa's quest for autonomy when he argued that Rosa was paradoxically "launching a revolution [in his quest for professional autonomy] purely to demonstrate his conformity with the critical canons of his age." Francis Haskell, *Patrons and Painters. Art and Society in Baroque Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 22, 354.

[25] Rosa and Lucrezia were only married in 1673 on Rosa's death bed. They became involved in Florence in the 1640's, while Lucrezia was married to another man (who apparently fled Florence never to be heard from again). Their relationship put them in a dangerous situation with the religious authorities after they moved to Rome in 1649, a predicament Rosa alludes to on numerous occasions in his letters. Rosa referred to Lucrezia as "Signora Comare" ("mistress" or "wife") (Borelli, letters 10, 22), while Passeri described their relationship as a "friendship". Passeri, *Vite*, 425. Two letters attributed to Rosa and Lucrezia are conserved in the BiASA, Rome. In the letter by Lucrezia, she addresses Rosa as her "amico caro". See Ozzola, *Vita e opere*, 245; BiASA MS 77 (96360). On the flexible use of the term "friend" in reference to marriage partners, see Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000), 19; Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 25; Guy Fitch Lytle, "Friendship and Patronage in Renaissance Europe," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons (Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 52-53; Ian Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 19,

not only that friends were in large part responsible for the facilitation, achievement and sustenance of Rosa's identity and experience of professional freedom, but that Rosa actively cultivated those friendships with this goal in mind. The ancient and enduring principle of reciprocity that defines friendship (one that Rosa and his friends referred to as a "Law" of friendship) produces an experience of equality, a levelling of power or "oneness" in which both or multiple participants are consequently granted an individuality and an independence. In its inherent mutuality, friendship recognizes the unique value and power of individual agency (and permits its exertion), but situates and produces it directly "in relation" to the friend who is, ideally, a mirror-image of that self.[26] (A very real sense of this feature of friendship may be experienced in the sensation of feeling like a "different person" upon seeing an old friend after a long period without any contact. The "selves" that we once were, together, have changed or entirely dissipated because the relationship that sustained them came to an end.) This feature of friendship is part of a much broader conception of the fluidity of boundaries between individuals in the early-modern period that pervades both the discourse and rituals of its practice by Rosa and his companions,[27] an "embeddedness" of selfhood or a common experience that – as Natalie Zemon Davis has noted – did not "preclude self-discovery, but rather prompted it," spurring the discovery of "one's own distinctive history."[28] The *homonic* principles of friendship informed the Neo-Stoic philosophy with which Rosa and his friends were so preoccupied. They are apparent in Rosa's epistolary comments (replete with a rhetoric of "debts" and "obligations"[29]), in the anecdotes of his early biographers (which must be

---

59; and Francesco Barbaro, "On Wifely Duties," in *The Earthly Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society*, ed. Benjamin G. Kohl and Ronald G. Witt (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), 196-7.

[26] The ancient tenet of similitude in friendship (expressed for example in Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics,* 227-228, Book IX, 4) is encapsulated by Michel de Montaigne, but is everywhere evident in the writing of other early-modern commentators on the subject of amity. As Montaigne writes, "the perfect friendship which I am talking about is indivisible: each gives himself so entirely to his friend that he has nothing left to share with another." Montaigne, *On Friendship* [1580], trans. M. A. Screech (New York: Penguin Books, 1991).

[27] Davis, "Boundaries and the Sense of Self in Sixteenth-century France," 56.

[28] *Ibid*, 63.

[29] See Borelli letters 30, 49, 78, 84, 94, 102, 115-118, 132, 137, 139, 224, 227, 237, 283-288, 294, 349 and 391.

approached with a cautious eye),[30] and in his professional and economic practices with clients and patrons. They also defined the social settings that Rosa made central to his mission (including the private academy, the villa, the theatre and the court), where he applied the ideal principles of friendship to both intimate and business relationships alike in the service of sustaining a free identity.

Ancient theorists posited three primary "types" of friendship (traceable in their most concrete form to the definitions of Aristotle): the most supreme was described as "perfect", "virtuous" or "true" friendship; the most deplorable (but necessary) was termed "useful" friendship; and the one that fell somewhere in between the two was called "enjoyable" or "pleasurable" friendship.[31] With his self-identification as "*amico vero*" Rosa intended to align himself with the first, most admirable (though essentially impossible) form of amity. These three categories are occasionally discernible in the relations between Rosa and his "friends", but the confluence between

---

[30] Throughout this study I rely primarily on Rosa's earliest and most reliable biographers, Giambattista Passeri and Filippo Baldinucci, both of whom claimed a personal friendship or terms of intimacy with Rosa (which they also cite in evidence of their accuracy), although Passeri appears the likelier candidate of the two as an actual "friend". Passeri, *Vite*, 416, 417-419 and 434. Baldinucci, *Notizie dei Professori del Disegno da Cimabue in qua*, ed. Ferdinando Ranalli. 5 vols (Florence: V. Batelli, 1974), 447-8, 463, 452, 454-55, 460, 463, 477, 490, 491 and 501. (All subsequent references to Baldinucci are to this edition, unless otherwise stated.) Two important biographies of Rosa were written in the eighteenth century, which draw from the accounts of Baldinucci and Passeri: Lione Pascoli's biography of 1736, which also contains information from other sources, and a biography by the Neapolitan artist Bernardo de' Dominici, published between 1742 and 1743. De' Dominici's account, the most problematic and fanciful of the lot, inspired Lady Sydney Morgan's romanticized but occasionally insightful biography of 1824.

[31] The primary ancient sources on friendship (many of which Rosa and his friends either read or were familiar with) include: Plato, *Lysis*, *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Books VIII and IX); Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*; Plutarch *Moralia*; Seneca *De Beneficiis*; Lucian, *Toxaris*; Plutarch, *Moral Essays*; and Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. The scholarship on Aristotle's theory of friendship is vast. See for example David Harris Calhoun, "Friendship and Self-Love in Aristotle's Ethics" (PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1989) and John M. Cooper, "Aristotle on Friendship", in *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, ed. Amelie Oksenberg Rorty (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980). Among the early-modern studies of friendship, the most important and well-known texts include: Marsilio Ficino, *De amore* (*Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love* [c. 1469], Alberti, *I Libri della Famiglia* [written 1434-41], Baldassare Castiglione, *Il Cortegiano* [1528], Stefano Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione* [1574], Torquato Tasso, *Il Manso, ovvero dell'amicizia* [1602], Michel de Montaigne, *On Friendship* [1603] and Francis Bacon, *Of Friendship* [1607]. Rosa's letters reveal his particular familiarity with the works of Lucian, Petrarch, Ovid, and more modern writers like Tasso and Ariosto. See Borelli, letters 146, 198. Cicero's *De Amicitia* was standard reading in the period, along with the *De Senectute* and *Epistulae Familiares*. See Charles Dempsey, "Some Observations on the Education of Artists in Florence and Bologna during the later Sixteenth Century," *Art Bulletin* 62: 4 (1980), 561, and Richard Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's 'Death of Atilius Regulus'," *Burlington Magazine* CIX: 772 (1967): 396.

them is apparent in Rosa's use of the term "*amico*" in reference to good friends, persons who are better termed acquaintances, colleagues, and even adversaries.[32] Many of Rosa's more intimate relationships can be termed "best" or "perfect" friends.[33] It is as a "true friend", moreover, that Rosa (and his friends) endeavoured to promote the ideal "true" or "sincere" aspects of friendship over the useful ones in the service of sustaining that position of autonomous independence that only the sincerest form of friendship conferred. But friendship, as both a concept and a relation, is a fragile and mutable entity, self-consciously ambiguous, expandable and purposely defiant of concrete definition: it changes and fluctuates in nature and degree, it surfaces at different stages of life or dies out, it borders on the familial or the erotic, or it subsists on the barest minimum of connection. It consists – always – in some alternatively clear-cut or vaguer combination of "perfection" and "utility", love and commerce, altruism and self-interest. In the study that follows I have tried to allow the flexible and complex nature of Rosa's own relationships to emerge.

A consequence of the emphasis Rosa placed on friendship as a strategy of self-creation and self-promotion was that the flip-side of that relation – acrimonious and hostile associations, and even outright enmity – gained an equally important role in the process of crafting and asserting a unique and liberated identity. Like friendship, rivalry also generated a requisite parity between its practitioners, producing a sense of autonomy and potential for superiority in each opponent.[34] Rosa made antagonism an important feature of his self-fashioning, characterizing himself as

---

[32] Rosa expresses a sense of irony about the meaning and use of the term "friend" in a letter to Ricciardi of 1655. Writing shortly after being accused of plagiarizing his satires, Rosa refers to "Partenio" (a nickname he had given to Giovan Francisco Savaro, who had written a pamphlet entitled *Parthenio* against a play by Rosa's friend Giovan Filippo Ghirardelli) as a "friend", noting that he was headed for prison for having written against the Pope. Borelli, letter 192. Rosa also makes an explicit distinction between "friends" and "acquaintances" in a letter to Ricciardi of 1650: "Conforme fo' con tutti gli amici, o per dir meglio conoscenti (che amico stimo solamente voi tutto che siate così bestiale, e rigoroso nel pigliar gli orsi a volo)." Borelli, letter 46. He also frequently takes pains to stress the uniqueness and degree of his affection for friends such as Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei, who he professes to consider his most important and "truest" friends. See Borelli, letters 87, 92, 93, 109, 113, 180, 182, 195 and 217.

[33] For Rosa's references to "true friendship", see Borelli, letters 41, 99, 108, 131, 166, 218, 253, 344, 373 and 391.

[34] See Rona Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals. Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), 6, and Frank Whigham, "Interpretation at Court: Courtesy and the Performance-Audience Dialectic," *New Literary History* xiv (1983), 629.

incontenta, *indiavolato*[35], and frequently citing his Neapolitan identity as a point of distinction, for better or worse.[36] Rosa's frequent complaints over the criticism and "envy" levied against him by his detractors extended to an even more profound epistemology of fatalistic determinism, in which Rosa saw his life as determined by the uncontrollable impulses of fate and "Fortune". This attitude seems incongruous with Rosa's otherwise forthright assertion of self-governance, but the cultivation of a discourse of fatalism (everywhere apparent in his epistolary and poetic grumblings of being misunderstood, unappreciated, and subject to the cruel "whims of fortune" – especially when his fame, freedom or financial situation were in jeopardy[37]), should instead be seen in connection with a broader set of oppositional strategies for actively creating a position of distinction and liberty. As Horace argued, "Adversity reveals genius, prosperity conceals it."[38] While friendship offered a sense of freedom in a parity of like-mindedness, enmity offered independence in a parity of opposition.[39] For Rosa, fate and fortune belonged to the same set of rivals as his critics and envious detractors who helped him assert a unique persona and autonomous professional position.

Rosa was not alone nor innovative in cultivating rivalry in the pursuit of individuality. Opposition is implicit in the fundamentally competitive nature of early-modern artistic practice, in which individual skill, practical freedom, and professional self-direction were determined in large

---

[35] See Borelli, letters 3 and 364.

[36] Roworth has also described Rosa's promotion of an identity "apart": a self-image of "wildness and savagery" that "stemmed not from raw nature but from his cynical, satiric inclinations." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 340 and 348.

[37] Writing to Ricciardi in 1651 about his painting of *Democritus*, Rosa noted that – in spite of the "perfection" he considered himself to have invested in the work – "fame is a strike of fortune", and it remained to be seen how the painting would be received. Borelli, letter 86. He reiterates the sentiment in his satire *La Poesia*: "La fama, in somma, è un colpo di fortuna". See Danilo Romei ed., *Salvator Rosa. Satire* (Milan: Mursia, 1995), 83, v. 466. Also see Borelli, letters 41, 92, 133, 147, 151, 153, 169, 191, 201, 204, 206, 245 and 246.

[38] Horace, *Sermones: The Satires of Horace* [c. 31 BC], ed. Arthur Palmer (London: Macmillan, 1964), Book II, Satire 8, line 73: "Ingenium res adversae nudare solent, celare secundae."

[39] Chambers, "Moral Freedom and Artistic Creativity", 170. Chambers cites G. W. F. Hegel's precept that "to be conscious of a limit is to have transcended it … only he who is by nature free is conscious of his bonds," and "only through his bonds can man demonstrate his freedom." Chambers, *ibid*, 175. For a Marxist perspective on the requisite existential relationship between freedom and constraint, see Bela Kiralyfalvi, "Lukács's Views on Artistic Freedom", *Leonardo* 16: 2 (1983): 125.

part by participation in rivalry with contemporaries and historical predecessors alike.[40] It is also a feature of the broader cultural phenomenon of "dissent" among Rosa's *seicento* contemporaries, outlined by Luigi Salerno, which tempered orthodoxy with libertinism, an interest in magic and the occult, and radical new modes of scientific inquiry.[41] In my study of Rosa, I aim to modify Salerno's rather limiting presentation of Rosa as a paragon of social dissidence by arguing that, while Rosa's quest for autonomy was antithetical to certain of the power structures of the social establishment, it was also required to operate *within* those structures, was to a great extent supported by them, and succeeded in doing so principally via the auspices of friendship. Identity consists in a constant interplay and negotiation between difference and similitude – between the need for distinction and inclusion, isolation and connection – and this is apparent in Rosa's characteristically volatile procedure of self-fashioning which frequently oscillates from one extremity of sociality to another. I have attempted to acknowledge many of the antagonistic strategies Rosa employed in his quest for freedom, but the full nature and extent of that aspect of his persona and practice will remain the subject of future research.

My approach to Rosa does not consist in a rigorous application of one theory or methodology, a procedure that I find unnecessarily limiting – particularly in attempting to elucidate a phenomenon as complex as the historical "self". This project is as much about art and writing as identity, and the plurality of methods and approaches I incorporate is to some extent a consequence of the rich variety of pictorial and textual sources – both Rosa's and those of his friends – that I

---

[40] On this phenomenon, see Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, esp. chapter 1. Vasari made both friendship and rivalry vital strategies for the artist's success. On Vasari and friendship, see Patricia Lee Rubin, *Giorgio Vasari. Art and History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 348 and *passim*. On competition as an organizational feature of Vasari's *Vite*, see Elizabeth Pilliod, "Representation, Misrepresentation, and Non-Representation: Vasari and his Competitors," in *Vasari's Florence. Artists and Literati at the Medicean Court*, ed. Philip Jacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 30-52. On the sociality of artists as central to Vasari's project, see Marc Gotlieb, "The Painter's Secret. Invention and Rivalry from Vasari to Balzac," *Art Bulletin* 84: 3 (2002): 469-490. On the related *topoi* of family and fraternity in Vasari's biographies, see Paul Barolsky, *Giotto's Father and the Family of Vasari's 'Lives'* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1992), esp. 10-11, 19-20, 103-4.

[41] Salerno, "Il dissenso nella pittura. Intorno a Filippo Napoletano, Caroselli, Salvator Rosa e altri," *Storia dell'Arte* 5 (1970): 34-65. Also see Caterina Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e cardinale Francesco Maria Brancaccio, tra Napoli, Rome e Firenze," *Storia dell'Arte* 12: 112 (2005): 130-1.

offer in evidence of my argument: a unique archive of paintings, prints, drawings, letters, satires and poems provides access to understanding Rosa's identity. In attempting to outline this persona, I aim for a pragmatic, flexible and inclusive consideration of the insights and working methods of a variety of social, anthropological and psychological theorists and historians who define subjectivity as the product of community. I regard the self as a complex, multifaceted, malleable, and changeable entity, both historically and culturally contingent, and a product of both individual and external forces. In arguing for the socially-bound nature of Rosa's self-fashioning I do not intend to deprive him of personal agency – a nascent Cartesian sense of self-determinacy – in that process. Instead, I argue that that this development was situated in, and facilitated to a considerable degree by, social relationships – in particular, the bond of friendship in which the parallel discourses of unity and individualism allowed practitioners to exercise both the benefits afforded by social support and to stake at the same time a very real claim for personal creativity, authorship and a powerfully self-directed individuality. Nor is it my intention to suggest that a social theory of selfhood is the only way to think about early-modern identity or autonomy. I concur with theorists like Gen Doy who propose a more inclusive and integrative theoretical approach to the self, seeing it as a "focus" where otherwise divergent theories like psychoanalysis and Marxism "can usefully come together, as subjectivity is situated dialectically in relation to the person and the political, the private and the public, the social and the psychic".[42] In this endeavour I also acknowledge alternative viewpoints that have challenged the post-modern assessment of subjectivity as a social construct, such as John Jeffries Martin's useful discussion of the alternatively internal and external sources of identity in the early-modern period.[43]

---

[42] Gen Doy, *Picturing the Self: Changing Views of the Self in Visual Culture* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2005), 4-5, 10, and *ibid*, *Materializing Art History* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 1998), 109.

[43] John Jeffries Martin, "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe", *The American Historical Review* 102: 5 (1997): 1330-3.

My approach has been influenced in particular by the work of modern and post-modern social theorists and historians who, in Doy's words, "have dismissed the notion of a coherent, individual self, able to position her/himself over and above the world as a controlling, conscious agent" and regard it instead as "fragmented, unstable, de-centered and constructed by discourse."[44] My introduction to this field began with Stephen Greenblatt's well-known and transformative vision of the self as constituted by complex, entwining social forces.[45] In attempting to understand the social process of self-fashioning in the court-based context of the *seicento*, I have found especially useful Martin Warnke's *The Court Artist*, which locates the development of the visual artist's autonomy in the early-modern dynastic court,[46] and Norbert Elias's sociological model of early-modern civility, which outlines the critical interdependency of individuals in the social networks and settings (including the court and the academy) that dominated the lives of Rosa and his contemporaries.[47]

The theory of a socially-constituted or "ethnographic" subjectivity advocated by sociologists and social anthropologists like Pierre Bourdieu, Clifford Geertz, Marcel Mauss, George Herbert Mead and Emile Durkheim, who see the individual as a product of interdependency or propose a "collective conscience" in which individuality and autonomy are both conceived as the products of social experience, solidarity and group identity,[48] offers a modern theoretical approach

---

[44] Doy, *Picturing the* Self, 2-3.
[45] See especially Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); and *idem*, "Fiction and Friction," in *Reconstructing Individualism*, ed. Heller et al., 30-52, where he argues that, while post-Enlightenment subjectivity is grounded in a concept of the "normative", Renaissance selves exist in relation to the "prodigious."
[46] Martin Warnke, *The Court Artist. On The Ancestry of the Modern Artist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Warnke's ideas are reflected in the writings of authors like Christopher Wood, "Why Autonomy?", *Perspecta* 33 (2002), 48-53, and Bram Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage*.
[47] Norbert Elias, *The Court Society*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), and *idem*, *The Civilizing Process. The History of Manners*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).
[48] See Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973); Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000) [originally published as "Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques," *L'Année Sociologique*, second series (1923-1924)]; George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self and Society*

to the self that is reflected in the early-modern conception of self-fashioning. (The charge of constructing an impersonal or detached sense of selfhood that Carol Gilligan levies against modern relational theories of subjectivity is dispelled in the case of the early-modern theory of friendship, which consists in a strong bond of affective intimacy and grants its "mirrored" participants a powerful sense of individual agency.[49]) A relational theory of selfhood is particularly useful in application to Rosa's (and his contemporaries) conception of identity as a series of performances, a phenomenon most evident in the genre of self-portraiture "in guise" or in the adoption of various theatrical roles on stage, but equally present in the practices of daily life. In this conception, the sense of possessive individuality that Rosa endeavoured to uphold remains a constant possibility, while identity itself is produced via the acknowledgement and appraisal of an audience.[50]

The performative and aesthetic dimension of self-fashioning, described by the sociologist Erving Goffman as a definitive feature of "everyday life",[51] is a thread that runs throughout my discussion. (Shakespearean aphorisms seemed fitting – if trite – subtitles in some of the chapters.) A consummate performer through and through, Rosa was fully aware of the fictive potential of his self-presentation, and cognizant of his own apparent self-contradictoriness in that performance, a characteristic noted by Rosa himself as much as by his friends and rivals.[52] According to his early

---

(Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1962 [1934]); Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (New York: Free Press, 1964 [1893]), 37-38. Also see Karen Sykes, *Arguing with Anthropology. An Introduction to Critical Theories of the Gift* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 11. On the "ethnographic" theory of self-fashioning, see James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Self-Fashioning: Conrad and Malinowski," in *Reconstructing Individualism*, ed. Heller et al., 140-62.

[49] Carol Gilligan, "Remapping the Moral Domain: New Images of the Self in Relationship," in *Reconstructing Individualism*, ed. Heller et al., 240.

[50] On possessive individualism, see Crawford Brough Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963); Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus*, trans. M. Sainsbury (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); and Dumont, *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

[51] Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre, 1959).

[52] Fully aware of the contrived nature of his philosophical statements, and of the difference between language and lived experience, Rosa wrote to Ricciardi in 1666: "Nel dar sentenze tutti siamo Burchielli. Ma una più tirannica filosofia vuole ch'ogni cosa sia temperamento al quale difficilmente si ricalcitra. Simil sorte di precetti escono giornalmente dalla mia bocca; e, pure col sentirli per verissimi, non si può che con una estrema repugnanza oprare al contrario. Amico, già sapete che siamo sforzati, e che dai detti ai fatti v'è qualche sorte di differenza." Borelli,

biographer Giambattista Passeri, for example, Rosa "knew to carry himself with admirable artifice, sustaining his position to great advantage".[53] Rosa crafted his personal and professional *personae* in both theatrical and everyday displays, often staged with the assistance of friends. Rosa's ever-present craving for fame, the achievement of which could produce a certain practical autonomy, required a constant and sustained performance in both "private" and "public" spheres.[54]

The performative dimension of Rosa's person emerges not only in his adherence to early-modern social codes (civility, virtue, honour and reputation) but also in his devotion to the doctrine of humorology. Rosa's melancholic humour, inexorably bound to both his masculinity and creativity, was an essential constituent in his claim for individual inspiration and professional autonomy. In this regard I have found informative the insights of social and gender theorists such as Alan Bray, Judith Butler, Mark Breitenberg, Gail Kern Paster and Frank Whigham, who emphasize the indissoluble link between the early-modern individual body and his or her "social" body, a union in which selves are constituted in performance.[55] The role played by gender (as a

---

letter 334. Burchiello was the nickname of the Florentine poet Domenico di Giovanni (1404-1449) whose rhymes were derived from illogical and comic juxtapositions.

[53] Passeri, *Vite*, 432.

[54] Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage*, 242-243. Rosa frequently linked his right to professional independence to his fame and public renown. In 1664 he boasted to Ricciardi that he was "sufficiently known by the whole world" and that it was necessary to leave the practical matters of painting to the artist and not attempt to prescribe ideas to him. Borelli, letter 303. Also see letters 4, 32, 48, 51, 52, 86, 88, 92, 102, 127, 128, 136, 137, 144, 150, 151, 158, 176, 178, 214, 271, 277, 305, 309, 328, 335, 346, 359, 360, 369, and 371. Rosa's letters reveal his conviction in the social basis of individual "merit". See Borelli, letters 26, 27, 169, 187, 235, 302. He often indicates his awareness of the social impact on reputation and identity. See Borelli, letters 46, 48, 93, 101, 103, 161, 175, 177, 178, 357. On the social basis of "reputation" in the Renaissance, see Floriana Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione. Nelle Corti del Rinascimento* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 2003), 217. On the fundamentally social and performative nature of the early-modern culture of honour and virtue, see Koenraad Verboven, "The Economy of Friends. Economic Aspects of *Amicitia* and Patronage in the Late Republic," in *Collection Latomus* (Brussels: Editions Latomus, 2002), 269: 46-7, and Elizabeth Cohen, "Honor and Gender in the Streets of Early Modern Rome," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* xxii: 4 (1992): 597-625.

[55] See Alan Bray, *The Friend* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); *idem*, "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England," in *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, ed. Rachel Adams and David Savran (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 340-50; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*; Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed. Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993); and Whigham, "Interpretation at Court," 623-639. On early-modern masculinity, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985); R. W. Connell, "The History of Masculinity," in *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, ed. Adams and Savran, 245-261; Harry Brod ed., *The Making of Masculinities. The New Men's Studies* (Boston:

social constituent of identity) in the early-modern period is also an important consideration in the context of the male-dominated discourse of friendship to which Rosa and his friends contributed. Rosa seems caught in the midst of a change between 1650-1800, identified by Raymond Stephanson, in which a form of male creative identity located in social reputation and "collective structures" takes on an increasingly interiorized or psychologically-located form: a moment of a "double sense of internal and reputational status."[56] Stephanson's thesis reflects the conceptions of structuralist and post-structuralist theorists like Michel Foucault, whose interpretation of subjectivity as a fragmentary, unstable, contextually-dependent, constantly changing, "relational" entity, generated in and by discourse and subject to power-structures, offers useful heuristic for understanding the broader social basis of identity in the early-modern period, particularly in relation to court culture.[57]

My project also ventures a social "psychology" of Rosa – a consideration of his personality and behaviour as products of social experience. I make no claim to describe the "real" or definitive Rosa (an impossibility from a historical as well as epistemological standpoint) but rather as comprehensive a picture of the artist and his multifaceted nature as possible, according to the documentary evidence of his own art and writing and the comments of his contemporaries: often overly-sensitive, defensive, phobic, irritable, self-centered and pedantic, Rosa is also generous, affectionate, loyal and a light-hearted jokester. His constant need to assert his talents to an audience and receive affirmation from them (a desire that Passeri, interestingly, attributed to the artist's

---

Allen & Unwin, 1987); D. Hammond and A. Jablow, "Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid: The Myth of Male Friendship," in *The Making of Masculinities*, ed. Brod, 241; Maurizio Calbi, *Approximate Bodies. Gender and Power in Early Modern Drama and Anatomy* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005); Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (New York and London: Routledge, 1996); Amussen, "'The part of a Christian man'," 213-230; and Thomas Lacquer, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990).

[56] Raymond Stephanson, *The Yard of Wit. Male Creativity and Sexuality, 1650-1750* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 8.

[57] See Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (London: Harvester, 1980), 96-100.

Neapolitan heritage[58]) suggests a feeling of inadequacy on his part, a sense of his own artistic and intellectual limitations.[59] I make no attempt at a rigorous application of psychoanalytic theory (which posits, not incidentally, an utterly "relational" self[60]), but emphasize instead the various instances in which Rosa and his colleagues express a conviction in the work of art (or other creative products) as an extension or locus of personal identity. In this I find a useful model in Richard Spear's study of Guido Reni,[61] a particularly promising example of the psycho-social history of the *seicento* artist.[62] In endeavouring to make Rosa both accessible and authentic, I acknowledge Lynn Enterline's cautious reminder of the "specular" relationship between author and subject, in which historical selves are impacted by the theorist's own definition of subjectivity.[63] I am also conscious of the warning of scholars (and Rosa himself) to mind the gap between practice and theory, reality and rhetoric.[64] Aware of the scepticism among certain scholars of the merits of a psychology of individuals or a "microhistory" of personal relationships, which can fall prey to an insular and narrow-minded set of conclusions,[65] I hope to avoid such pitfalls firstly by claiming at the outset

---

[58] Passeri, *Vite*, 430.

[59] Baldinucci noted Rosa's undeservedly high opinion of his work, referring specifically to the challenges Rosa faced in history- and figure-paintings. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 477-478. Passeri records with embarrassment a particular instance of Rosa's "lively opinion of himself". Passeri, *Vite*, 434.

[60] On the "relational individualism" of object-relations psychoanalysis, see Nancy Julia Chodorow, "Toward a Relational Individualism: The Mediation of Self through Psychoanalysis," in *Reconstructing Individualism*, ed. Heller et al., 197-207. Breitenberg argues that the "psychic phenomena" that modern psychology locates in the individual must be resituated in the social exchange and experience in which it is situated in the early-modern period. Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 12.

[61] Richard Spear, *The "Divine Guido": Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997).

[62] Spear, *The "Divine Guido"*, 5 and note 19. I share Spear's conviction about the potential of the artist's work (pictorial and otherwise) to reveal the "visible traces" of the mind. At the same time I heed Ebert-Schifferer's caveat that the work of art cannot always be regarded as a literal representation of the artist's self-conception. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 80, note 6.

[63] Lynn Enterline, *The Tears of Narcissus. Melancholia and Masculinity in Early Modern* Writing (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 13; Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 27.

[64] Mariah Loh, "Strategies of Repetition from Titian to Padovanino: Producing and Reproducing Venetian Style in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Painting" (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 2003), ii (citing Denis Mahon). Also see Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," *French History* 2: 2 (1988): 142.

[65] Giovanna Perini warns that "[a] self-centered microhistory prying into the personal relations between individuals often risks becoming little more than a shrewd revival of nineteenth-century local erudite or antiquarian studies." Perini, "Carlo Cesare Malvasia's Florentine Letters: Insight into Conflicting Trends in Seventeenth-Century Italian Art Historiography," *Art Bulletin* 70:2 (1988): 281.

that my project makes no attempt to forge a new theory of early-modern psycho-sociality, and secondly by arguing that my approach intends to incorporate both a macro- and micro- view of social relations in the period under scrutiny. Rosa's friendships are representative of a much more pervasive and complex social phenomenon of his time, although they remain a vital component of his personal experience. If my work tends to privilege the latter, microscopic view, it is with full knowledge of the potential blind-spots that may result. My study of Rosa is presented to the reader less as a comprehensive analysis than a small but meaningful step in an important and relatively uncharted direction, and it will form part of a more extensive project on the subject of friendship in the lives of *seicento* artists.

This is not the place for a historiography of the theory of early-modern social history and social art history, which are long and complex. I wish however to acknowledge my debt to scholars such as Richard Trexler, Ronald Weissman, Dale Kent, Sharon Kettering and Natalie Zemon Davis who have attempted to "re-socialize" the early-modern individual, as defined by Jacob Burckhardt, with the use of a variety of "communitarian ideologies"[66]. Their collective project, now long

[66] A term used by John W. Chapman in "Toward a General Theory of Human Nature and Dynamics," in *Human Nature in Politics* (*Nomos XVII*), ed. J. Roland Pennock and John W. Chapman (New York: New York University Press, 1977), as cited in H. Perry Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits: A study in seventeenth-century identity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 4. Among the studies of particular note, which highlight the cooperative and social nature of artistic creativity and invention, see: Richard Trexler, *Public Life in Renaissance* Florence (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980); Trexler ed., *Persons in Groups. Social Behavior as Identity Formation in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1985); Trexler, *Dependence in Context in Renaissance Florence* (Binghamton: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1994); Ronald Weissman, "Reconstructing Renaissance Sociology: The 'Chicago School' and the Study of Renaissance Society," in *Persons in Groups*, ed. Trexler, 39-46; Weissman, "The Importance of Being Ambiguous: Social Relations, Individualism, and Identity in Renaissance Florence," in *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, ed. Susan Zimmerman and Ronald Weissman (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989), 269-80; F. W. Kent, "The Dynamic of Power in Cosimo de'Medici's Florence," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons (Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 63-77; F. W, Kent, "Illegitimate and Legitimating Passions in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Political Discourses," *Cultural and Social History* 2 (2005): 49-62; F. W. Kent, "Ties of Neighbourhood and Patronage in Quattrocento Florence," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Kent and Simons, 79-98; Sharon Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France"; Kettering, *Patronage in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century France* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); and Davis, "Boundaries and the Sense of Self in Sixteenth-century France," 53-63. Burckhardt famously argued that, while Medieval man was "conscious of himself only as a member of a race, people, party, family or corporation," Renaissance man "became a spiritual individual, and recognized himself as such." Burckhardt, *The Civilization of*

underway, has already undergone a series of critical re-examinations.[67] Scholarship on friendship in the context of the early-modern artist, which has gained significant ground in recent years but is by no means a new topic of interest, is also too extensive a field to summarize here. My own work has profited considerably from Elizabeth Cropper's and Charles Dempsey's study of Nicolas Poussin's social circle; Jennifer Montagu's work on the social situation of the artist; Joanna Woodall's various studies of portraiture, patronage and sociality; Patricia Simons' studies of the social (and especially the homosocial) context of early-modern art; Kate Bomford's studies of friendship among humanists and artists in the Northern European context; and the work of social art historians like Bram Kempers, who regard the emergence of the early-modern artist's professional independence as a socially-based phenomenon.[68]

The communal foundations of invention, too, are an important consideration in my approach to Rosa's position as a novel, "original" artist. Rosa's intellectual friends, colleagues and collaborators (especially the learned Ricciardi) made critical contributions to his inventive process.[69] A consideration of the social basis of "genius" tempers but does not contradict Rosa's

---

the Renaissance in Italy (London: Phaidon Press, 1960 [1860]), 81. For a dissection of Burckhardt's theory of the Renaissance "individual", and an argument for the early-modern "self" as fundamentally "relational", see John Jeffries Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[67] Doy, for example, notes that many of the post-modern theories of socially-based selfhood proved unacceptable for people "subjected to oppression and exploitation during the period of 'modernity'," for whom the idea of a self-governing identity was essential. Doy, *Picturing the Self*, 3.

[68] Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Jennifer Montagu, "Antonio and Gioseppe Giorgetti: Sculptors to Cardinal Francesco Barberini," *Art Bulletin* 52: 3 (1970): 278-298; Montagu, "Bernini Sculptures not by Bernini", in *Gianlorenzo Bernini. New Aspects of his Art and Thought*, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1985), 25-43; Montagu, *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); Joanna Woodall ed., *Portraiture. Facing the Subject* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997); Woodall, *Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2006); Patricia Simons, "Portraiture, Portrayal, and Idealization: Ambiguous Individualism in Representations of Renaissance Women," in *Language and Images of Renaissance Italy*, ed. Alison Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Simons, "Homosociality and erotics in Italian Renaissance Portraiture," in *Portraiture. Facing the Subject*, ed. Woodall, 29-51; Kate Bomford, "The Visual Representation of Friendship amongst Humanists in the Southern Netherlands, c. 1560-c. 1630" (PhD dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2000); Bomford, "Peter Paul Rubens and the Value of Friendship," *NKJ* 54 (2003): 229-257; Bomford, "Friendship and Immortality: Holbein's *Ambassadors* revisited," *Renaissance Studies* 18: 4 (2004): 544-581; and Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage*, 4, 142, 188, 301, 317, 304.

[69] Ricciardi provided Rosa with the initial *pensiero* for his images on more than one occasion. See chapter five.

own claims to a rational and self-sufficient *ingegno* or *fantasia*.[70] Wendy Roworth has argued that Rosa adhered to a "rational" system of inspiration: contrary to the Platonic vision that grants the creative impulse solely to a divine, external force that the artist experiences "irrationally" (the divine "*furor poeticus*", a creative frenzy or madness, in which to be "inspired" is literally to be "breathed into" by the gods), Rosa located the source of his inspired "genius" in both a Platonic experience of "extrinsic" influences and an "innate" ingenuity determined by the four humors. (Roworth elucidates Rosa's complex conception of inspiration with the help of the definition provided by his close friend, the poet Antonio Abati, in his *Frascherie* of 1651.[71]) The Platonic roots of Rosa's concept of "inspiration" are implicit, however, in his comment to the collector Don Antonio Ruffo that he must wait to be "enraptured" or "coerced" (*sento violentato*) before taking up

[70] On the concept and history of "*fantasia*" (*phantasia*), see Ellen Perry, *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 150-1511ff.
[71] "… the poetic faculty comes from two things, one innate, the other extrinsic. The innate is 'la felicita dell'Ingegno nel Poetare, e of the l'impulso a l'Arte'; this comes from the disposition planets at the time of birth. The external source of poetry is 'un Estasi, o furore' which he explains in terms of Plato's theories in the *Phaedrus* as a gift of the gods. But, he adds, today the learned know that the 'avventitio furor poetico' comes also from a natural temperament, one harsh from an excess of melancholy due to turbulent emotions such as anger or love, and, he explains, the Aristotelian theory of the temperaments: '…'l Furore, come Aristotele insegna, derivi da un' accensione d'atra bile, affermo, che in niuno é più fisse, e più connaturale questa accesa commotione si spiriti, che nel Satirico, il quale non da latro affetto riceve il poetico eccitamento, che dall'ira, che pur di furore, hebbe nome... *Facit indiqnatio versum* cantò il Satirico.' The Satirist, filled with excessive anger and bile**,** is inspired by his own indignation or furor. Abati explains that the satirist ignites the yellow bile, or choler, the black bile, 'atra bile', of poetic melancholy. This inflammation breaks into the innermost recesses of the *fantasia*, whose stirrings are always indulged by the intellectual or rational faculty, which in turn stirs or blends the images which are preserved in the imagination. Hence arises that mental excitation which he has been describing. The satirist has the advantage of his choleric temperament to raise him from poetic melancholy, and goaded by his indignation he will be moved to create." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 75-6. In her discussion of Rosa's "*Genius*" etching, Roworth notes that, in Rosa's usage, the term "*genio*" refers to his "spirit" or "nature" (inclusive of his humoral temperament). The term "*ingegno*" (intelligence) comes closer to the modern conception of genius as a creative faculty or inventive "brilliance". "Genio", in its original ancient Roman connotation, had two different but closely related meanings: the action of generation ("to beget, to cause to be born"), and to "strongly influence" another person or thing. The latter of the two meanings had the more profound import for early-modern thinkers, as a referent for an individual's "natural inclination" or "inborn intellectual or imaginative power". Bloom, *Genius: A Mosaic of One Hundred Exemplary Creative Minds* (New York: Warner Books, 2002), 7. Roworth notes that the term "Ingenuus" that Rosa includes in his "*Genius*" etching means "sincere and true", but "also carries the connotation of noble and free." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 84, note 57. On the development of the modern concept of Genius sees E. Zilsel, *Die Entstehung des Geniebegriffs* (Tubingen, 1926); H. Dieckmann, "Diderot's conception of Genius", *Journal of the History of Ideas* II (1941): 151-182; S. H. Monk, "A Grace Beyond the Reach of Art," *Journal of the History of Ideas* V (1944): 131-50; Rudolf Wittkower and Margot Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn. The Character and Conduct of Artists* (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1963); and Rudolf Wittkower, "Imitation, Eclecticism, and Genius," in *Aspects of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. E. R. Wasserman (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), 158.

his paintbrush, and in other statements of a similar bent.[72] They are also apparent in his frequent claims for *bizzarria*, a vital feature of Rosa's unique persona which Roworth locates specifically in his otherwise rational practice of moral satire.[73] They are detectable in his interest in subject matter that treats a distinctly irrational conception of inspiration, such as the *Bacchanal* of the 1640's-1650's (Christie's, London) [Fig. 53], the *Pan and Pindar* of 1666 (Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia) [Fig. 126],[74] or a drawing of the 1640's that appears to depict a "divinely inspired poet"[75] [Fig. 84]. Rosa's faith the role of his own rational agency in that process is clear from his location of the inventive "spark" in his individual (and melancholic) mind. It is also revealed by his participation in the contemporary theoretical discourse on the "Idea", derived in part from a Platonic conception of inspiration and an Aristotelian vision of self-generated creativity.[76] For Rosa, the "irrational" component of melancholic inspiration was vital to the assertion of a self-generative (rather than divinely-produced) power: proof of the melancholic's individual agency lay in his ability to control and wield his latent, ever-present irrationality toward productive ends.[77] The mastery of the

[72] See Borelli, letter 321 and Appendix I. 4. In 1647 Rosa wrote to Giulio Maffei of the influence of God's "fury" on his person. Borelli, letter 19. In 1659, he wrote to Ricciardi of being "excitable" and "subject to enthusiasms". Borelli, letter 225. In an early letter of 1650 he again inferred the divine source of inspiration: "fate quello che Dio v'ispira." Borelli, letter 49. Roworth interprets Rosa's statement to Ruffo, and his use of the term "*entusiasmo*", as an expression of his desire to give free reign to his inspired and satirical indignation. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 377-9. The particular words that Rosa uses, however ("*trasportare*" and "*violentato*" – he must "let" himself be "enraptured" and carried off by "impulses" of enthusiasm) are nonetheless borrowed from the Platonic discourse on the imagination as subject to an unseen and uncontrollable force of guidance or coercion.
[73] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 1, 2, 4.
[74] For the *Bacchanal*, see my discussion below in chapter two. Helen Langdon noted the divine, Platonic dimension of inspiration implicit in Rosa's *Pan and Pindar*, which conveys a vision of "the poet, put into a divine delirium, search[ing] for inspiration in the forest and wild places". Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 55.
[75] Michael Mahoney dates the drawing to the 1640's. Mahoney, *The Drawings of Salvator Rosa*. 2 vols (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1977) 312, no. 25.21. The image can be interpreted alternatively as a sincere or ironic depiction of the divine or external source of inspiration. On the putto's association with Bacchic rites of inspiration see Dempsey, *Inventing the Renaissance Putto* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
[76] For a reference by Rosa to the "Idea", see Borelli, letter 262. On the "Idea", see Panofsky, *Idea. A Concept in Art Theory*, trans. Joseph J. S. Peake (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968). Rosa's faith in his own "mind" as the source of ingenuity is clear from other epistolary comments, as in letter 324: "la [mia] testa per grazia de' Cieli non ha fatto altra novità …".
[77] The melancholic has from his very origins been conceived as intrinsically or partly "irrational" or "mad". See Giovan Battista della Porta, *Della Fisonomia dell'huomo* [1610], ed. Mario Cicognani (Milan: Longanesi & C., 1971), chapter X, "Dell'umor Malinconico", 79 and 948. For the complex development of the idea of the melancholic as original, exceptional, uniquely talented and innately self-directed in their creativity – an idea that

irrational potential of both inspiration and melancholia, moreover, was achieved not only through the rational perspective of the satirist but by means of friendship.[78] Rosa would have been the first to admit that his auto-inspired *ingegno* or *fantasia* received a significant stimulus from external sources of influence, especially from close friends like Ricciardi whose contributions were intrinsically admissible to the "self-sufficient" imagination via the like-mindedness implicit in true friendship. The fundamentally social nature of "genius" (*ingegno*) lies, at the very least, in its mandatory requirement of an "other" (receptive or hostile) against which to prove its claims, and an audience to recognize and assess its nature. In exploring the social nature of invention, authorship or "genius" I have found useful the insights of theorists who situate creativity within the nexus of social relationships that inspire it.[79]

Various scholars of Rosa have already noted the significance of his social relationships, although with little systematic or sustained attention to their importance for his professional identity

---

stems from the pseudo-Aristotelian Problemata XXX and extends to the theories of Cicero, Melancthon, St. Augustine, Petrarch, Marsilio Ficino, Antonio Guainerio, Giovano Pontano, Paracelsus, Agrippa of Nettesheim and Robert Burton – see Raymond Klibansky, Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy. Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), esp. 6-7, 18-29, 31-2, 40-1, 50, 68, 95, 159, 217-218, 249-50, 253 and 259. Also see Simon Brittan, *Poetry, Symbol and Allegory. Interpreting Metaphorical Language from Plato to the Present* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003), 12-13; Noel L. Brann, *The Debate Over the Origin of Genius during the Italian Renaissance* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002), 2-3. In order to be "special" (in a good, rather than "freakish" way) the melancholic had to strike a balance between his hot and cold humors to control his affliction. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 32. Roworth has argued that Rosa reconciled apparently conflicting concepts of creative inspiration as irrational and rational through his "self-identification as a satirist and Cynic". Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 92-3.

[78] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 382. See my discussion of melancholia and friendship in chapter four.

[79] In this I found useful the insights of artistic, literary, dramatic, and cultural theorists who describe the collective or collaborative nature of invention and creativity, such as William E. Wallace, "Michelangelo at Work: Bernardino Basso, friend, scoundrel and capomaestro," *I Tatti Studies*, vol. 3 (Florence: Villa I Tatti, 1989), 235-277; Melissa Meriam Bullard, "Heroes and their Workshops: Medici patronage and the problem of shared agency," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994): 179-198; Montagu, "Bernini Sculptures not by Bernini"; Evonne Levy, "Ideal and Reality of the Learned Artist: The Schooling of Italian and Netherlandish Artists," in *Children of Mercury: The Education of Artists in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Brown University, 1984), 20-27; Wendy Stedman Sheard and John T. Paoletti eds., *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978); Wayne Koestenbaum, *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration* (New York and London: Routledge, 1989); Heather Hirschfeld, "Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship," *PMLA* 116: 3 (2001): 609-622; Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); James Leach, "Modes of creativity," in *Transactions and Creations: Property Debates and the Stimulus of Melanesia*, ed. E. Hirsch and Marilyn Strathern (Oxford: Berghahn, 2004), 151-175; Vera John-Steiner, *Creative Collaboration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); and Karen Burke Le Fevre, *Invention as a Social Act* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987).

or objectives.[80] Rosa's friendships are often treated as an ancillary rather than central issue of concern, much of the scholarship on the artist focusing on issues of formal influence and the (still pressing) need to establish a definitive corpus of pictorial works.[81] Caterina Volpi, Helen Langdon, and Elena Fumagalli are among the few who have made important contributions to understanding the role of friendship in Rosa's life.[82] The subject of Rosa's autonomy or independence has also been discussed by most scholars of the artist, but few have addressed the issue as a separate or central subject of concern.[83] A number of important studies on Rosa have also appeared over the course of the preparation of this dissertation, including a series of papers by international scholars delivered at the Biblioteca Hertziana in January 2009. Some of these studies have reflected my own

[80] Among the most noteworthy are: Lucio Festa's study on the relations between Rosa and the Maffei family, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei" (Un grande pittore napoletano e una famiglia volterrana), *Volterra* (1963), 5 pages; Luigi Salerno's articles and foundational monograph on the artist, *Salvator Rosa* (Milan: Edizioni per il club del libro, 1963); Wendy Roworth's dissertation of 1978 and an article on Rosa's friendship with Ricciardi, "The Consolations of Friendship. Salvator Rosa's Self-Portrait for Giovanni Battista Ricciardi," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 23 (1988): 103-124; Jonathan Scott's monograph, *Salvator Rosa: His Life and Times* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995); and the recent exhibitions in Naples, *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, and Florence, F*ilosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza: pittura napoletana del Seicento dalle collezioni medicee.* Exhibition catalogue (Florence: Giunti, 2007).

[81] The more programmatic and archival study of Rosa's life and work was first taken up at the turn of the twentieth century by Benedetto Croce, Giovanno Alfredo Cesareo, Aldo de Rinaldis, Ulisse Prota-Giurleo, Lucio Festa and Leandro Ozzola, and continued by Uberto Limentani and Luigi Salerno, among others. Aside from the ambitious studies of Roworth, Langdon, Scott and Richard Wallace and other more recent scholars, many of the contributions to the field have been somewhat restricted in scope, consisting primarily of contextual and iconographic studies, re-statements of existing scholarship, and a number of dubious and occasionally absurd attributions. See Xavier Salomon's review of the Naples exhibition in *Burlington Magazine* CL (2008): 493-495. His doubts concerning certain paintings in the show confirmed my own initial suspicions.

[82] Volpi has written insightfully on Rosa's Neapolitan and Roman friends and patrons. See Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," *Storia dell'Arte* 93-4 (1998): 356-373; idem, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Franesco Maria Brancaccio tra Napoli, Roma e Firenze," *Storia dell'Arte* 112: 12 (2005): 119-136; *idem*, "L'ordine delle immagini e il disordine della ricerca," in *Scienza e Miracoli nell'Arte del '600*, ed. Sergio Rossi (Milan: Electa, 1998), 74-81; and *idem*, "Filosofo nel dipingere: Salvator Rosa tra Roma e Firenze (1639-1659)," in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 28-46. Fumagalli has discussed Rosa's Florentine academic experience. See Fumagalli, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*. Langdon has studied certain of Rosa's Florentine and Roman relationships. See Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence 1640-1649," *Apollo* 100: 151 (1974): 190-197; Langdon, "Two Book Illustrations by Salvator Rosa," *Burlington Magazine* 118: 883 (1976): 698-99; Langdon, "A Theatre of Marvels," 179-192; and Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 47-57.

[83] In a paper delivered at the Renaissance Society of America conference in 2007, James Clifton situated Rosa's autonomy in relation to the Foucaultian concept of the "author-function" – a "'text" comprised of his pictorial and textual production, and analyzes Rosa's "bid for autonomy" in connection with "several ongoing, interrelated discourses": early modern individualism, the "death (and return) of the author", and humanism vs. anti-(and post-) humanism." Personal communication from the author; conference paper entitled "Rosa's Freedom".

initial impulses toward "re-socializing" Rosa.[84] Together with the comprehensive *catalogue raisonnèe* of works and documents currently being planned by Volpi for publication in 2011,[85] the work of current scholars will hopefully provide a much-needed corrective to the contextual lacunae that persist in the field. It is to this cause that I submit my own project on Rosa, with the hope that it, too, will contribute to a growing resurgence of interest in Rosa's life and work, and expand a relatively unchanged scholarly approach to the artist by showing the promise of a new direction.

Why Rosa? Long described as a herald of the fully autonomous artist, Rosa's tenuous position on the cusp of "modernity" and the enduring perception of his Romantic persona make him an informative case study in the exploration of the nature and acquisition of the early-modern artist's professional freedom and the role played by friendship in this endeavour. Despite Francis Haskell's claim for Rosa's "almost single-handed" creation of "the image of the artist as a being apart,"[86] I hope to make clear in the pages that follow that Rosa was not alone in this endeavour. He is better understood as a particularly vocal representative (that voice amplified to mythical proportions by his Romantic admirers) of the culmination of a long and laborious mission on the part of his predecessors and contemporaries to navigate and overcome the restrictions of power – especially the court – that continued to determine the artist's fortunes well into the seventeenth century. Nor is Rosa alone in availing himself of the benefits offered by friendship in this endeavour. Many of the same practices can be observed in the lives of his contemporary artists and intellectuals. Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665), for example, found success through the support of a close network friends, clients and patrons, and pursued a mode of self-fashioning guided in large

[84] Volpi, for example, sees the need to reassess the myth of Rosa as an "independent artist, free and completely disinterested in success and money", a "legend [that] has in fact entailed the isolation of the figure of the painter from his cultural and artistic context, meaning that the enormous influence that his princely patrons … have not been recognized." Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 29.
[85] *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673)* (Rome: Ugo Bozzi, forthcoming).
[86] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 22.

part by Michel de Montaigne's (1533-1592) ideas about friendship.[87] Pietro Testa (1611-1650), who shared Rosa's melancholic inclinations and his disdain for traditional patronage, sought in the cultivation of amity a strategy for dealing with both issues.[88] Peter Paul Rubens' (1577-1640) letters reveal his skilful mastery of the rhetoric and rituals of friendship in all spheres of private and professional life, and an awareness of its complex and often challenging applications, particularly as an instrument of diplomacy.[89] The astronomer and antiquary Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637) made friendship a central component of his patronage practice, in the service of cultivating a democratic ideal for himself, his friends and his clients.[90] And Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) used the academic sphere of amity to manipulate his relationships with patrons and carve out a position of relative professional independence.[91] Rosa was also not the only early-modern artist to be celebrated and distorted by the Romantics: they made Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571), for example, into a similarly heroic antecedent of the "fiercely independent" and emotionally-compelled artist.[92] What is special about Rosa is that his contribution to this broader phenomenon consisted in a particularly programmatic assertion of individuality, one of significant enough profundity to captivate the fantasy of his posthumous admirers perhaps more than any other artist of his generation.

The following chapters are devised thematically and treat key aspects of the social nexus of Rosa's identity. Chapter one deals with the performative dimension of Rosa's self-fashioning – a

---

[87] See Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, esp. 16-19 and chapter 5.
[88] See Cropper, ed., *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650. Prints and Drawings* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), esp. xii-xiii.
[89] See Mark Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics. Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Bomford, "Peter Paul Rubens and the Value of Friendship," *NKJ* 54 (2003): 229-257; and Anne T. Woollett and Ariane van Suchtelen, ed., *Rubens and Brueghel: A Working Friendship*. Exhibition Catalogue (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum; The Hague: Royal Picture Gallery. Zwolle: In Association with Waanders Publishers, 2006). For Rubens' letters, see Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, esp. letters 12, 22, 68, 82, 84, 126, 157, 221 and 236).
[90] See Lisa T. Sarasohn, "Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and the Patronage of the New Science in the Seventeenth Century," *Isis* 84: 1 (1993): 70-90.
[91] See Mario Biagioli, "Galileo's System of Patronage," *History of Science* 28 (1990): 1-62.
[92] Victoria C. Gardner, "*Homines non nascuntur, sed figuntur*: Benvenuto Cellini's *Vita* and Self-Presentation of the Renaissance Artist", *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28: 2 (1997): 447-465, esp. 464.

natural beginning in view of Rosa's adoption of theatrical performance as the earliest of his techniques of self-manufacture and self-promotion. Rosa's performativity extended from the stage to other practical and theoretical facets of his daily life, where social reception was vital to achieving a distinctive and admirable reputation. Rosa's private literary and theatrical academy in Florence, the *Accademia dei Percossi*, was among the most important of these contexts. Removed from (and ideally opposed to) the setting of the court and its control, the academy and its members cultivated an egalitarian ideal of friendship and pursued a social form of solitude that offered Rosa a self-centered environment, conducive to the promotion of a unique and "free" persona. Chapter three examines more closely the rituals that defined academic sociality: letter-writing, poetry, and conversation. The letters and poetry of Rosa and his friends are particularly important as documents of friendship. A number of these poems are discussed or published here for the first time. Chapter four is a case study of one of the most important documents of friendship for Rosa, the portrait he painted as a gift for Ricciardi, now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York. [Fig. 64] The quiet, contemplative impression of this image conceals an intricate essay on Rosa's conviction in companionship as a locus of identity. This portrait belongs to a set of images that Rosa made as gifts for friends and patrons in an effort to promote his professional and economic autonomy. Chapter five explores this tactic in greater detail, in connection with related strategies that comprised a veritable "business of friendship", including the art market, the public exhibition, printmaking, the pursuit of novel and self-directed subject-matter, the solicitation of advice and assistance from friends, and the promotion of an image of *stravaganza* and liberality. Friendship offered Rosa an escape route from the traditional structure of patronage, and his relationships with art dealers, clients, and patrons alike were defined or re-cast in the terms of affective bonds in the service of levelling an otherwise uneven system of exchange.

Rosa and his "Friends": A Cast of Characters

The following is an alphabetic roster of the principal figures among Rosa's companions, colleagues, patrons, clients and rivals, intended as a useful point of reference for the reader's consultation.[1] It is by no means a comprehensive list of all of Rosa's associates, many of whom have not yet been either identified or verified.

Abati, Antonio (Gubbio c. 1600-5-Sinigallia 1667)
A poet and writer; a sometime friend of Rosa, who first met him at the court of Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio in Viterbo.

Apolloni, (or Appolloni) Abate Giovanni Filippo (Arezzo c. 1620-1688)
A writer of oratories; a member of the household of Cardinal Flavio Chigi; he was in the service of Cardinal Volunnio Bandinelli when nominated as legate of Romagna; also a member of the *Percossi*.

Baldinucci, Filippo (Florence 1624-1697)
A biographer, historian and connoisseur, and author of one of the most reliable early biographies on the artist. He may have known Rosa personally, although the nature and degree of their friendship is uncertain. He moved in the same Florentine academic circles as Rosa, and was acquainted with many of Rosa's friends and colleagues.

Bandinelli, Volunnio (Siena c. 1597-1667)
A poet and *letterato*; a member of the *Percossi* and the *Accademia della Crusca.* He was later made Cardinal by Pope Alexander VII (1658) and was a tutor of Prince Cosimo III de' Medici (1642-1723).

Baldovini, Francesco (Florence 1635-1716)
A Florentine clergyman and poet; the Secretary of Cardinal Nini in Rome. He was a witness at Rosa's deathbed in 1673. His account of Rosa's death, which reveals the close nature of their friendship, was included by Baldinucci in his *vita* of the artist. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 467-476.

Bandini, Antonio
A musician; he set to music Rosa's ode for Ricciardi, *Non ha tregua ne fine il duol mio* (see Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, p. 17). Borelli notes that Rosa "abruptly interrupted relations with him in April of 1646 for unclear motives." See Borelli, letter 14.

Daniello Bartoli (Ferrara 1608-1685)
A Jesuit priest, writer, poet and historian. On his relationship with Rosa, see chapter one.

Berni, Francesco (Florence, seventeenth-century)
A poet and doctor; a member of the *Percossi*, referred to by Baldinucci as "dottor Berni". A descendent of the more famous and highly influential poet Francesco Berni (c. 1497-1536).

Bernini, Gian Lorenzo (Florence 1598-Rome 1680)
A sculptor, architect, painter and dramatist. The most influential and successful artist in *seicento* Rome. Rosa and Bernini were engaged in a significant theatrical and artistic rivalry.

[1] Some of the biographical information in this list has been taken from Borelli, *Salvator Rosa: Lettere*.

Bonacina, Giovanni Battista (Milan c. 1620-Rome 1670)
An engraver active in Rome from 1650 onward. He was responsible for the only extant *seicento* portrait of Rosa.

Brancaccio, Cardinal Francesco Maria (Bari 1592-1675)
Cardinal and Bishop of Viterbo, and Rosa's first prominent patron in Rome. Brancaccio was also immersed in the academic culture of *seicento* Rome and likely exerted a strong influence on Rosa's academic interests.

Briccio, Giovanni (1579-1645)
A painter, mathematician, musician, poet, comedy-writer and actor. He participated in Rosa's early comedic performances in Rome in the 1630's.

Brunetti, Cosimo (Siena(?) c. 1628/30-Poland(?) after 1678)
A lawyer, poet, and man of letters. Rosa met him through Ricciardi. See Limentani, "Per la biografia di Cosimo Brunetti," *Studi secenteschi* XIX (1978), 109-27. He translated *Les Provinciales* of Blaise Pascal (1659), and in 1653 he moved to Holland, then Paris and London, where he came in contact with Port Royal; "until 1656 the major part of his energies were expended in pleading the cause of Arnauld with the intransigent Alexander VII in hope of obtaining a reconciliation between the papacy and the Jansenists. ... The outcome resulted in the condemnation of Port Royal by the pope, following which Brunetti, deluded, moved definitively to Paris." See Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Cardinale Francesco Maria Brancaccio", 130; on Brunetti, see G. Pignatelli, "Brunetti, Cosimo", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 14 (1972), 572-73. Brunetti and Rosa often met each other while taking walks in the Piazza Navona in Rome (Borelli, letters 108, 161), and the two dined together at Rosa's house (letter 288).

Cavalcanti, Andrea (Florence 1610-73)
A poet, writer and art collector, known for writing a few anti-clerical short stories. A member of the *Percossi* and the *Accademia della Crusca*.

Cavallo, Padre Bonaventura (Amantea 1619-Caserta 1679)
General commissioner of the Franciscan order, and bishop of Caserta.

Cesti, Padre Marcantonio (Pietro) (Arezzo 1623-Florence 1669)
A Franciscan priest and musician; Maestro di cappella of the Cathedral of Volterra. He set to music two of Rosa's odes: *Hor son pur solo* and *La Strega*, and gained fame for his musical performances in Venice in 1652.

Chigi, Don Mario
The brother of Pope Alexander VII and governor of the ecclesiastical state. An important ally of Rosa's in Rome. Lady Sydney Morgan alludes to the closeness of his relationship with Rosa. See Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, I, 342.

Chigi, Agostino (Siena 1634-Rome 1705)
The son of Augusto Chigi and Olimpia della Ciaia. Nephew of Pope Alexander VII, and Don Mario Chigi. He was made governor of Castel Sant'Angelo in 1656, and held other important posts throughout his career.

Chigi, Cardinal Flavio (Siena 1631-Rome 1693)
Nephew of Pope Alexander VII. He was made Ambassador to France in 1664.

Chimentelli, Valerio (Florence 1620-Pisa 1668)

A professor of Greek and moral philosophy at the University of Pisa from 1648 onwards. A member of the *Percossi*, the *Accademia della Crusca*, the *Accademia fiorentina*, and the Pisan *Accademia dei Disiuniti*. He was also a tutor to the Medici.

Christina, Queen of Sweden (Stockholm 1626-Rome 1689)

Queen of Sweden from 1632 to 1654. After abdicating her throne in 1654, she lived in France and Rome. A prominent patron of artists, scientists and academics, she invited Rosa to work at the Swedish court in 1652 (an offer he famously declined).

Colonna, Lorenzo Onofrio (Palermo 1637-Rome 1689)

A prominent member of the wealthy and influential Colonna family in Rome. He held numerous titles, including the Viceroy of Aragona (1678), Regent of Naples (1689), Grand Constable of the Realm of Naples. An important patron of Rosa's in Rome.

Cordini, Francesco (1625-after 1684)

A Florentine connoisseur and art dealer and a member of the *Percossi.* He shared a sometimes awkward friendship and business relationship with Rosa.

Corsini, Monsignor (Cardinal) Neri (Florence 1624-1678)

The Papal Nuncio of France. He negotiated the commission from Rosa for the large *Battle Scene* [Fig. 60] for King Louis XIV of France, paid for in 1652 (see Borelli, letters 148, 149) and extended the invitation to Rosa on behalf of the King to work at the French court, which Rosa declined. See Borelli, letters 144, 148, 149, 150, 151, 306 and 308.

D'Agliè, Conte Filippo S. Martino (1604-1667)

An important military and political figure in the commune of Agliè, in the region of Turin. In 1630 he was made *luogotenente* of the *Compagnia delle Corazze di Vittorio Amedeo I*. He became the minister, personal counselor and favourite of Maria Cristina di Borbone-Francia. His position elicited numerous enemies, including Cardinal Richelieu, who arrested him in 1640. Released after the death of the Cardinal, he left politics for a life of private diversion which he spent restoring the Castello di Agliè.

Dati, Carlo Roberto (Florence 1619-76)

A linguist, philologist, poet and writer, and a member of the *Percossi*. He was vice-secretary of the *Accademia della Crusca*, librarian of Leopoldo and Gian' Carlo de' Medici, and tutor of Cosimo de' Medici, after Volunnio Bandinelli. He appears to have maintained his close friendship with Rosa after the latter's return to Rome in 1649.

Fabretti, Cosimo

The secretary of Giovan Battista Ricciardi. He married Ricciardi's sister Caterina (see Borelli, letter 215).

Falcone, Aniello (Naples 1600-1665)

A Neapolitan painter, particularly renowned for his battle scenes. He studied with Ribera in Naples, and may have been one of Rosa's most important early masters.

Favoriti, Agostino (Sarzana 1624-Rome 1682)

A poet and *letterato*. He was Secretary to Cardinal Flavio Chigi and Giulio Rospigliosi, court poet to Pope Alexander VII, *familiare* of Cardinal Brancaccio and numismatist to Queen Christina of Sweden. A fellow member of the *Accademia degli Umoristi*, he was a one-time friend of Rosa's

who became embroiled in a heated argument in the early 1650's: using his pseudonym "Ippolito Sciribandolo", he circulated a criticism of the *Il Costantino* (1652) by Ghirardelli, a friend of Rosa's. See Borelli, letters 175-178 and Limentani, "La Satira dell'Invidia di Salvator Rosa e una polemica letteraria del Seicento," *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 134 (1957), 570-585.

Fracanzano, Francesco (Monopoli 1612-Naples 1656)
A Neapolitan painter who studied under Ribera. Rosa trained with him in his youth. He became Rosa's brother-in-law when he married Rosa's sister, Giovanna, in 1632. On Rosa and the Fracanzano family, see Lorenzo Salazar, "Salvator Rosa ed i Fracanzani (Nuovi documenti)," *Napoli Nobilissima* XII: 1 (1903), 119-123.

Franceschini, Baldassarre ("Il Volterrano") (Volterra 1611 - Florence 1690)
A painter and collaborator of Rosa's. He befriended Rosa in Florence and later visited him in Rome in 1653. See Borelli, letter 162.

Ghirardelli, Giovan Filippo (Rome 1623-53)
A poet and playwright. The author of the tragedy *Il Costantino* (1652), for which Rosa provided the frontispiece. See Borelli, letters 177-178, and Limentani "La Satira dell'Invidia di Salvator Rosa e una polemica letteraria del Seicento".

Ghisolfi, Giovanni (Milan 1623-83)
A landscape painter, collaborator and follower of Rosa. Baldinucci discusses his relationship with Rosa. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 502-03.

Incontri, Giovanna
The wife of Giulio Maffei. Likely the godmother of Rosa's son Rosalvo.

Inghirami, Curzio (Volterra 1614-1655)
A poet famous for his forgery of a number of ancient Latin and Etruscan documents.

Inghirami, Valerio (Volterran, seventeenth century)
A poet and writer, and Apostolic Protonotary and Vicar General of Prato. He was a close friend of Francesco Redi. He dedicated at least one poem to Rosa (see chapter three).

Landini, Raffaello
A Florentine gentleman and dilettante painter. Rosa spent time in Landini's villa outside of Florence. See Borelli, letters 5, 6, 12-14, 17, 18, 22 and 186.

Lanfreducci, Cavaliere Luigi
A knight of Santo Stefano, and a mutual friend of Rosa and Ricciardi. Lanfreducci was among the recipients of the "*testaccie*" or paintings of heads that Rosa sent from Rome to a number of friends in Florence in 1651.

Lasagnini, Dottor Pier Filippo Tommaso
A member of the *Percossi*, who participated in their improvised comedies in the role of one of the "maidens". He is described by Baldinucci as one of Rosa's "greatest confidents", and he is listed among the friends who provided the biographer with information on Rosa for his *vita*. Baldinucci states that it was to Lasagnini that he turned for an account, from Rosa's own mouth, of the extent of the money that Rosa invested in his academy and which he spent willingly on his friends in that city. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 452-454.

Leoli, Cavaliere Gaspare

A Pisan gentleman and knight of Santo Stefano. The *Gesta triumphalia per Pisanos facta* is attributed to him. See Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 70, n 10

Lippi, Lorenzo (Florence 1606-65)

A Florentine painter and poet. One of Rosa's closest Florentine friends, and a likely member of the *Percossi*. His epic poem, *Il Malmantile Racquistato*, reveals the mutual influence of Rosa and Lippi on one another's writing and painting. The poem, a parody of Ariosto and Tasso, was largely written in Austria in the 1640's when Lippi was in the service of the Archduchess Claudia de'Medici; it was first publicly recited in Florence in November 1649, completed around 1650, and published posthumously in 1676 by G. T. Rossi in Florence.

Lisci, Mariotto

A gentleman of Volterra who participated in Rosa's comedies, hosted in Volterra, playing the role of a servant". See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461.

Maffei, Antonio

Canon of the Cathedral of Volterra. There are a number of his poems among the pages of the Kempner manuscripts in the BiASA, Rome (MS 77), which contain poems and documents by Rosa or his friends. See Ozzola, *Vita e opere*, 250. The Maffei family were the *Provveditori* of the salt business in Volterra, the region's sole commercial source of income. See Silvano Bertini, "Sulle orme di Salvator Rosa nelle campagne volterrane," *Volterra* 1 (1972), 11-14.

Maffei, Francesco

A Capuchin missionary who died on a mission to the Congo.

Maffei, Giovanni

Archdeacon of the Cathedral of Volterra. Brother of Giulio Maffei.

Maffei, Giulio (died December 9 1654)

A merchant and member of a prominent Volterran family, and a probable member of the *Percossi*. A close friend and correspondent of Rosa until his death in 1654, he hosted Rosa and his friends at his house in Volterra and at the Maffei family villas at Barbaiano and Monterufoli. He likely met Rosa in Rome during his first sojourn in the city in the 1630's. He was the godfather of Rosa's son Rosalvo. See Borelli, letters 7 and 9.

Maffei, Ludovico

The brother of Giulio Maffei.

Maffei, Marcantonio

A politician and brother of Giulio Maffei. Rosa calls him "Signor Politico" in his letters. See for example Borelli, letters 27, 32, 34, and 35.

Maffei, Paolo

The son of Ludovico Maffei. The "page" of Gasparo Altieri, Grand Master of the Knights of Malta.

Maffei, Raffaello

A relative of Giulio Maffei. A dramatist and local *provveditore* of Volterra. Rosa mentions one of his comedic performances in a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1645. See Borelli, letter 7.

Maffei, Ugo

Papal financier (*charge d'affaires*) in relations with France, conservator of the Campidoglio, and prior of the Caporioni in 1662 and 1681. He was brother of Giulio Maffei and uncle of the famous author, Scipione Maffei. (1675-1755), and was perhaps the first member of the family to befriend Rosa in Rome. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 450. He got himself into trouble with the law in 1651 over an illicit affair with the Duchess di Ceri was Anna Maria Aldobrandini, the wife of Francisco Maria Cesi, Duke of Ceri. See Borelli, letters 41, 81-3, 93, 103, 111-113.

Malatesti, Antonio (Florence 1610-1672)

A Florentine poet, silk merchant and academic. A close friend of Lorenzo Lippi and Rosa, and probable member of the *Percossi* as well as other Florentine academies. He dedicated poems to Rosa, Lippi and Baldassare Franceschini, among others. He also appears in Lippi's *Malmantile Racquistato*. The Kempner MSS of documents pertaining to Rosa in the BiASA in Rome contains some poems that appear to be by Antonio Maffei,[2] which are mostly religious and moral-philosophical in subject.

Martinelli, Giovanni (Montevarchi c. 1604-Florence 1659)

A Florentine painter who was likely friends with both Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi. He was an exponent of the moral-allegorical and academic mode of Florentine *seicento* painting, also taken up by artists like Lippi, Francesco Furini and Cesare Dandini, which exerted a strong influence on Rosa's Florentine painting.

Martinelli, Giulio (1590- ?)

A Florentine gentleman of uncertain occupation, who likely befriended Rosa between 1635 and 1640. Rosa dedicated to him his engraving of *The Rescue of Oedipus* in 1663. See Wallace, *The Etchings of Salvator Rosa*, cat. 116, and Borelli, letter 296.

Martinotti, Francisco (Casale Monferrato 1636-Rome 1679)

Active in Rome from 1663 as a collaborator of Rosa's and a copyist of famous works.

Masturzo, Marzio

A Neapolitan painter who befriended Rosa in his youth in Naples (according to Bernardo de' Dominici), and studied under Aniello Falcone with Rosa. He likely participated in Rosa's early comedic performances in Rome in the 1630's.

Medici, Gian' Carlo de' (Florence 1611-Florence 1663)

Son of Cosimo II de' Medici and Maria Maddalena of Austria, notorious for his hedonism. He was made Cardinal in 1644. Gian' Carlo was Rosa's principal court-patron in Florence, for the first half of the 1640's, commissioning numerous paintings from Rosa for his Casino di San Marco. A sponsor of the *Percossi*'s theatrical performances at his Casino, he was notorious for his hedonism and was very active in Florentine academic, artistic and intellectual circles. He founded the *Accademia degli Immobili* and opened the *Teatro della Pergola* in 1658.

---

[2] BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 14. File B 1. 1: "Del Sig.[e] Ant. Maffei Nobil Volterrano". The poems in this file include "Oratio de Xpo Nascente" (in Latin) (pp. 3r-5r), "Affetto nel Natale del Torbo eterno" (pp. 6r-7r), "Il Natale Coro e Semicoro Pastorale" (pp. 7v-9v), "Per il parto augustissimo della Vergine Hebra Madrigale" (p. 10r), "Trino Egloga Terrolimpica dell'Incarnation del Verbo Eterno, Trino Vranio Gefilo," a poetical dialogue between three persons of the same names (p. 10v), and "Del desio della Gloria" (dated 1632) (p. 13v).

Medici, Mattias de' (Florence 1613-Siena 1667)

Son of Cosimo II de' Medici and brother of Gian' Carlo and Ferdinando II. He participated in the 30 Years' War. He may have played a significant role, along with Gian' Carlo and the Medici Roman agent Fabrizio Piermattei, in inviting Rosa to Florence in 1640.

Melosi, Francesco (Pieve 1609-1670)

A Florentine writer and amateur poet. He was Governor of Ronciglione and Caprara before being ordained a clergyman. The author of a laudatory and apologetic *Capitolo* in honour of Rosa, which the painter cited in his letters on more than one occasion. See Borelli, letters 179, 181, 182.

Mercuri, Girolamo (Naples 1606?-Rome 1682)

A friend of Rosa's from his youth in Naples, from 1633 or 1635. He was *capo di maestro* of the household of Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio; he likely helped to secure Rosa's position with the Cardinal, who he accompanied to Viterbo in 1637 or 1638. In a letter of 1659 (letters 222 and 330, n. 4) Rosa referred to Mercuri as having "proven his friendship" for over twenty-six years. After 1655, Mercuri was *maestro di casa* for Cardinal Flavio Chigi. In his youth Mercuri was a priest, and later became Cardinal.

Minucci, Paolo (Florence 1623-Radda di Chianti 1665)

A Florentine writer and secretary to Prince Mattias de' Medici. In 1688 he annotated Lorenzo Lippi's epic poem *Il Malmantile Racquistato*. He was also a member of the *Percossi.*

Mola, Pier Francesco (Colderio 1612-Rome 1666)

A prominent and highly successful painter in Rome, and likely friend of Rosa's. Rosa mentions him once in his letters, in reference to the artist's illness in 1665 (letter 309). He shared a number of mutual friends, professional colleagues and patrons with Rosa, including the art dealer Niccolò Simonelli.

Musso, Niccolò (Roman? Seventeenth century)

A cleric, dramatist and "connoisseur". Directed Rosa's early theatrical comedies in Rome, held at the Vigna dei Mignanelli. (Not to be confused with the Roman painter Niccolò Musso.)

Napoletano, Filippo (Naples c. 1587-Rome 1629)

A painter best known for his landscape and genre paintings and etchings of soldiers, animal skeletons and city views. Rosa likely knew the painter during his youth in Naples.

Nerli, Filippo Marchese (1639-1712)

Passeri identifies him as the son of Pietro Nerli, and nephew and brother of the two Cardinals Francesco Nerli. (Passeri, *Vite*, 430) He was Conservator of Rome in 1662 and 1682. He commissioned the altarpiece of the *Martyrdom of Saints Cosmas and Damian* from Rosa in 1669 for his family chapel in S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, Rome.

Omodei, Luigi Alexander (Milan 1608-85)

He was named cardinal by Pope Innocent X in 1652. He commissioned the *Madonna del Suffragio* from Rosa in 1661. See Borelli, letter 252, n 4.

Panciatichi, Lorenzo (Florence 1635-76)

A gentleman of the court of the Medici, and Canon of the Florentine Metropolitana.

Pandolfini, Pietro (Florence, seventeenth century)
He commissioned a painting from Rosa for one of his chapels. See Borelli, letter 65, n 1. He was also among the recipients of the "*testaccie*" or paintings of heads that Rosa sent from Rome to a number of friends in Florence in 1651.

Paolini, Lucrezia (Florence, c. 1620-1696)
Rosa's life-long partner. They married only when Rosa was on his deathbed in March of 1673.

Parigi, Alfonso (1606-1656)
A Florentine architect and scenographer. In 1635 he became court architect to the Medici. He was a friend of both Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi. Rosa may have visited Parigi's villa of "La Mazzetta" at Poggio di San Romolo, which had a view of the Castle of Malmantile. See Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa* II, 58.

Passeri, Giambattista (c. 1610-1679)
A Roman painter and biographer; pupil of Domenichino. He knew Rosa personally and described himself as Rosa's good friend in his important (and generally reliable) early biography of the artist, written in 1673 but only published in 1772. He was also acquainted with many of Rosa's friends and circle in Rome.

Penna, Cavaliere Ascanio della (Perugia 1607-Pisa ?)
A Perugian resident in Pisa, and courtier of the Medici. A collector and dilettante, a patron of Lorenzo Lippi and friend of Rosa. In 1635 he was nominated by the Medici as Provveditore Generale dell'Arsenale di Pisa.

Polei, Dottor (Volterra, seventeenth century)
A Volterran friend of Rosa's, mentioned frequently in his letters.

Poussin, Nicolas (Les Andelys 1594-Rome 1665)
A prominent and influential French painter. He is mentioned only once in Rosa's letters (see Borelli, letter 315), but described by the Earl of Shaftesbury in his *Second Characters or the Language of* Forms (1712, published in 1914) as a good friend of Rosa's in Rome. Their friendship has also been forwarded on the basis of their status as neighbours in the vicinity of the Trinità dei Monti, along with the larger community of foreign artists living in that quarter of Rome. The two men also had a number of close friends in common, including Carlo Dati, the connoisseur Abbè Nicaise (who was also a friend of Bellori), and Niccolò Simonelli. See Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 45 and n 80.

Quaranta, Orazio (Salerno, seventeenth century)
A poet, writer and Jesuit priest from Salerno, involved with the Inquisition as a *Consultore della Sacra Congragazione Indice*. Among his religious writings were *La vita di S. Genesio, notaro e martire* (Roma, per Nicolò Angelo Tinassi, 1682) and a *Vita del beato Giouanni di San Facondo dell'Ordine di Sant'Agostino scritta da D. Orazio Quaranta consultor del Indice in tre libri diuisa nel secolo, nella religione, e nella Gloria* (Roma, per Nicolo Angelo Tinassi, 1673). A member of the Roman *Accademia degli Umoristi*. Baldinucci includes Quaranta among the list of Rosa's friends – the Roman "men of letters and persons of high affairs" – who supplied him with information for his biography of the artist. Rosa mentions Quaranta in a letter to Ricciardi of September 1663, the same year as the *Giants* engraving, where he cites with irony his authority as a poet. See Borelli, letter 292.

Redi, Francesco (Arezzo 1626-Pisa 1698)

A Florentine scientist, *letterato*, and court physician to the Medici. Among his most well-known works is the *Bacco in Toscana* (*Bacchus in Tuscany*) of 1685, a history of wine in the Tuscan region. He was a member of the *Accademia della Crusca* and the *Accademia del Cimento*, and shared many mutual friends with Rosa, and likely formed a close friendship with Rosa himself, who mentions him in his letters. See Borelli, letters 183, 184 and 186.

Ribera, Jusepe de' (1591-1652)

A Spanish painter who worked in Rome, Parma and Naples. He exerted a profound influence on Neapolitan artists of Rosa's generation. Rosa is generally believed to have studied with Ribera in Naples, although there is (as yet) no documentary evidence of their relationship.

Ricciardi, Giovan Battista (Giambattista) (1624-1686)

A Pisan poet, satirist, playwright and academic. Son of the noble Florentine Francesco Ricciardi. He was eventually elected to the post of Reader in moral philosophy at the University of Pisa (although he only attained this position in 1673, the year of Rosa's death). A member of the *Percossi*, the *Accademia Pisana* and the *Accademia degli Stravaganti*. He was Rosa's most important lifelong friend and correspondent, and the majority of Rosa's extant epistolary correspondence was written to him. In his (unpublished) *vita* of Ricciardi, Giovanni Calvoli Cinelli described him as possessing a *mostruoso ingegno*, who wrote sonnets in the "familiar" style, which were widely read and popular among his contemporaries. BNCF Magl. IX 67, "Giovanni Cinelli Calvoli, *La Toscana letterata ovvero Storia degli scrittori fiorentini*", Life of Giovanni Battista Ricciardi, 227-233.

Rosa, Giovanna (Naples 1617-post 1673)

Rosa's sister. She married the painter Francesco Fracanzano in 1632. See Borelli, letters 194 and 201; the latter contains a false report of her death.

Rosa, Giuseppe (Naples 1613-1656)

Rosa's brother. He was a piarist at the convent of Saint Maria di Caravaggio in Naples. See Festa, *Uno scolopio mancato ed uno vero: Salvator Rosa ed il fratello*," *Napoli Nobilissima* 2: 2 (1962), 69-76.

Rosa, Rosalvo (Florence before 1641-Rome 1656)

Rosa and Lucrezia's first son, possibly born in Volterra around June 18th 1641. See Borelli, letter 31. His untimely death during the plague in Naples during the summer of 1656 (letter 199), where Rosa had sent him along with Lucrezia in order to escape persecution by the Inquisition in Rome, may be the subject of two paintings by Rosa: the *Umana Fragilitas* (c. 1657-8, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge) and the so-called *Portrait of Rosalvo* (which may be a copy of a lost original) (1640's, Palazzo Barberini, Rome). Rosalvo's name appears to be a deliberate conflation of Rosa's own first and last names. In a letter of that year, just prior to his son's death, Rosa lovingly described his son as an extension of himself: "Idio vi dia quella salute che desidero a me stesso et a Rosalvo mie viscere, che lo meritate più voi che tutte le cinquecentomila anime che dimorano in Napoli." Borelli, letter 198.

Rosa, Augusto (Rome October (?) 1657-1739)

Rosa and Lucrezia's second son. Landscape painter in imitation of his father. Rosa frequently referred to him in his correspondence with the nickname "*Farfaricchio'*, from "*farfaro*", a grass that rises a little from the ground (*Vocabolario della Crusca*). See for example Borelli, letter 252. Rosa's friend Ricciardi maintained a close relationship with Augusto after Rosa died. See I.

Miarella Mariani, "Lettere di Augusto Rosa a Giovan Battista Ricciardi (1673-1686)," *Studi Secenteschi* XLIV (2003), 281-313.

Rossi, Carlo de' (Rome ?- 1683)

A prominent Roman banker and art collector. One of Rosa's primary collectors in Rome. He is described by Rosa as a good friend (see Borelli, letters 344, 345), and by his biographer Baldinucci as Rosa's "most cordial friend". See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 442.

Rossi, Luigi de' (Torremaggiore c. 1598-Rome 1653)

The organist of the church of San Luigi dei Francesi in Rome, from 1633. He wrote music for the *Il palazzo d'Atlante (The Palace of Atlas)*, the libretto of Giulio Rospigliosi (Pistoia 1600-Rome 1669), who later became Pope Clemente IX. In 1646 he went to Paris where he performed the *L'Orfeo*, the first Italian opera presented in France.

Rovai, Francesco (Florence 1605-1648)

A Florentine poet, academic and amateur artist, a copyist of Rosa's paintings, and a member of the *Percossi*, the *Accademia degli Apatisti*, the *Svogliati*, and the *Alterati*.

Ruccellai, Orazio Ricasoli (Florence 1604-1673)

A poet, writer, philosopher, scientist and academic. He was a *gentiluomo di camera* of Ferdinando II de' Medici and a disciple of Galileo Galilei. He was also a member and eventual *Priore* of the Accademia della Crusca (nominated in 1667). The nature and degree of his friendship with Rosa is not yet clear, although he seems to have written a poem for the artist entitled *Memoriale di Salvator Rosa alla Sacra Conversazione*.

Rubiera, Camillo

He is recorded by Giovanni Mario Crescimbeni (*L'istoria della volgar poesia*, 1730-31, IV, 270) as an author of *Rime* which circulated in manuscript form. Rubiera defended Rosa against the accusations of plagiarism he was receiving from members of the *Accademia degli Umoristi* in Rome in 1654. See Borelli, letters 177, 178.

Ruffo, Don Antonio (Messina 1610-1678)

A wealthy Sicilian art collector. In 1663 He purchased from Rosa two pendant paintings of *Pythagoras and the Fishermen* and *Pythagoras Emerging from the Underworld*. See Borelli, letters 272, 289. In the same year Rosa declined Ruffo's request for a pendant painting to Rembrandt's *Aristotle* (1653, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

Salvetti, Pietro (? -d. 1697)

A satirist, musician and numismatist; and music teacher of Prince Ferdinando II de' Medici (1610-1670). He was also a member of the *Percossi*.

Savaro, Giovan Francisco (Pizzo Calabro 1610-?)

A scholar and author of the *Parthenio*, a libelous and satirical pamphlet against the *Costantino* of Ghirardelli. See Borelli, letter 176, n 3.

Scorno, Signor Canonico da

A writer and member of an ancient Pisan family. His literary compositions were the object of mockery. See Borelli, letter 240. Rosa mentions him frequently in his letters. He lent his support to Rosa in 1654, and lived near to Rosa for a period of time in Rome. See letters 85, 177, 179, 181, 183. Rosa refers to himself as a friend of Scorno in a letter to Ricciardi of 1659 (letter 221) and

called him his "*padre putativo*" in another letter of the same year (letter 220). Scorno would occasionally take a turn with Rosa on one of his many walks on the Trinità dei Monti (letter 285).

Serenai, Lodovico

An astronomer and member of the *Percossi*. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 460.

Sgambati (or Scambiati), Reginaldo (Naples?-Naples 1648)

A Dominican friar and Lenten preacher, civic orator, comic poet and *letterato* who first befriended Rosa in Naples. He traveled widely to Tuscany, Genoa and Venice, and died in the convent of San Domenico Maggiore in Naples, where he had been novice and had taken his orders. See I. Echard and I. Quetif, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis illustrate*, 2 vol., Lutetiae Parisiorum, I. B. Ballard et N. Simart, 1719-21, II, 559. Rosa made a humorous caricature of Sgambati [Fig. 42].

Signoretti, Girolamo (Florence?, active 1644-70)

A printer and bookseller. Rosa mentions him frequently in his letters, and painted a *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* for him, among other paintings.

Simonelli, Niccolò (c.1611-Rome 1671)

The *guardaroba* for Prince Cardinal Camillo Pamphilj (1644-1654), and subsequently of Flavio Chigi. A connoisseur, art dealer and antiquarian, who formed close friendships and business relationships with many artists in Rome. According to Passeri (*Vite*, 420), he was instrumental in Rosa's introduction to the Roman art scene.

Susini, Pietro (Florence 1629-70)

An actor and playwright. He was an *aiutante di camera* of Leopoldo de' Medici. See N. Michelassi, "Il Teatro del Cocomero di Firenze: uno stanzone per tre accademie (1651-1665)," *Studi secenteschi* XL (1999), 167, n 75.

Testa, Pietro (Lucca 1611-Rome 1650)

A painter, printmaker and draftsman, best known for his graphic work. The nature and degree of Testa's friendship with Rosa is unclear (Rosa does not mention him in his letters and his early biographers do not describe them as friends). They shared many mutual friends and acquaintances (including for example Niccolò Simonelli and Antonio Abati), as well as similar iconographic interests and professional aspirations. Testa also shared Rosa's antagonistic and melancholic inclinations. Mahoney has suggested that Rosa's drawing of an *Allegory of Fate* [Fig. 49] may allude to Testa's tragic suicide in 1650. See Mahoney, *Drawings*, 305-6.

Testi, Fulvio (Ferrara 1593-Modena 1646)

A poet, writer and ambassador at the court of the Duke Francesco I d'Este in Modena. From 1640-1642 he was governor of Garfagnana. Much of his literary production treats civil, solemn subjects.

Torricelli, Evangelista (Faenza 1608-Florence 1647)

A mathematician, physicist and *letterato*, and a member of the *Percossi*. He appears to have been quite good friends with Rosa, including him as a beneficiary in his final will.

Vendramin, Paolo

The Venetian ambassador to Florence. A member of the *Percossi*, he is remembered as the author of a composition entitled *Adone*, given in Venice in 1639 and set to music by Francisco Mannelli. See A. Belloni, "Il Seicento", in *Storia letteraria d'Italia*, ed. Milan 1958, 417. In 1651 he wrote to Rosa and encouraged him to publish his satires. See Borelli, letter 106.

Chapter I
The Self Performed: Reputation and Sociality in the Making of Rosa's Identity, and the Crafting of an Academic Ritual

Performance was an essential component of Rosa's personal and professional identity and a key strategy in its production and display. It is most clearly evident in his theatrical activity, but it is an equally pervasive theme in his art and writing. It is particularly apparent in Rosa's self-images, which present the self in a series of "roles" – as a distinctively divisible and manipulable entity – although it emerges from all of his images in a literal or metaphorical sense. Rosa's paintings, prints and drawings reveal a programmatic concern to display a mastery of gesture, expression and the *affetti* – all of which (if Rosa's biographers are to be believed) were inspired by Rosa's own movements in front of the large mirror he kept in his studio.[1] The cast of characters that populate his pictorial *oeuvre* thrust their limbs out in dramatic gestures of signification – pointing, praying, asking, directing, informing, debating, denying and conceding. An interest in performance as an iconographic subject also emerges in some of Rosa's images, such as the mask-wielding protagonist of the enigmatic *La Menzogna* (c. 1645-48, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 34]; the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* (1640's?, UK, private collection) [Fig. 15], which represents one of Rosa's comic *personae*; the large *Scene of Witchcraft* (c. 1646, National Gallery, London) [Fig. 41],[2] where the horizontal dispersal of figures calls to mind a stage filled with actors; and the enigmatic series of prints known as the *Figurine* (1656-58) [Figs. 90-95], which bear an affinity to contemporary prints of costumed characters.[3] Rosa's active adoption of performance highlights the

---

[1] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 582.

[2] Rosa's witchcraft scenes may also be linked to his interest in mountebank performance, itself connected to the practice of sorcery and magic. See Erika Esau, "Tiepolo and Punchinello: Venice, Magic and Commedia dell'arte," *Australian Journal of Art* IX (1991): 52-; Robert Erenstein, "Satire and the Commedia dell'arte," in *Western Popular Theatre*, ed. David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London: Methuen, 1977), 33.

[3] The iconography and function of these prints remains elusive, but at base they are tied to the same conviction in performance as a method for asserting a moral-philosophical agenda. Peter Tomory interprets the *Figurine* as a socio-moral commentary. Tomory, "Battles, war and soldiers: Salvator Rosa as moralist", *Storia dell'arte* 69 (1990): 256-67. Sergio Tretola proposes an affinity between the figures and contemporary theatrics. Tretola, *Figurine d'Acquaforte. Mostra di incisioni di Salvator Rosa*. Exhibition catalogue (Benevento, Museo del Sannio, 2000-2001), 9-15. Christina von Heusinger proposes the *Figurine* were intended as a kind of "pattern

essentially social and reputational basis of his identity,[4] cultivated equally on the stage of the theatre and everyday experience. This chapter considers the nature of this activity by way of introduction to Rosa's private academy in Florence, the *Accademia dei Percossi*, an important early social context for Rosa's development where comedic acting and poetic recital defined both the mission of the academy and Rosa's own personal vision.

I.1. Self-Performance as a Strategy of Celebrity

By the time Rosa arrived in Florence in 1640 he had already achieved a certain success in asserting his independence. His biographer Giambattista Passeri says that in 1639, while Rosa was still in the employ of Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio in Rome, he had moved into his own house on the Via Margutta in order to have "greater freedom" and to enjoy the "more frequent company" of his friends.[5] Finding it difficult to make a name for himself as an artist on the competitive Roman art scene, however, Rosa turned from painting to acting as an alternative avenue

---

book" or repertoire of poses for paintings. Von Heusinger, "A Group of Trial Proofs and Early States of Salvator Rosa's *Figurine*," *Print Quarterly* 1:2 (1984): 119. Dispelling the popular Romantic interpretation of Rosa's *Figurine* as "bandits," Richard Wallace interprets them as self-conscious "*capricci*", intended in large part to display Rosa's inventiveness and mastery of the figure. Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Figurine* in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston," *Print Quarterly* 6: 1 (1989): 49. Rosa's *Figurine* may well have been intended as a graphic repertoire of characters, inspired by the roles of the *commedia dell'arte*. Isolated on their pages in a manner akin to the graphic work of Jacques II de Gheyn, Giovanni Battista Castiglione or Jacques Callot, Rosa's characters seem to be presented with a similarly theatrical intention. For De Gheyn's prints of "actors" and soldiers, see F. W. H. Hollstein ed., *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts c. 1450-1700.* Fouceel-Gole (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1949), 3: 132-3 (*The Masks*) and 178-9 (twelve plates of *Officers and Soldiers of the Bodyguard of Emperor Rudolph II* (after Hendrick Goltzius, 1587). Also see Esau, "Tiepolo and Punchinello", 42-3, and Sarah R. Cohen, "Body as 'Character' in Early Eighteenth-Century French Art and Performance," *Art Bulletin* 78: 3 (1996): 454-456.

[4] Langdon has connected Rosa's landscapes with the distinctively "theatrical" and rhetorical vision conveyed in the writings of the Jesuit Daniello Bartoli (1608-85). Langdon, "A Theatre of Marvels," 181; Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 50; also see Limentani, *Poesie e lettere inedite di Salvator Rosa* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1950), 28, who previously suggested the likelihood that Rosa and Bartoli knew each other well. Rosa mentions Bartoli and his poetic composition, *La povertà contenta*, in a letter of 1650. Borelli, letter 51. Bartoli, *La povertà contenta descritta e dedicata a' ricchi non mai contenti* (Venice: Francisco Baba, 1650. Floriana Conte has discovered that Bartoli dedicated his *L'uomo di lettere difeso et emendato* of 1645 to Rosa, with an epistolary dedication composed by Girolamo Signoretti beginning "Al Sig. Salvatore Rosa, mio padrone colendissimo ...". Conte, "Fortuna di Salvator Rosa nella letteratura del tempo" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference at the Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13, 2009). Bartoli, *L'uomo di lettere difeso et emendato* [Florence, Stamperia di S.A.S. alla Condotta, 1645], translated into English as *The Learned Man Defended and Reform'd* (London, 1660).

[5] Passeri, *Vite*, 420. The address of Rosa's house on the Via Margutta is recorded in a manuscript in the BiASA as "Roma, 8. Via Margutta 53/B. Palazzo Patrizi". BiASA, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 14.

for acquiring fame. Rosa's early performances are described by his early biographers as part of a larger program of self-promotion and self-advertisement – a strategy to "*dare tanta copia di sé*" ("give himself a great deal of exposure").[6] Rosa first launched himself onto the stage as a street-performer: dressed as a mountebank, he cavorted about the city with his friends, playing tricks on the crowds that gathered to watch them in the *piazze*. Moving from one place to the next, they presented "beautiful caprices and spirited jokes" and made up "ridiculous prescriptions for various diseases".[7] Isabella Molinari has suggested that Rosa and his friends may have been responsible for introducing to Rome the particular type of mountebank performance involving a collapsible stage and ox-drawn wagon.[8] Some idea of this type of theatrics can be gained from contemporary images, particularly paintings by Roman *Bamboccianti* such as Jan Miel's *The Charlatan* (c. 1645, Hermitage, St. Petersburg) [Fig. 143], where a group of spectators appear utterly captivated by the wild gesticulations and proclamations of the players on stage, or Karel Dujardin's *A Party of Charlatans in an Italian Landscape* (1657, Louvre, Paris) [Fig. 144], whose protagonist shares a particular affinity in costume with the figure in Rosa's *Self-portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15]. Rosa's charlatan performances garnered a significant amount of public recognition, inspiring him to gather his friends at his house on the Via Margutta (in a manner that likely foreshadows his later Florentine academy) to organize the production of improvised comedic performances to stage at the

---

[6] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 440; Passeri says, similarly, that Rosa adopted acting in order to "make his person more greatly known". Passeri, *Vite*, 421.

[7] Passeri, *Vite*, 421; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 440.

[8] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," *Biblioteca Teatrale* 49/51 (1999): 214. Taking from Giovanni Martucci's hypothetical reconstruction, Molinari proposes "we can imagine that the painter and his group used a wagon drawn by oxen or horses. After arriving in a piazza, [Rosa as] Formica apostrophized the public with Neapolitan language and *lazzi*, launching witty and sarcastic epigrams … he sang accompanied by a lute, while his companions sold unguents and recipes." Molinari, *ibid*, 213; citing Martucci, "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'," *Nuova Antologia* 5 (1885): 641-658. On mountebank performances, see also John H. McDowell, "Some Pictorial Aspects of Early Mountebank Stages," in *Studies in Philology* 37 (1940): 84-96. For contemporary commentaries, see Mary Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray (London: Henry Colburn, 1857), 1: 174; Tommaso Garzoni, *La piazza universale* [1585], trans. J. A. Symonds, 745-7; Thomas Coryate, *Coryats Crudities, Hastily gobled up in Five Moneths Travells in France, Savoy, Italy* [1611], trans. F. Taviani and M. Schino, *Il Segreto della Commedia dell'Arte* (Florence: La Casa Usher, 1982), 160-61; and G. D. Ottonelli, *Della Christiana Moderatione del Theatro* [1648], Book I, 121-2.

vigna of the Mignanelli just beyond the Porta del Popolo, with the help of the cleric and dramatist Niccolò Musso.[9]

Passeri identifies Musso for his esteem as a preacher,[10] but he was also a respected "connoisseur of art" who had advised the Duke of Modena, Francesco I d'Este, on paintings he sought for his collection. His relationship with Rosa, then, may have been based in part on Musso's involvement in the art world, and Rosa would likely have availed himself of his friend's illustrious reputation in the service of his theatrical productions.[11] The group probably consisted primarily of painters, in view of their practice of pretending to sell "certain silver jars" in parody of mountebanks and charlatans.[12] Among them was perhaps Marzio Masturzo, who De Dominici claims Rosa befriended during his youth in Naples in the *bottega* of Rosa's uncle, Paolo Greco, and with whom he had probably seen the comedic performances of Neapolitan actors such as Ambrogio

---

[9] Passeri, *Vite*, 421. Pascoli elaborates (with some inventive license) on Passeri's observations regarding Rosa's desire to perpetuate his fame through theatrical performance, not only in public, but also among the *conversazioni* of the nobility, accompanying his performances with the lute. Pascoli, *Vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti moderni, con indice analitico* [1730-1736] (Rome: Società multigrafica editrice Somu, 1965), 66-67. Martucci imagines that Rosa and his acting company erected a theatre box and a type of gallery placed around it for the spectators. The director or impresario of these performances was, according to Passeri, Niccolò Musso who was "in some esteem of literature for the sermons made in more Lent to Rome." Martucci, "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'," 648. E. T. A. Hoffmann claimed that Musso's theatre was under the protection of the Colonna family, although Martucci notes that there is no indication of this in contemporary sources. See Hoffmann, "Salvator Rosa", in *Contes fantastiques*; republished and translated by Christopher Lazare, in *Tales of Hoffmann* (New York: Grove Press, 1946), 390; Martucci, *ibid*, 648.
[10] Passeri, *Vite*, 421: "… Niccolò Mussi, who was then in some esteem of literature for the preaching he did in many [celebrations of] Lent in Rome".
[11] "On July 18 1640 Francesco I's Roman agent Francesco Mantovani wrote to the duke that monsignor Bentivoglio was to give him as a gift Bernini's bust of Costanza Bonarelli and twelve Flemish landscapes, but waited to invite him since 'vuole che il Sig.r Niccolo Mussi li veda prima, per assicurarsi, che siano degni di passare nelle mani di V. Alt.'" Adolfo Venturi, *La Regia Galleria Estense in Modena* (Modena: Toschi, 1882), 249-51. A week later, he told the duke of Musso's enthusiasm for the paintings: "Ho volute subito avisare V. Alt. Del giudicio dato dal Sig.r Nicolo, perche possa tanto piu volentieri accettare la offerta." On September 1, 1640, Mantovani wrote to the duke about some of Rosa's paintings: "et perche quello di Salvator Rosa piacque gia all' A. V.ra piu dell'altro di Monsu Armanno, il Sig.r Abbate Musso ne ha fatti fare due al medesimo Rosa ... quanto abbia cooperate il Sig.r Musso con la sua perizia et accuratezza, è impossibile di esporlo, ardendo di desiderio di mostrare con le opere a V. Alt. la devozione infinita che professa." Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 218-219.
[12] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa", 212. De' Dominici records that they sold "certi albarelli di argento". De' Dominici, *Vite*, 222.

Buonomo or Pier Maria Cecchini.[13] Other members may have included Giovanni Briccio (1579-1645), a painter, mathematician, musician, poet, comedy-writer and actor who Passeri records as making the fake, ricotta-cheese-based unguent used by Rosa's friends in their mountebank performances, and whose own interest in a distinctively witty and burlesque brand of comedy accords with Rosa's own.[14] In an effort to find the rest of the members of Rosa's troupe, Molinari turned to an index of actors by Carlo Cartari in the Archivio di Stato in Rome, compiled between 1630 and 1654.[15] The list reveals a broad range of social and professional backgrounds, from artists, musicians and singers to *literati* and even surgeons. The majority are painters, some from Federico Zuccaro's academy but the majority from the circle of the Cavaliere d'Arpino, who "staged comedies under his supervision in which [the actors] played ridiculous roles and made various festival apparatuses". These actors, Molinari suggests, were probably the same ones with whom Rosa formed his first friendships in Rome. In addition to this group there were also the brothers and successful musicians Luigi and Giancarlo de' Rossi.[16] The stage performance that

---

[13] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 209; De' Dominici, *Vite*, 210 and 254-55. Molinari also suggests that, due to his time as a novitiate with the *Scolopi*, Rosa likely "came into contact with the comedians of one of the oldest *stanze* of comedy in Naples, the *Stanza della Duchesca*, where from the same fathers and in those same years came to be instituted the *Oratorio della Congregazione degli Artisti*." (Molinari, *ibid*, 210) Rosa refers to a Ferrarese actor named Geronimo Carafe who performed as a *zanni* in Naples in a letter to Ricciardi of 1654. Borelli, letter 182. See U. Prota-Giurleo, *I teatri di Napoli nel '600. La commedia e le maschere* (Naples, 1962), 34, 49, 51.

[14] Passeri, *Vite*, 421. Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa", 214. Briccio's tie to Rosa's band of actor friends is further suggested by Federico Cesi's ownership of the Villa dei Mignanelli, which was possibly in his possession as early as 1639; Briccio was closely connected to the Cesi family. Molinari, *ibid*, 217-18; Luciano Mariti, "Esercizio d'attore nel Seicento: Giovanni Briccio & C.," in *Scritti in onore di Giovanni Macchia* (Milan: Mondadori, 1983), II: 650, note 47.

[15] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa", 214; Mariti, "Esercizio d'Attore nel Seicento", 636ff.

[16] Not to be confused with Rosa's friend, the merchant Carlo de' Rossi. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 356-7; Passeri, *Vite*, 434. Gian' Carlo was a harp player and Luigi was a "celebrated composer of melodramas and music for the cardinal Antonio Barberini" and an author of "numerous successful popular songs," three of which appear in Rosa's spurious *Libro di Musica* (a collection of favourite music by friends, at one time erroneously attributed to Rosa himself) suggesting that Luigi and Rosa forged a friendship through a shared love of music. See Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa", 215. On the De'Rossi brothers, see Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 9-11, 106 and 139; Giovanni Alfredo Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere edite e inedite di Salvator Rosa*. 2 vols. (Naples: Tipografia della Regia Università, 1892), 136; G. Monaldi, *I Teatri di Roma negli ultimo tre secoli* (Naples: Ricciardi, 1928), II: 14; Alberto Cametti, "Alcuni documenti inediti su la vita di Luigi Rossi compositore di musica (1597-1653), *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 14: 1 (1912): 1-26. Rosa's book, *Libro di Musica MS di Salvator Rosa*, was bought from Rosa's heirs in 1770 by the musicologist Charles Burney, who attributed its twelve songs (now known to be by Cesti, Capelliui, Legrenzi, Cavalli, Rossi, Carissimi,

Rosa adopted at the Vigna dei Mignanelli would later become a central activity among the members of Rosa's private academy in Florence, where acting *all'improvviso* characterized both public comedies and more private, intimate recitals of poetry. These plays were of the amateur rather than professional sort, performed by *dilettanti* who acted for their own enjoyment rather than for a living.[17]

Rosa was not the only artist to employ theatrical performance as a strategy for self-assertion (or sheer enjoyment, for that matter), nor to regard it as a promising means for achieving that goal.[18] In his *Della Christiana Moderatione del Theatro* of 1648, the cleric Giovanni Domenico Ottonelli enumerated among the faults of public performers their particular susceptibility to that "common aim motivating all humanity" toward achievement: "the expectation of gain".[19] Broadly defined, the "actor" is at base an egoist (and materialist) whose primary objective is self-assertion, and performance offers him both a liberated and superior state of being.[20] Rosa's decision to adopt acting alongside painting as a method for fame was likewise a mode of fiction, but

---

Pasqualini and Bandini) to Rosa. On the *Libro di Musica* and Rosa's fictional reputation as a musician, see Margaret Murata, "Dr. Burney Bought a Music Book," *The Journal of Musicology* 17: 1 (1999): 76-111; Frank Walker, "Salvator Rosa and Music," *Monthly Musical Record* LXXIX, 910 (1949) and LXXX, 913-14 (1950); and Limentani, *Poesie e Lettere*, 7-18.

[17] See Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, *A Documentary History* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Shakespeare Head Press, 1990), 1, 32, 115, and *passim*; Marvin T. Herrick, *Italian Comedy in the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960), 210. Rosa's brand of comedic performance was that of the *virtuosi* who imitate the professional actors and "do for pleasure what the professionals do for money". Andrea Perrucci, *Dell'arte rappresentativa* [1699], Proemio, 187-92, cited in Richards and Richards, *ibid*, 203. On the extempore comedies of private *seicento* academies, see Douglas Radcliffe-Umstead, "The Erudite comic tradition of the *Commedia dell'arte*", in *The Science of Buffoonery*: *Theory and History of the Commedia dell'arte*, ed. Domenico Pietropaolo (Toronto: University of Toronto Italian Studies 3; Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989), 37; Kathleen M. Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy: A Study in the Commedia dell'arte, 1560-1620, with special reference to the English stage* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), 212-13, 218.

[18] Cosimo Lotti, Battista Franco, Agnolo Bronzino, Giovanni Briccio, Gianlorenzo Bernini and Rosa's nephew Michelangelo Fracanzano are among the many artists who took up comedic acting. See Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa', 197; on Battista Franco, see Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Paola della Pergola, Luigi Grassi e Giovanni Previtali (Novara: Istituto geografico De Agostini, 1967); on Fracanzano, see Borelli, letter 330, note 3. For Briccio, as for Rosa, comic performance allowed the display of erudite, intellectual pretensions. See Mariti, *Commedia ridicolosa: comici di professione, dilettanti, editoria teatrale nel Seicento: storia e testi* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1979), 166 and *passim*.

[19] Ottonelli, *Della Christiana Moderatione del Theatro*, Book. I, 121-2, cited in Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 244.

[20] Frederik Schyberg, "The Art of Acting," *The Tulane Drama Review* 5: 4 (1961): 63-5.

one that made himself the living and immediate subject of artefice.[21] While painting proffered a conceptual form of self-representation for the artist ("*ogni dipintore dipinge sè*," after all), acting offered its practitioner a literal "embodiment" – a self-representation in which producer and product are physically equated. Importantly, the fiction that the stage proffered upon the actor's true self provided an intoxicating sense of freedom, permitting the practice of otherwise unacceptable ideas and behavior. By the mid-seventeenth century, the profession of acting was considered an edifying liberal art, adopted by humanist intellectuals in the academies and at court. Thanks in large part to the apologetic publications of dramatic theorists, the actor was by Rosa's time deemed an independent professional, worthy enough not only to declare his own merits but even (for certain individuals) to attain a significant degree of celebrity.[22] The improvised brand of performance, too, had gained regard among critics as superior to scripted theatre since it was considered to present a greater intellectual challenge to its performers.[23] Certain aspects and forms of theatrical practice, however – especially the lowly brand of street performance that Rosa adopted – continued to elicit critical scorn. Rosa's own performative self-promotion of an antagonistic, independent identity capitalized on this collective state of affairs: he exploited the inferior repute of itinerant street performance as an affront to the critical establishment, and he found license for his satirical persona in the moral-philosophical potentialities of the stage. For Rosa, theatrical performance would remain an enduringly integral strategy in the assertion of an identity of independence.

---

[21] On the semiotic dimensions of acting, see Michael L. Quinn, "Celebrity and the Semiotics of Acting," *New Theatre Quarterly* VI: 22 (1990): 154-161.

[22] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 10, 80-88; M. A. Katritzky, *The Art of Commedia: A Study in the Commedia dell'arte 1560-1620, with Special Reference to the Visual Records* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006), 39-43. On the ancient critical derision of actors, see Schyberg, "The Art of Acting," 68-9.

[23] Perrucci considered that only the most competent and expert actors should attempt improvised comedy. See Perrucci, *Dell'arte rappresentativa*, Proemio, 187-92. In his *Le Fatiche Comiche* of 1623, Domenico Bruni likewise noted the difficulty of improvised performance. See Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 228. In *Il Cortegiano* of 1528, Baldassare Castiglione had commended the skill of "impromptu exchange" in speaking and conversation since it "demands skill in 'copiousness': the capacity to say that same thing in different ways and thus generate the impression of verbal 'flow' and expansion." Henke, *Performance and Literature in the Commedia dell'Arte* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 39.

The theatrical stage represented a meta-reality of the more generally performative nature of lived experience in the *seicento*, when reputation and social standing were integral to the making of individual identities.[24] The pervasive early-modern concept of the *theatrum mundi*, famously codified by William Shakespeare's dictum "all the world's a stage",[25] permeated the popular conduct books of the period that dictated appropriate individual conduct and the methods for acquiring virtue and honour. One of the most well-known, Stefano Guazzo's *La Civile Conversazione* (1574), made public reputation (irrespective of and superseding one's own conception of self-worth) the crucial factor of self-definition.[26] In this formulation, the early-modern self was essentially a "socially expressive agent,"[27] whether performed on the stage of the theatre or everyday life. Rosa lamented his obligation to engage in a dissimulative brand of performance in a letter to Ricciardi of 1651: "I go around advising on the best way to wear a mask, or those acts of abasement and flattery that are so necessary in this court if you want to get ahead or at least to stop falling behind other people …".[28] Rosa's sarcastic comment to Ricciardi suggests his awareness of its ironic nature. In embracing the world of theatre at an early point in his career, Rosa seized the opportunity to capitalize on the prevailing paradigm of subjectivity, recognizing both its symbolic and genuine usefulness for his own self-construction and self-perpetuation.

---

[24] See Roger Freitas, "Singing and Playing: The Italian Cantata and the Rage for Wit", *Music & Letters* 82: 4 (2001): 510-11; Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 193; Whigham, "Interpretation at Court," 623-39; Elias, *The Court Society*, 63 and *passim*.
[25] Freitas, "Singing and Playing," 511; from Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, II.7.139. On the prevalence of this concept in the *seicento*, see Peter N. Skrine, *The Baroque: Literature and Culture in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1978), 1-24; and Howard D. Pearce, "A Phenomenological Approach to the *Theatrum Mundi* Metaphor," *PMLA* 95: 1 (1980): 42-57.
[26] Whigham, "Interpretation at Court," 635-37.
[27] Cohen, "Body as 'Character'," 458.
[28] Borelli, letter 85: "Lo vado istruendo circa il modo d'adoperar la maschera, cioè gli atti d'humiltà, e della adulatione, cose necessarissime a questa Corte per chi vuol avanzarsi o almeno per non restar dietro agli altri ..." A similar sentiment of the necessity, and even usefulness, of the mask is conveyed in another letter to Ricciardi, regarding the slander he was receiving from the Roman academic community over the authorship of his satires (Borelli, letter 177), in which he claims to "laugh at such deceptions" with a "stoic mask". Rosa's interest in the ancient Greek satirist Lucian (whom he mentions in two letters to Ricciardi, see Borelli, letters 146 and 198) would have led him to the poet's dialogue *Necromancy*, where the Cynic philosopher Menippus aligns human life with the poet's play. The same metaphor was repeated by Erasmus in his well-known *Praise of Folly* (1509). Skrine, *The Baroque*, 2-3. For the significance of Lucian's satires to Rosa's poetry, see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 32-33, 89, 165-66, 274-75, 320 and 365

I.2. Acting *all'Improvviso*: The Individuality and Interdependency of the Performed Self

The perception of the early-modern actor as self-sufficient and the vision of dramatic improvisation as "spontaneous" are both Romantic notions that belie the interdependent nature of players, and the calculated, sophisticated character of their practice. Only in the broader sense of the actor's socio-cultural position can improvisation be regarded as individualizing: it conflated the previously distinct dramatist and actor into a single entity, and allowed him a new "independence and sovereignty"[29] over his practice. This autonomy, however, remained socially-constituted by the player's audience and fellow actors. Far from impulsive, a successful extempore performance consisted in a long accumulation of material, memorized in advance so that it could be used "in the moment" on stage, giving the impression of spontaneity and inventiveness.[30] Improvised theatrical performance thrived on its condition of "perpetual renovation," a flexibility and variability in its characters and plots.[31] This was likely a large part of its appeal for Rosa, as it offered him the opportunity to exercise his own cherished love of novelty of invention and permitted a constant modification and perfection of his own performative identity.[32] Based in and conflated with his theatrical role, this "performative" self could be continually re-invented or renovated in order to sustain its originality. Importantly, this creative process was communal in nature.[33] Seventeenth-century theorists commented at length on the requisite interdependency of actors in improvised performance, and the essentially collaborative nature of their unique inventions: in 1695 Evaristo

---

[29] Schyberg, "The Art of Acting," 71.
[30] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 187; Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy. The Improvisation Scenarios, Lives, Attributes, Portraits and Masks of the Illustrious Characters of the Commedia dell'arte*, trans. Randolph T. Weaver (New York: Dover Publications, 1966), 33; Pietropaolo, "Improvisation as a Stochastic Composition Process", in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. Pietropoaolo, 174; Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 38, 49.
[31] Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 71-2.
[32] Novelty was a vital aspect of Rosa's professional identity and conception of independence, as will become clear in the following chapters. See especially my discussion in chapter five.
[33] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 188.

Gherardi defined "a good actor" as one who managed *both* self-motivated imagination and an integration with his fellow players.[34]

The fundamentally social aspect of invention is a key consideration in understanding Rosa's identity as an inspired innovator, and is essential in helping to brush away the lingering vestiges of the Byronic myth of self-sufficiency that still cling to him. The improvised play was "a process of collaborative 'making', the success of which was rooted in *virtuoso* skills and the players' familiarity with each other in the performance situation."[35] Acting *all'improvviso* required actors to be intimately familiar with each other's individual performative skills[36] – to form a veritable brotherhood[37] – and the success of Rosa's theatrical performances in both Rome and Florence suggests the degree of camaraderie among his actor friends. The establishment of each actor's individual, unique stage *persona* also relied upon frequent practice and performance with fellow actors.[38] Masking also operated in a highly collaborative way in that the identity of the masked actor functioned only in relation to other masked actors on the stage.[39] These *personae* were further sustained by the audience, whose willingness to suspend disbelief buoyed the realism of the actors' fiction. Rosa's brand of role-play allowed him to fuse his real and desired identities into one, intended to encapsulate the qualities he associated with his personal and professional ideal.

I.3. Rosa as Coviello and Pascariello: The Performance and the Mask as Modes of Self-Fashioning

---

[34] Gherardi, *Le Theatre Italien de Gherardi* [1700], cited in Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 204.
[35] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte,* 186-7; Duchartre, *The Italian* Comedy, 30; and Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 24.
[36] Pietropaolo, "Improvisation as a Stochastic Composition Process", in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. Pietropoaolo, 170. Comedic improvisation is a collaborative, "stochastic" procedure, "at once a function of individual competence and a function of concerted teamwork". Pietropaolo, *ibid*, 168-170.
[37] Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 113.
[38] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 109.
[39] Giulio Ferroni, "L'ossessione del raddopiamento nella *commedia dell'arte*," in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. Pietropaolo, 137.

Rosa's theatrical alter-ego combined the Neapolitan characters of the *commedia dell'arte*, Pascariello and Coviello, with certain qualities of the street-performing mountebank and saltimbanc. The significance of this many-layered role for Rosa's identity is apparent in its repeated performance in both public and private settings throughout his career. Contrary to Giovanni Martucci, who argues that Rosa and his fellow actors did not self-identify with the roles they played, I argue that Rosa's adoption of theatrical *personae* involved a purposeful conflation of self and character.[40] For Rosa, the adoption of these masks offered both self-concealment and self-display: the presumptive façade of comedic disguise sanctioned the projection of a hyperbolic caricature of his true self, enabling him to exhibit the objectionable and socially un-tolerated (and intolerant) qualities that characterized him. It was an avatar, no less, composed of masks long associated with antagonistic behaviour.[41] The license given to the actor by theatrical "disguise" is a key to its significance for Rosa as a tactic of self-assertion. Theatre offers both the actor and the audience a "reaffirmation of the multiple existential potentialities we incorporate but cannot realize" in real life, and does so "on a totally acceptable, traditionally sanctioned, and unexceptionable occasion … in an institutional context which is connected with everyday existence"; the actor himself becomes the "literally corporeal vehicle of this ritual reaffirmation."[42] The only surviving anecdote concerning Rosa's public performances in Rome (discussed in detail below) suggests that they were bitterly satirical in nature – early expressions of the moral-philosophical proclivity that would come to characterize Rosa's professional identity and his sense of self-righteous independence.

[40] Martucci, "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'," 652.
[41] On the liberating, permissive power of the mask, see André Chastel "Masque, Mascarade, Mascaron", in *Fables, Formes, Figures*, vol. I, Idées et Recherches (Paris: Flammarion, 1978), 253.
[42] Burns, *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and in Social Life* (London: Longman, 1972), 105, cited in Goodlad, "Approaches to Popular Drama through the Social Sciences", in *Western Popular Theatre*, ed. Mayer and Richards, 245. Theatre is "a ritual device for the constant renewal of belief in human autonomy for individuals required constantly to submit to the vexacious necessities of consistent, recognizable role behavior in the world of ordered social life".

It is no coincidence that Rosa chose two of the most popular Neapolitan characters of the *commedia dell'arte* for his theatrical *personae*.[43] Similar in their comedic function, Coviello (a shortened version of the Neapolitan diminutive of Giacomino, "Iacoviello") and Pascariello (a late-*cinquecento* version of the beloved Neapolitan Pulcinella[44]) were both versions of the *zanni*, one of the seven primary masks of the *commedia dell'arte*. The *zanni* – a name derived from the Italian dialectical nickname for "Giovanni", and etymologically linked to the English "zany" – constituted one of the *parti ridicole* and were usually conceived as servants or attendants.[45] They could be performed as cunningly intelligent or blunderingly stupid, and often the two versions of *zanni* were pitted against each other in order to induce comic situations.[46] The few indications that we have regarding Rosa's particular version of the character suggest that he favored the first, clever *zanni*, who was responsible for driving the plot of the comedy with his trickery and deceptive wit.[47] (Baldinucci emphasizes the "sly" [*astuto*] disposition of Rosa's Coviello.[48]) The *zanni*'s centrality in the play, along with his distinctively self-centered behavior, suggests his appeal for Rosa, who in adopting the role made himself a focus of both the audience's and the actors' attention.[49] Rosa's

---

[43] Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 123. Rosa adopted a well-known identity for the profusion of his own persona. Both Coviello and Pascariello were at that time in Rome being performed, for example, on the aristocratic stage of the Barberini (Coviello was performed by Bernini, an important point that I will return to) in Giulio Rospigliosi's *Egisto* or *Chi soffre speri* in 1637 and 1639. Chiara D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi* (Florence: Edifir, 2002), 93; D'Afflitto and Danilo Romei eds., *I teatri del Paradiso: la personalità, l'opera, il mecenatismo di Giulio Rospigliosi (Papa Clemente IX)* (Pistoia: Maschietto & Musolino; Siena: Protagon editori toscani, 2000), 18-19.

[44] Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 199; Michele Rak, "Cade il mondo. Icone, magia, saperi e devozione nelle satire di Salvator Rosa," in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 92-3, 96, note 18. Rak aligns Rosa's Pascariello with the "Pascariello Truono" who "combined elements of [Neapolitan] identity with Tuscan literature".

[45] On the etymology of "*zanni*," see Nicoll, *Masks, Mimes and Miracles*, 263-5.

[46] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 119. In his *I Frutti delle moderne comedie* (Padua, 1628, 23-4), Pier Maria Cecchini noted that performances required both types of *zanni* in order to spur the comedic action.

[47] Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 22; Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 198. Rosa's references to *zanni* in his satires also suggest his preference for the witty, first type. See *La Poesia*, vv. 425-438; *La Guerra*, vv. 484-489; *Il Tirreno*, vv. 247-267. For plays centered on Coviello, see Anna Maria Testaverde, *I canovacci della commedia dell'arte* (Turin: G. Einaudi, 2007); and Francesco Cotticelli et al., *The Commedia dell'Arte in Naples: A Bilingual Edition of the 176 Casamarciano Scenarios*, vol. I (Lanham, Maryland and London: The Scarecrow Press, 2001), which includes *scenarii* like "Coviello's Pranks", "Coviello Betrays his Master", and "Coviello's Mischief".

[48] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461.

[49] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 146.

interest in the role of the first *zanni* also lay, perhaps, in its integrality to the "master-servant agon" that characterized most of the *commedia*'s plots. The first *zanni*'s constant complaints about his oppression, and his ability to challenge and undermine the authority of his master,[50] reflect Rosa's own professional desires. The ostensible incompatibility of the character's "servant" status with Rosa's own libertarian proclivities can thus be discarded since the *zanni* were regarded more as obliging than slavish and always retained a "semblance of independence".[51] Both the mountebank and the first *zanni* enjoyed reputations as deceptive, offensive, and occasionally abusive characters, qualities that recommended them to Rosa as roles expressive of his own pursuit of an aggressively satiric mode of independence on the stage of real life.[52] The mountebank and charlatan mocked the stupidity of their audience with false potions and prescriptions and cultivated an "atmosphere of terror and illusion" among their onlookers. As a mountebank, Rosa exploited the role's reputation (particularly according to religious authorities) as "[a] rogue and vagabond whose activities were socially and morally reprehensible."[53] Achieving public notoriety with this character in street performance, Rosa sought the same qualities of deception and rebellion on the comic stage and found them in the figure of the first, wily *zanni*, who deceives both his fellow performers and the public by adopting various guises and playing cruel tricks on the other characters. Baldinucci says that, in Rome, Rosa first adopted the character of Coviello "Formica" (Coviello "the Ant"), while Passeri refers to this role as Pascariello Formica.[54] Molinari argues that Baldinucci was incorrect in

---

[50] Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 27.

[51] Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 62, 100. Pulcinella, another of the *zanni*, also had a quality of independence.

[52] Cotticelli et al, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, *passim*. In the mid-sixteenth century, "*zanni* entertainment was [considered] too socially and morally suspect for gentlewomen to attend in public". Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 81. Both the charlatan (the fake doctor, magician or miracle-worker, whose name means "to speak boastfully in order to confuse others") and mountebank (the superstition-mongerer, whose name derives from his practice of erecting a platform above his spectators) had a long history rooted in medieval popular entertainment, and both were characterized by their deceptive nature. Esau, "Tiepolo and Punchinello," 51-2.

[53] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia* dell'Arte, 17; Ottonelli, *Della Christiana Moderatione del Theatro*, 455-6. The mountebanks were increasingly criticized in the mid-sixteenth century by professional actors who considered them a threat to the seriousness of their profession. Cope, "Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*", *PMLA* 102: 2 (1987): 177-8.

[54] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 440; Passeri, *Vite*, 420.

his identification, likely projecting backward the persona of Coviello "Patacca" that Rosa first began to perform in Volterra and Florence after 1640, asserting that Rosa's first stage mask was Pascariello Formica.[55] It is plausible, however, that Rosa adopted the Neapolitan role of Coviello in Rome prior to reprising it again in Florence.[56] It was more certainly in Florence that Rosa appears to have taken up yet another character, Trespolo, who featured prominently in a number of Ricciardi's plays. I will return to this role later on. Capitalizing on the interpretative fluidity of the *commedia* characters – and Coviello and Pascariello were considered particularly flexible[57] – Rosa melded these types, along with the qualities of certain other masks like the Neapolitan Pulcinella, into his own unique persona.[58]

The reconstruction of Rosa's actual appearance in his theatrical role rests on rather scant pictorial or textual evidence. The only palpably theatrical self-images that survive are the splendid *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15], and, perhaps, the so-called *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* (mid-1640's?, Siena, Palazzo Chigi-Saracini) [Fig. 13]. There are also a number of paintings of "masks" in the inventories of the Colonna collection that are ascribed to Rosa, evidence of his (and the

[55] Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 198-199, 240-1. Molinari argues that Rosa's "second role, as 'Coviello', was born on the occasion of the first carnival Rosa spent at Volterra with his friend Giulio Maffei" in 1640. Lippi's reference to Rosa's role as "Coviello Patacca" in the *Malmantile Racquistato* (Canto IV, 14) suggests to her that the role was first performed in Florence, "a little while after Rosa's first sojourn in Volterra". Molinari, *ibid*, 240-1; Lippi, *Il Malmantile Racquistato di Perlone Zipoli, colle note di Puccio Lamoni e d'altri* (Florence: Nella stamperia di Michele Nestenus e Francesco Moücke, 1731).

[56] Rosa was likely familiar with the earliest Neapolitan performances of the characters Coviello and Pascariello by Andrea Calcese and Ambrogio Buonomo, performed in 1629 and perhaps in 1622-23. In 1639, Molinari notes, these actors were in Rome "where Rosa debuted his mask … and Bernini introduced the comic parts of *Zanni* and Coviello in *La fiera di Farfa*, the intermezzo to *Chi soffre speri* by Giulio Rospigliosi," performed at Palazzo Barberini. Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 205-7.

[57] Nicoll, *Masks, Mimes and Miracles*, 260-1. Coviello was often a mixture of the *Capitano* and *zanni*; in the Neapolitan scenarii he is often "gentleman or rich bourgeois". Pascariello was variously portrayed as a *Capitano*-type, a *zanni* or a *Dottore*-type, or as some mixture of them.

[58] Rosa's theatrical persona also borrowed from Pulcinella, an early-*seicento* Neapolitan servant-type *zanni* whose name means "chicken stealer" in Greek or "little chick" (rascal) in Italian (but who became a Neapolitan symbol), alternatively performed as witty or doltish. Rosa refers to himself as Pulcinella in two letters to Ricciardi of 1661 and 1670. See Borelli, letters 243 and 380. Also see Croce, *Pulcinella e il personaggio del napoletano in commedia*, (Rome, 1899); and Croce, *I Teatri di Napoli nei secoli XV-XVII* (Naples, 1891). For Pulcinella's origins, see Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 91-94; Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 315, note 24; and Nicoll, *Masks, Mimes and Miracles*, 290-3. Molinari notes that "the significance of Rosa's interpretations lay not in presenting a Neapolitan mask for the first time on the Roman stage ... but in using a comic mode that was up until then unexplored, based on personal expressive abilities." Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 208.

Colonna's) broader interest in the subject if not literally representative of his own theatrical appearance.[59] In the 1683 inventory of Carlo de' Rossi there are also various "maschere di commedia dell'arte", all given to Rosa, including a Pantalone, a Zanni, a Cola, a Pulcinella and a Padre Gratiano.[60] A "small Pulcinella" was also among the works of the artist lent by the private collections of the Roman nobility for one of the exhibitions in the church cloister of S. Salvatore in Lauro in 1710.[61] Ricciardi, who collected many of Rosa's paintings and graphic work, also had at least two paintings of comedic masks in his collection.[62]

Rosa's *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15], a title given to the painting on the basis of Baldinucci's reference to a self-portrait by Rosa in the guise of Pascariello "with torn gloves," was painted as a gift for his Florentine friend, the printer Girolamo Signoretti.[63] Although Baldinucci described Rosa's Florentine theatrical persona as Pascariello, the character was likely informed by the qualities of Coviello – a version of which he later reprised among friends in Volterra. Pascariello was a more independent figure than Coviello. Perhaps best associated with the role of the *Capitano* (he traditionally wore a sword, as Rosa does in his self-portrait), Pascariello was also aligned with the acrobats and dancers[64] and thus offered a link between the *zanni* tendencies of

---

[59] I am grateful to Natalia Gozzano for bringing these paintings to my attention. Gozzano, "Salvator Rosa, i Colonna e la Commedia dell'arte: il mondo del teatro dipinto e recitato nella Roma del Seicento" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference at the Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13, 2009); also see Gozzano, *La Quadreria di Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna. Prestigio nobiliare e collezionismo nella Roma barocca* (Rome: Bulzoni editore, 2004), 217-18. For the Colonna inventories, see E. A. Safarik and C. Pujia, *Collezione dei dipinti Colonna, Inventari 1611-1795*, ed. Anna Cera Sones. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 1996). Gozzano identified at least six paintings and drawings by Rosa in the Colonna inventories of 1679, 1689, 1714 and 1783 that were described as "masks": a Pulcinella, a "mascarone," a Dottore, a Coviello, and a Pulcinello with a Sleeping Soldier. The Colonna shared Rosa's love of theatre; he mentions the Constable Colonna's comedies in 1670 (Borelli, letter 375).

[60] For De' Rossi's inventory (dated October 27 1683) see Ubaldo Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti intorno alla Storia della Pittura. Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione, detto il Grechetto, Salvator Rosa, Gian Lorenzo Bernini*. Fonti per la storia della pittura e della scultura antica, VIII (Monzambano: Edizioni per le fonti di storia della pittura, 1978), 77-82, doc. CLXXII; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 364-373.

[61] Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 87, doc. CLXXIV, c. 162v, Prestato nel 1710 dalla principessa di Piombino.

[62] Ricciardi's inventory of 1683 lists "Un maschera da commedie" and "Dua tondi disegnatovi dua Zanni con cornice di albero bianche." Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 93, 95, inventory 179, 180.

[63] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 456. On the status and significance of this particular painting as a gift, see chapter five.

[64] Pascariello was often depicted as a tight-rope performer or valet. Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy*, 247.

Coviello and the saltimbanc-mountebank character of Rosa's street performances. Both Pascariello and Coviello, in fact, shared in their Neapolitan origins an acrobatic and musical pedigree.[65]

Giovanni Martucci and Paul Carter imagine Rosa's Coviello as combining Pascariello's "black velvet costume and red stockings" with Coviello's roguish behaviour.[66] In Lady Sydney Morgan's fanciful conception, Rosa's Coviello was "adroit and vainglorious, a Proteus in character, language and manner … his black velvet jacket and pantaloons … strongly contrasted with his conventional mask with its crimson cheeks, black nose and forehead".[67] Morgan's comment raises the important question of whether or not Rosa wore a mask. Baldinucci says Rosa and his friends "went about … in masks" for their mountebank antics,[68] but nowhere does he specify the use of masks in Rosa's later performances in Florence. In the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello*, the symbolic or functional mask that usually accompanies the actor in similar, contemporary portraits is lacking.[69] But this alone does not disprove Rosa's use of a mask in comic performance. The *zanni* were among the traditionally masked roles of the *commedia*, and the mask was vital for both Coviello and Pascariello, who usually wore close-fitting leather half-masks (either "smooth moulded and close-fitting" masks made of linen-lined leather that moulded to the face, or "vizards made rather more elaborate by the addition of bushy facial hair on brows and cheeks") that covered only the

[65] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 200-4, 216. Pascariello played an instrument "derived from improvisory instruments like the *pignato*, a sort of clay or copper cooking pot that produced, when hit, an unmistakable sound; or from the *calascione*, an instrument with two or three strings, of popular origin like the lute, which had to be accompanied by shiningly and actions." The likelihood that Rosa made music a feature of his performances is also suggested by Baldinucci's observation of Rosa's love of lute-playing, Pascoli's comments, and by a letter of the "excellent abbot Cancellieri" (now lost), mentioned by Lady Sydney Morgan, in which it is claimed that Rosa accompanied his performance with instruments as a "cantate buffe". See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 501; Pascoli, *Vite*, 66; Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, vol. I, 248, 283, and *passim*.
[66] Paul Carter, "A Roman Comedy," *Art and Artists* 12: 9 (1978): 37.
[67] Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, 100, note.
[68] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 440.
[69] For example, Agostino Carracci's portrait of Giovanni Gabrielli (c. 1599, Art Gallery of New South Wales), Carlo Biffi's portrait of Francesco Gabrielli (1630, Biblioteca Ambrosiana), or Domenico Fetti's portrait of an actor (variously identified as Tristano Martinelli, Giovanni Gabrielli, or Francesco Andreini) (c. 1614-22, Hermitage). See Taviani and Schino, *Il segreto della commedia dell'arte*, 27; and Pamela Askew, "Fetti's 'Portrait of an Actor' Reconsidered," *Burlington Magazine* 120: 899 (1978): 59-65.

upper part of the face.[70] In Jacques Callot's etching of Coviello from his *Balli di Sfessania* series of the early 1620's [Fig. 140] (one of the few iconographic records of the character[71]) he is shown mid-dance, wearing a mask with a long beak-like nose and a plumed hat, with a sword and slapstick attached to his belt.[72] A 1642 engraving by Francesco Bertelli shows Coviello with long, close-fitted trousers, a tight waistcoat and a short cape, playing the mandolin and wearing the usual large-nosed mask and a pair of eyeglasses.[73] [Fig. 141] Pascariello also wore a mask with a pronounced nose and feathered plume, as seen in Callot's rendition of "Pasquariello Truonno" [Fig. 139].[74]

It is very likely that Rosa used a mask in his performances. The mask was an intrinsic feature of the *commedia dell'arte*, whose performances and individual characters were both described as "*maschere*". More than this, Rosa's castigation of Gianlorenzo Bernini for straying from one of the central tenets of the *commedia dell'arte* (an important event that I will discuss below) suggests Rosa adhered to traditional elements of performance.[75] But the artful, constructive function of performance was not solely reliant upon the mask itself, and the concept of "masking" incorporated other aspects of the actor's persona, including costume, gesture, facial expression, voice and other physical attributes and behavior. The close analogy drawn between the actor and

---

[70] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 2, 113; Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy*, 49. On the variations of the *zanni's* costume, see Katritzky, *The Art of Commedia*, 189-92.
[71] On the debate over the connection of the series to the *commedia dell'arte*, see Katritzky, *The Art of Commedia*, 225-26; rather than "imaginative *capricci*", he sees them as based (if freely) on actual performance practice.
[72] The *battacchio* or "slap stick" was a club-like object made of two wooden slats that produced a loud smacking noise when struck, without causing harm to its target. *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, second edition (New York: Random House, 1987), 1795.
[73] Nicoll, *Masks Mimes and Miracles*, 261; and Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy*, 44.
[74] Donald Posner, "Jacques Callot and the Dances Called Sfessania," *Art Bulletin* 59: 2 (1977): 211, fig. 17.
[75] Rosa chastised Bernini for including extraneous characters, not central to the narrative, in his plays. Writing on the subject of theatre in 1699, Perrucci notes in his *Dell'arte rappresentativa* (Regola VII, 273-9) that Neapolitan actors perform "without the mask". Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 135. This is a late commentary, however, and the iconography of the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries suggests that the *zanni* usually wore masks. Jacques Callot's representation of Coviello, for example, in his etched series of *Sfessania* of the early 1620's, shows him wearing a mask. Callot's rendering of Pascariello – Rosa's other favourite character – also wears a mask. See Posner, "Jacques Callot and the Dances Called Sfessania," 211, 212. Also suggestive of Rosa's adherence to certain "rules" of the *commedia dell'arte* is the participation of Rosa's friend Francesco Maria Agli, a Bolognese businessman, who traveled expressly from Bologna in order to perform the role of Dottor Graziano – a character who, according to the rules of the *commedia* as described by Perrucci, had to be performed in perfect Bolognese dialect. See Gianrenzo P. Clivio, "The Languages of the *Commedia dell'arte*", in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. Pietropaolo, 218.

his character in contemporary theories of masking may well have informed Rosa's *Self-Portrait as Pascariello*. Here, Rosa equates his own visage with the role itself, intentionally blurring the line between the two. Pascariello's most noteworthy characteristic – his astute and cunning wit – was, after all, prized by Rosa as an essential attribute of his own personal and professional identity.

The second, more uncertain of Rosa's two "theatrical" self-images, the *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* [Fig. 13] is a much-debated image that some scholars have linked to Rosa's theatrical roles. Scott suggested the figure was a self-portrait in the guise of Coviello as *Capitano* – a "braggart Spanish captain",[76] but it may represent one of the *bravi*. Significantly, both Pascariello and Coviello could incorporate elements of these military *personae*. The Captain, a role usually

---

[76] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 61, 239 note 11. He considers it a likely self-portrait, since "the likeness to the Pascariello portrait seems close." Ebert-Schifferer likewise interprets it as a self-representation as Coviello, as "capitano Patacca." Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68. First documented only in 1781, the painting's iconography and authorship are subject to ongoing debate among scholars. Salerno, who also accepted it as a self-portrait, attributed it to Rosa's Florentine period while Ozzola, Ward Bissell and Xavier Salomon have doubted Rosa's authorship, arguing instead that it is a pastiche by a Romantic artist, based on the similar, smaller version of the painting in the Detroit Institute of Arts [Fig. 12], and inspired by the mythology of Rosa's banditry and participation in the Neapolitan revolt; Salomon also notes its uncharacteristically "sleek" paint surface. See Salerno, Salvator Rosa; Ozzola, Vita e Opere; Ward Bissell, *Masters of Italian Baroque Painting. The Detroit Institute of Arts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 174; Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 494-5. Salerno also noted a resonance with the Romantic image of Rosa as a "painter-at-arms", but did not refute the possibility of a self-portrait. Salerno, in *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli.* Exhibition catalogue (Naples: Electa: 1984), 428, cat. 2.215, where the painting is entitled "Ritratto di gentiluomo armato". Frederick Cummings considered the Detroit painting to be the first version of the two paintings, the Siena version being a more complex elaboration on the same figure. Cummings, *Art in Italy 1600-1700*, 139, n. 35. Meroni considered it a portrait of Agostino Chigi (1634-1705), dating it to Rosa's later Roman phase. Meroni, "Salvator Rosa: autoritratti e ritratti di amici," *Prospettiva Firenze* 25 (1981): 66. Chigi was the nephew of Pope Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi), and was made *Reichsfurst* (prince of the Holy Roman Empire) in 1659 by Emperor Leopold I. He married Maria Virginia Borghese and gained the principates of Farnese (1658), Campagnano (1661) and Ariccia, and was made Governor of Castel Sant'Angelo. If Rosa's portrait was made during his Florentine sojourn – as its style seems to suggest – then Agostino would have been a young boy at the time and, therefore, an unlikely candidate for the figure represented in the painting. Brigitte Daprà has noted the close physiognomic resemblance to the *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* in the National Gallery in London [Fig. 10]. The compelling outward stare, a blend of intense vitality and pensive melancholia, suggests qualities that are highly self-referential for Rosa, and Daprà notes that it is "perhaps better to describe him as a 'dueling nobleman', faithful to his reputation as a rebellious and provocative personality." Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 103, cat. 4. The same identity may inform another possible, smaller *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* in the Palazzo Chigi-Saracini [Fig. 14]. The painting can also be connected with self-images in emulation of Giorgione's *Self-portrait as David with the Head of Goliath*, where the identity "soldier" was intended to convey an image of virtue, fortitude and invincibility. Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*, 39, 43.

intended to mock military authority and the profession of the soldier (particularly the Spanish[77]), was often nicknamed "*Capitano Spavento*" ("Captain Fright"). He was considered a vainglorious character, a haughty braggart who coveted fame and its display and took pleasure in flaunting his intelligence and gallantry.[78] This character was often distinguished, no less, by a "long rapier and fierce moustache",[79] both of which feature in Rosa's painting. The *bravi*, alternatively, were mercenary soldiers or hired thugs who were portrayed either as street criminals or the "strong-arm" men of the nobility.[80] Importantly, the *zanni* often disguised themselves as *bravi*, and played up the traits of the "*spadaccino*" (swordsman, a term used by various scholars to identify Rosa's portrait and the proper name of one of the *bravi* roles) or the more erudite qualities of the learned *bravo* who possessed a "comprehensive and encyclopedic knowledge".[81] This characteristic seems to be embodied by the proud, self-righteous aspect of Rosa's figure, which, combined with the military paraphernalia of the image, presents a further manifestation of Rosa's identity of antagonistic independence. The flag-standard, the arquebus (a muzzle-loaded firearm popular in Italy and Spain[82]), the trumpet, the drum, the burning fuse, and the sword held by the figure (more than likely being drawn rather than sheathed) all point to a singular *concetto* of explosivity – another performative metaphor, here in a martial idiom, for the indignant and inspired quality of Rosa's self-conceived autonomy.[83] These are concepts which pervade his letters, satires, and inform even

---

[77] In his *Dell'arte rappresnetativa* (Regola VII, 273-9), Perrucci says the Capitano can be played as Spanish or Neapolitan. Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte,* 134. The Captain was often used to mock the Spanish adventurers of Charles V." Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 41.
[78] Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 41-44.
[79] John H. McDowell, "Some Pictorial Aspects of Early Commedia dell'arte Acting", *Studies in Philology* 39:1 (1942): 47.
[80] Radcliffe-Umstead, "The Erudite comic tradition of the *Commedia dell'arte*", 43. The *bravi* were often hired by the Captain to carry out certain unsavory deeds on his behalf.
[81] Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 52-53; Chiarini, "Gli anni fiorentini di Salvator Rosa", in *Salvator Rosa, Tra Mito e Magia*, 24; Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 179.
[82] The arquebus (or harquebus) originated c. 1400. *Random House Dictionary*, 874.
[83] The trumpet and sword are also symbols of "fame" and victory. Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), 126; Z. Z. Filipczak, *Picturing Art in Antwerp*, 1550-1700 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 98 and G. De Tervarent, *Attributs et Symboles dans l'Art Profane, 1450-1600* (Lausanne; Geneve: Dros, 1958), 156-7.

the very name of his academy, the *Percossi*, a moniker that will be discussed at length in the next chapter. Both of Rosa's self-portraits, as Pascariello and Coviello-as-*capitano* (or *bravo)*, present a proud image, perhaps sharing with contemporary images of actors a "concern to dignify the image of the actor … and strengthen his identification with the educated and even courtly strata of society."[84] In this context it is noteworthy that the sword, which appears in both self-images, is also a potent symbol of social rank and privilege.

Rosa may also have relished the opportunity to play up the foolish traits of Coviello, and to caricature an aspect of his identity (his Neapolitan "nationality") toward which he had life-long, conflicting attitudes.[85] Indeed, Baldinucci indicates that the performances staged by Rosa and his academic friends in Florence were of "noble and serious" subjects, but they included "ridiculous parts".[86] Roworth has noted the comic and tragic duality inherent in satire itself, and considered that both played a role in Rosa's own poetic and painterly satiric practice.[87] Comedic performance was characterized as much by physical comedy as by erudite flights of rhetoric,[88] and Rosa's particular version of the mountebank (which consisted of dressing as a saltimbanc or acrobat) suggests his interest in this more farcical aspect of theatre. (Rosa's interest in the performative potential of the body is evident from the rhetorical and moral-didactic gestures that permeate his pictorial *oeuvre*.) The contemporary notion that comedic foolishness bordered on madness, a

---

[84] Katritzky, *The Art of Commedia*, 214; Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 216. Rosa's self-portraits may seem incongruous with the hostility he expressed toward war in his satires and, perhaps, the *Figurine* series of prints. Peter Tomory has argued that Rosa's *Figurine* represent the "idle" Spanish soldiers of *seicento* Naples; together with his battle paintings and his satire *La Guerra* (1640's), they comprise "a powerful indictment of war as a vehicle for hero worship". Tomory, "Battles, war and soldiers," 265. But they take on new meaning when understood as representations of theatrical *personae*.

[85] Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy*, 291. Niccolò Barbieri described Coviello as "provok[ing] hilarity" with "grimaces and silly speech". Barbieri, *La Supplica*, *discorso famigliare di Niccolo Barbieri detto Beltrame diretto a coloro che scrivendo o parlando trattano de' comici trascurando i meriti delle azzioni virtuose* (Venice, 1634). In his *Dall'arte rappresentativa* (Regola XII, 340-2) Perrucci claimed there was always room for the foolish and ridiculous since they "can give more pleasure than any metaphor or language and wit". For Rosa's attitude toward his Neapolitan identity, see my discussion below.

[86] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 452.

[87] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 124.

[88] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 216.

condition that in turn approximated wisdom or genius, may also have inspired Rosa to pursue the seemingly irrational aspects of the character as indicative of a more profound sagacity.[89] And he would undoubtedly have adhered to the perception of comic acting as an erudite profession that required a mastery of classic literature, philosophy and rhetoric.[90] Rosa's type of performance may have been one of a number of seventeenth-century Neapolitan adaptations that mixed the foolish and intelligent qualities of the two *zanni* together in a single role, a hybrid that elicited censure from the Neapolitan dramatic theorist Andrea Perrucci.[91]

Cognizant of the artificial nature of performance as a technique of self-fashioning, Rosa was equally invested in the serious and sincere potentialities of that process. As I suggested above, the Neapolitan *zanni* offered Rosa both self-concealment and self-display, asserting at once a fiction and a reality. The role or character itself (manifested by the actor's mask, costume and behavior) performed this dual operation of disguise and revelation,[92] at once distancing the "true" identity of the actor and foregrounding his fictive persona. The half-mask of the *zanni*, moreover, physically embodied this dual procedure by hiding the top half of the face while exposing the bottom.[93] This

---

[89] In his *I Frutti* (34-5), Cecchini described Pulcinella's role as a kind of "disciplined clownery" whose madness came close to wisdom. Perrucci (*Dell'arte rappresentativa*, Regola VII, 283-6) recorded the ancient conception of *zanni* as essentially intelligent characters: "the ancients portrayed [the *zanni*] as bald, possibly to indicate that they had hot brains." Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte,* 135.

[90] Perrucci recommended actors "be familiar with the figures and tropes of rhetoric, for with these they will be able to make a great impression". Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 131-2. Actors consulted a variety of literary sources in order to compile a repertoire of material, including philosophy, sonnets and poetry, and classical rhetoric. *Ibid*, 149. Rosa's own collection of maxims, the *Teatro della Politica* (1669), may have been motivated by a similar impulse toward compilation, and may have a connection to his theatrical activity. See Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica: Sentenziosi afforismi della prudenza*, ed. Giorgio Baroni (Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1991); Festa, "Aforismi, massime e sentenze di Salvator Rosa," *Curiosità Letterarie Napoletane, trascelte, raccolte e presentate a A. Altamura*. Biblioteca Napoletana, 2 (Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1971), 71-75. Rosa may refer to these maxims in a letter to Ricciardi of June 8 1669, where he says he has certain "maxims and principles in mind". See Borelli, letter 369; Festa, *ibid*, 71.

[91] Perrucci writes, "Zanni should be either always witty or always stupid … when first Zanni are stupid they transgress their role … which is to draw out the intrigue by ingenuity and guile." Perrucci, *Dell'arte rappresentativa*, Regola VII, 283-6.

[92] On this dual function of the mask, see Moshe Barasch, "The Mask in European Art," in *Art the Ape of Nature. Studies in Honor of H. W. Janson*, ed. M. Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler (New York: H. N. Abrams Inc.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981), 253-264.

[93] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 113. That full masks could completely conceal the actor's true identity is suggested by the observation of Filomardi, the Papal Nuncio to Poland, regarding a performance by priests in 1640: "'I was told there were no priests in the comedy, and indeed I only recognized one. ... they

oscillation between concealment and display was further enhanced by an interpretative fluidity of identity between the role and the actor himself: the characters were understood by the audience as evocative both of a generic and traditional "type" (symbolized by the mask itself) and a unique individual, represented by the actor who made the role personal by his own specific qualities of appearance, gestures and regional dialect.[94] The masks, too, could take one of two forms: a personification or life-like representation of the actor himself, or an impersonal, deformed image, unidentifiable with a real visage.[95]

Theatrical practitioners and commentators of the period suggest a dual conception of the relationship between the actor and his role. On the one hand, they are separate – many contemporary portraits of actors evince the division between mask and person by displaying the sitter holding the requisite symbolic mask away from the face.[96] On the other hand, they are conflated – an idea implicit in the recommendations of certain theorists that actors should "correspond in physical appearance as closely as possible" to their performed role.[97] There is evidence that suggests Rosa saw a fundamental equation between self and character. I have already cited the pictorial strategy of the *Pascariello* self-portrait, where Rosa appears to liken real physiognomy with fictive role. There are also references in his letters to Ricciardi that reiterate his identification with both Coviello and Pulcinella.[98] Even more significantly, Rosa participated in the common practice of personalizing his mask with the use of witty surnames, making Pascariello into

---

were wearing masks, and they were so concealed that one needed to be astute to recognize them." M. Brahmer, 'La commedia dell'arte in Polonia', *Ricerche slavistiche* (1954): 3. On the function of *commedia dell'arte* masks, see Antonio Fava, *The Comic Mask in the Commedia dell'arte* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007).

[94] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte,* 2, 111, 118, 314 note 15. In some roles, like Pantalone, "the actor's skill becomes of more significance than the part he plays". Nicoll, *The World of Harlequin. A Criticial Study of the Commedia dell'Arte* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 62.

[95] Taviani and Schino, *Il segreto della commedia dell'arte*, 449, note 1.

[96] *Ibid*, 27. See the portraits cited in note 74 above.

[97] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 40-41. This was the advice of Leone de' Sommi in his theatrical treatise *Quattro dialoghi*. Ms. Cod. 2664 Biblioteca Palatina, Parma, in Rasi, *I Comici*, I, 108-110.

[98] See Borelli, letters 126 and 243.

"Pascariello Formica" (Pascariello the Ant) and Coviello into "Coviello Patacca" (Coviello the Pretender or Coviello the Stain, perhaps).[99]

These epithets convey an innocuous and self-deprecatory humor that conceals a nascent desire for self-assertion and independence – a kind of satiric social "irritation" and "persistence", perhaps. The terms "Formica" and "Patacca" have complex and multivalent import that Rosa may well have intended to exploit in their use. The name Formica, which we know Rosa adopted in the 1630's in Rome, has a long theatrical pedigree. As Molinari has shown, this character appears in at least two earlier comedies: as "Formicone" in the play of the same name by Publio Philippo Mantovano (Venice, 1533; performed by Mantovano himself in 1534), and as "Formica" in Giovan Battista Marzj's *Riscatto d'Amore* (1618). In both plays, the character represents a hard-done-by servant type.[100] Rosa may well have been inspired by these performances to adopt the epithet for his own theatrical persona, but "Formica" also belongs to a more pervasive tradition of animalistic names in the *commedia dell'arte*.[101] His choice of the name may reflect, in part, the *zanni*'s more general "debased kinship" with the world of animals and infants, and his "paradoxical" position "between wisdom and foolishness"[102] – the *zanni*, rather like the ant, is at once a symbol of industrious intelligence and miniscule futility. The name may also be explained in connection with the etymology of "Pulcinella", which seems to derive from the Latin "*pulex*" (or the Italian "*pulce*") meaning "flea". (Hence Pulcinella is "little flea", a diminutive term of affection.[103]) It seems more likely, however, that Rosa intended to capitalize on the contemporary interpretation of the ant as a

---

[99] Croce noted the more generally recurrent use of epithets for Pascariello and Coviello: "occorre notare come tanto 'Pascariello' quanto 'Coviello' solessero, ordinariamente, nella commedia dell'arte, aver altri cognomi, intitolandosi il primo 'Pascariello Pettola', e il secondo 'Coviello Ciavola'." Croce, "Recenzione dell'opera del Cesareo," 130.

[100] In Mantovano's comedy he is the "unwitting object of a hoax," while in Marzj's he is the servant of the captain Farfallone, forced to "sustain with ironic detachment the vicissitudes incited by the cowardice of his patron." Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 210-211.

[101] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 211.

[102] Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 37, 132.

[103] The prominent nose of the mask worn by Pulcinella may have been associated with the "prominent proboscis" of the flea. Katritzky, *The Art of Commedia*, 191. Some of the *zanni* wore animal masks, and it is tempting to imagine Rosa's potential mask making some physiognomic reference to the ant.

distinctively self-sufficient and efficacious symbol, representing industry, ambition, diligence, forethought and wisdom.[104] Rosa may well have conceived of the ant in a manner similar to the flea, whose "biting character" appears to have directly reflected the "caustic remarks" of Pulcinella.[105] In this sense, the ant is also an apt emblem for Rosa's distinctively provocative ("agitative" and "aggravating") satirical-philosophical mission.[106] In his discussion of Rosa's rivalry with Bernini, Jackson Cope suggested that Bernini belittled Rosa and his theatrical persona as a mere social-climber, whose criticism of Bernini was motivated by a desire for inclusion in court circles and the status it conferred.[107] Positioning Bernini and Rosa within a struggle of opinion regarding the social standing of the artist, Cope proposed that Bernini saw Rosa's use of the "industrious" epithet "Formica" as self-contradictorily ironic, in view of Rosa's apparent pretensions to distance himself from the "populist" realm.[108] Cope's suggestion is also useful for understanding how Rosa may have interpreted the term. In his satire *La Poesia*, Rosa endorses the assiduous nature of the ant by way of reference to Aesop's fable of the Ant and the Grasshopper: the industrious ant gathers his supplies in readiness for winter instead of idling about, teaching his companion a painful lesson about the importance of preparing for necessity.[109] In the same satire, Rosa uses the term "*formiche*" (as was common at the time) to refer to trifles or little, insignificant things.[110] Rosa perhaps intended to play on the small stature implied by the ant's minuteness,[111]

---

[104] See Hope B. Werness et al., *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in Art* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 8-9; also see the entries for "Formica" in the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* [Venice, 1612] (Florence: Licosa Reprints, 1974); and Salvatore Battaglia, *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*.

[105] A. Guyot Cameron, Review of Henry Lyonnet, "Pulcinella & C.", *Modern Language Notes* 17: 4 (1902): 115.

[106] The "swarming and chaotic" activity of ants associated them with agitation. Rosalva Loreto López, "The Devil, Women, and the Body in Seventeenth-Century Puebla Convents," *The Americas* 59: 2 (2002), 190, note 29.

[107] See the section below, *"Stage-Fighting" with Bernini*, for a further discussion of Bernini's attack on Rosa.

[108] Cope, "Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*", 184.

[109] *La Poesia*, vv. 148-165. In *La Pittura* (vv. 148-153), Rosa again gives the ant an efficacious agency, referring to the legend of the gods populating the almost-deserted Tessaglia by transforming ants into men.

[110] *La Poesia,* vv. 406-414. This was one of a number of negative associations for the ant: it was often used in a figurative sense to refer to an insignificant trifle, a petty or miserly person, a physical slowness, or a numbness experienced in a part of the body. To have the "brain of an ant" was to be inherently stupid. See the entries for "Formica" in the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and Battaglia, *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*.

thereby alluding to a self-perceived experience of injustice and its defeat. He may have known the famous Renaissance emblem of the ant devouring the elephant (and *vice versa*), accompanied by the saying: "*Concordia res parvae crescunt*, *discordia maximae dilabantur*" ("Through concord small things may grow greater; through discord the greatest are destroyed").[112] [Fig. 142] It is no great stretch of the imagination to see the appeal of the "struggling ant" to Rosa as an epithet (at least in part) that reflected his self-conceived relationship with Bernini, the great "elephant" of Rome, who by the late 1630's had already trampled a sizeable path through the Roman art establishment.

The name "Patacca" presents an equally intriguing multivalency. Rosa uses the word only once in his writings, specifically in reference to his theatrical role, but without any explanation of its meaning.[113] A clue may be offered by its contemporary usage. Between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries, the term was used to refer to a large but useless type of coin. (Thus it shares with "Formica" a denotation of insignificance, worthlessness and minusculity.) In idiomatic usage, however, "pattaca" refers to trickery, cheating, or fraudulence. A "Pataccaro" – similar to a charlatan or mountebank – is the Roman name for a person who sells false coins or other worthless objects for high prices. In this sense, it is tempting to suggest that Rosa intended the term as a pun on the fictive, witty and skilfully deceptive nature of his comic performance. The word "patacca" also means "stain," and in this sense shares with "Formica" both a self-deprecatory and self-assertive tone – indicating irritation or endurance, or perhaps even the aggressive spirit required to "make one's mark". In Formica and Patacca, then, Rosa found the nominative equivalents for his unique brand of provocative theatrics.

---

[111] The ant's "miniscule size" lends them a symbolic meaning, in contrast to larger animals, of "the inequality of the human condition." Werness et al, *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in Art*, 8.

[112] Werness et al, *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in Art*, 8; James Hall, *Illustrated Dictionary of Symbols in Eastern and Western Art* (New York: Icon Editions, 1996), 8; George Boas, *The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1950).

[113] Borelli, letter 126. Also see Lorenzo Lippi's reference to Rosa as Coviello Patacca in the *Malmantile* (Canto IV, 14).

Rosa's characters were inexorably tied not only to his antagonistic and satirical self, but also to his nationality. As Neapolitan stereotypes, Coviello, Pascariello and Pulcinella offered a caricature of Rosa's particular ethnicity, regarded as utterly "different" in its alternatively Roman and Florentine settings.[114] In both his ridiculous and intelligent incarnations, the *zanni* was made alternatively into a mockery or celebration of the typecast traits of Neapolitans as boastful, foolish, loquacious, lazy, avaricious and prone to "extravagant speech," or as ingenious, astute and crafty.[115] For Rosa, then, the true self and the theatrical persona were fundamentally inseparable, and the performative venue of the stage became a fundamental procedure and strategy for the making of and propagation of a professional identity. The same may be said of another role adopted by Rosa in Florence – Trespolo – who featured in all seven of Ricciardi's extant plays and seems to have been devised with Rosa in mind.[116] In a letter of 1664, Rosa refers explicitly to a role in one of Ricciardi's comedies: "… But while we are on the subject of a beautiful wife, I give you news of how the other evening I heard your comedy of the *Forza del Sospetto*, that is the one that we once recited together, (You are lucky to have such a beautiful wife), which to me was extremely pleasing, and to my consolation was pleasing to everyone, with your greatest applause."[117]

---

[114] The earliest *zanni* represented Venetian or Bergamasque nationalities, but eventually incorporated, or were altered into, roles representing Neapolitan, Roman or other national identities. Katritzky, *The Art of Commedia*, 82-3. Coviello is a Neapolitan *zanni*, performed only in the Neapolitan dialect. Gianrenzo P. Clivio, "The Languages of the *Commedia dell'arte*", in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. Pietropaolo, 223, 227. The "centuries-old" rivalry between Tuscany and Southern Italy was "the source of many subjects of parody in the theatre and in literature." Rak, "Cade il mondo," 92.

[115] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 134-5; Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, 124.

[116] The manuscript copies of Ricciardi's comedies are in BNCF, MS Magl. VII. 1285, 152r-181r and MS Magl. VII, 1286, 62r-209v. The plays are: *Amore è Cieco overo La Barberia* [Bologna: Longhi, 1684], *La Forza del Sospetto overo Il Trespolo Hoste* [Ronciglione, n. p., 1674], *Il Trespolo Tutore* [Bologna, n. p., 1669], *La Ruota della Fortuna* [Bologna: Longhi, n.d.], *Chi non sa Fingere non sa Vivere overo Le Cautele Politiche* [Bologna: Longhi, n. d.], *Lo Spozalizio tra' Sepolcri* [Bologna: Longhi, 1695], and *Per la Gloria non per l'Amore contendono i Rivali* [Bologna: Pisarri, 1687]. For Ricciardi's published comedies, see Lione Allacci, *Drammaturgia* [Venice, 1755], 183, 374, 422, 686, 783, 842, 913 and 931; and Silvia Castelli ed., *Manoscritti teatrale della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*. Catalogo ragionato (Florence: Polistampa, 1998). The manuscript collections of the Biblioteca Corsiniana in Rome contain another comedy by Ricciardi, entitled *La Rivalità generosa*, which also features the oft-favoured character Trespolo. MS 45E17 (cod. 638, fol. 139ff).

[117] Borelli, letter 301: "… Ma già che stiamo in questo proposito di bella moglie, vi do nova come l'altra sera fui a sentire la vostra comedia della *Forza del Sospetto*, cioè quella ch'una volta recitassimo assieme, (Beato te ch'ai così bella moglie), la quale a me piaqque in estremo, e per mia consolazione è piaciuta a tutti, con vostro sommo

Molinari has suggested that the character of Trespolo, well-suited to Rosa for sharing certain characteristics with the *zanni* Coviello and Pascariello, may have been inspired by Rosa himself.[118] A similar sort of self-identification with roles also seems to have occurred with the other members of the *Percossi*, for whom the malleable and open structure of Ricciardi's plays allowed the characters to be "oriented toward the actor who connects with them".[119] An interpretation of Rosa's theatrical *personae* as inexorably tied to his own person, then, gains significant support from the fact that his friends (especially Ricciardi, who played a particularly vital role in Rosa's self-fashioning) approached their roles in the same way. The collaboration implicit in the formation of Rosa's character of Trespolo – a joint product of Rosa as actor and Ricciardi as author – also reveals the significant contributions made to Rosa's theatrical identity by academic theatrical enterprise.[120]

As Giovanni Martucci argued in an essay of 1885, Rosa's performance as "Coviello Formica" was an embodiment of his liberated, "independent" spirit, attaining an almost talismanic quality in its continued significance throughout his career.[121] Modern theorists have emphasized the transforming and liberating effect of the mask on its wearer, its power to "license revelry and extravagant stage activity."[122] This liberty was a key feature of the appeal of acting for Rosa, as an exercise for the assertion of an antagonistic and free identity. For Rosa, the ridiculous mask of the *zanni* (whether or not it made use of an actual face mask) offered an exaggerated representation of his true person – one that enabled both a representation of an ostensibly "true" self *and* authorized

---

plauso." The phrase "you are lucky to have such a beautiful wife" is a reference to a line from Ricciardi's play, *La forza del sospetto* (1654) where the young lover Clearco sings the same words to the jealous host Trespolo.

[118] Molinari considers Rosa's comment above (along with other evidence) as proof of his performance as Trespolo and Ricciardi's as Clearco. In another letter of February 2 1650, Rosa alluded to Ricciardi's role as the "lover" in the comedy *Lo Sposalizio tra' Sepolcri*. Borelli, letter 51. See Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 243-7.

[119] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 248. Using Baldinucci's references to the types of roles usually performed by the members of Rosa's academy, Molinari attempted to reconstruct the dramatic roster of players for a hypothetical performance of Ricciardi's *Il Trespolo Hoste*. Molinari, *ibid*, 246-7.

[120] Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 197.

[121] Martucci, "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'," 643, 658.

[122] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 113.

its antagonistic spirit by concealment in costume. The cathartic, apotropaic, illusionistic and permissive functions of comic theatrical performance recommended it to Rosa as an outlet and strategy for the assertion of an identity of difference.[123] The deception inherent in these particular brands of public performance was consciously employed by Rosa as a tactic for achieving fame with a persona that, unmasked, risked censure and condemnation. The *zanni* were considered particularly free and independent characters,[124] and Rosa may have regarded this flexibility as an opportunity to fashion his distinctive performance. That this mission was only partially successful in Rome is revealed by the circumstances surrounding one of Rosa's performances during the Carnival of 1639. Passeri's account of the event highlights the centrality of performance to Rosa's self-conception, and presents it as a turning point in the artist's mission for independence that would lead him to turn to Florence – and to the relation of academic friendship – as a new, more propitious venue for its enactment.

I.4. "Stage-Fighting" with Bernini: A Turning Point in the Crafting of an Antagonistic Persona

The satirical quality of comedic performance made it a natural choice for Rosa as a strategy of self-display. Various scholars have described the characters of the *commedia dell'arte*, which mock the archetypes and authority figures of the real world, as "rooted in sharp socio-political observation."[125] In 1634 the critic Niccolò Barbieri hinted at the satirical, erudite objective of improvised comedy when he noted that, unlike the "buffoonery" of trestle-stage acting which aimed only at ridiculing human nature, the *commedia* had "instruction to virtuous conduct" as its goal.[126] Those who defended comedic theatre against its (usually religious) critics often argued for its edifying and moral-didactic value – a vindication that Rosa would surely have

[123] On the cathartic and apotropaic nature of comedic theatre, see Fava, *The Comic Mask*, 4-5.
[124] Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy*, 247.
[125] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 194.
[126] Barbieri, *La Supplica*, chapter IX, cited in Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 205.

supported.[127] There is a continuing debate among scholars regarding the satirical nature of the *commedia* performances, but its satiric potentialities are nonetheless undeniable.[128] This potential was likely a feature of comedy that appealed to Rosa – the only surviving anecdote of Rosa's Roman performances, Passeri's story of the Carnival production of 1639, has an epideictic and satirical motivation at its core. On that occasion, Rosa struck out at his most formidable adversary, Bernini, disclosing his vision of the theatre (and its opportunities for self-creation) as an enterprise aimed, like the rest of his pictorial and textual production, toward affirming a unique and provocative identity.

The story of Rosa's rivalry with Bernini is meaningful not only for the two artists involved, but also for the broader context and discourse of performative identity in *seicento* Rome.[129] Unlike Baldinucci, who passes over the affair cursorily, Passeri presents the episode as the trigger for Rosa's move to Florence; the emphasis he places on the event in his narrative may well reflect the significance that Rosa gave it, himself. Passeri's anecdote exposes the broader significance of social reputation in Rosa's brand of self-construction, and it reveals the perilous nature of Rosa's early quest to reconcile independence with achievement.[130] Rosa's challenge to Bernini was a

---

[127] Barbieri defended comedy on the grounds that it served a social function by exposing folly and excess," while Pier Maria Cecchini and Domenico Bruni argued for "the social and moral purpose of the theatre". Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 241-2; Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 197.

[128] For both sides of the argument, see Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 194; and Erenstein, "Satire and the Commedia dell'arte," 30-46. The "critical attitude" toward the outside world that Erenstein considers an essential feature of satiric performance (and which some scholars argue is not evident in the records of the *commedia dell'arte*) is certainly apparent in Rosa's 1639 performance. On the prevalence of epideictic rhetoric in *commedia* discourse, see Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 42.

[129] Rosa's attack on Bernini should also be seen as part of (and supported by) a strain of the more pervasive polemical atmosphere of the Roman theatre, characterized by an anti-Bernini sentiment. The students of the Collegio Capranica had retaliated against Bernini's criticism of their work with a performance at the carnival of 1638 entitled *La Berniniana*, "in which they hypostatized all the possible characteristics [and] moral and artistic defects of the protagonist" with such enthusiasm that Bernini was forced to seek the pope's aid to put a stop to it. Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 221; Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, chapter IX, letter of the Duke of Modena's ambassador, February 6 1638; Ademollo, *I Teatri di Roma nel secolo Decimosettimo* (Rome: Pasqualucci, 1888), 40.

[130] Passeri's story has a narrative significance that presents it as a moral lesson of the failure that can result from a misdirected and poorly grounded pursuit of fame. Baldinucci's account of Rosa's move to Florence follows (in anachronistic organization) a different scandal: the painting of *Fortune* (1659, J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu) [Fig. 98] which, like Passeri, offers an image of Rosa as challenging the established, courtly authorities of Rome.

pivotal instance in his career of self-assertion (facilitated, no less, in the social context of friends) against a representative of the system that continued to determine the successful union of freedom and fame among creative professionals.

Bernini, the consummate courtier-artist, was the paradigmatic example of this achievement. Rosa's attack on Bernini reflects his conflicted, simultaneous position of animosity toward and desire for inclusion in the court context that permitted an artist to attain freedom, fame and wealth. Bernini had managed this through an early compliance with (and an eventual ability to influence) papal and dynastic authority – a success aided in part by a more natural inclination toward social affability and courtly conduct that was entirely contrary to Rosa's temperament. A letter by a Modenese correspondent of 1633 indicates the power Bernini wielded over the Roman court in his theatrical productions – his ability to get away with "taking great liberties in speaking" and to "offend large numbers of people in a public space".[131] Rosa's criticism expresses a desire to harness the same power and influence.

During his fateful performance at the Vigna in 1639, Rosa appeared on stage dressed as Coviello Formica and, with his prologue,[132] proceeded to ridicule Bernini for his habit of including extraneous characters in his comedies. Having agreed with the other characters that a comedy would relieve them from the bother of the heat, Formica laid down a few ground rules: "I don't want us to act comedies like some people who spread dirt about all and sundry, because, in due course, you can see that the dirt spreads faster than the poet's ink. And I don't want us to bring on

In Baldinucci's estimation, Rosa's comedic performances in Rome – and the upset caused by the retaliation of his rivals – only served to the advantage of Rosa's self-promotion and good reputation, and the story is just one in a string of events that achieve the same end. Passeri's detailed account is the more revealing of the two, and from it emerge a series of important points about the nature of Rosa's identity and its enactment. Baldinucci does not make an explicit chronological connection between Rosa's departure for Florence and the events of the theatrical "duel" with Bernini. His timeline implies that Rosa went to Naples for a brief period in order to let the dust settle in Rome, only to return again for a time before receiving the Medici's invitation. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 440-441.

[131] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 223; Stanislao Fraschetti, *Il Bernini* (Milan: Hoepli, 1900), 259ff.

[132] The accusation Rosa levied against Bernini likely set the tone for the entire play, since the prologue was the place for the "important poetic and ideological declaration" of the performance. Ferruccio Marotti and Giovanna Romei eds., *La Commedia dell'arte e la società barocca*. *La Professione del Teatro* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1991), 57.

stage couriers, brandy sellers, goatherds and rubbish of that sort, which are the folly of an ass."[133] Well known for his elaborate, machine-driven performances, Bernini had only just performed a comedy (probably the *Fiera di Farfa*, performed in 1639[134]) where "in order to represent Dawn, and to give naturalness to the work, he included brandy-sellers, couriers and goatherds in the city, things entirely against the rules that do not allow any such personage who is not included in the story."[135] He was in the audience when Formica made his declaration, accompanied by the "well-known" painters Giovanni Francesco Romanelli and Guido Ubaldo Abbatini.[136] Passeri, also present, says that when he glanced at Bernini to see his reaction, the well-seasoned courtier "with a skilful nonchalance" showed no sign of having understood the joke.

But Bernini obviously did get it, and he and his theatrical collaborator Ottaviano Castelli took revenge on Rosa by responding with their own comedic productions. Castelli's play attacked not only Rosa's reputation but also the art of painting itself, which Passeri, Romanelli and even Bernini considered going one step too far.[137] Bernini, also Neapolitan by birth, had himself favoured the role of Coviello in one of his own performances in 1637,[138] and Rosa's adoption of the character was conceivably motivated in part by a desire to take on a mask favoured by his rival. As Carter has suggested, it is possible that after 1639 the role of Coviello became publicly synonymous

[133] Passeri, *Vite*, 421-422. Translation by Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 21. Rosa may have mocked Bernini again in 1651, in a letter to Giulio Maffei, where he compared Giulio's nose to the obelisk of the Four Rivers fountain in Piazza Navona and its "vistosi ruscelletti" ("showy little streams"). Borelli, letter 105.
[134] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 219.
[135] Passeri, *Vite*, 421. Carter suggests certain excessive elements of Bernini's productions in the 1630's may have been at the root of Rosa's attack: in a January 1634 production in celebration of the arrival of the King of Poland, Bernini included flying angels and a cloud that opened to reveal paradise; in 1638, Bernini devised an elaborate re-enactment of the flooding of the Tiber and a fictive spectacle of fire; donkeys appeared in both performances. Carter, "A Roman Comedy," 38. Philip Sohm suggested to me the intriguing possibility that Formica "the ant" attacked the giant, "elephantine" Bernini by assigning to him the more negative (ie. dirty) attributes of that creature.
[136] Passeri calls them "*personaggi conosciuti*". Passeri, *Vite*, 421.
[137] Passeri, *Vite*, 421. Fraschetti proposed that Castelli's play may have been Bernini's *I Due Teatri*, although Molinari considers this unlikely. Fraschetti, *Il Bernini*, 259; Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 220.
[138] Carter, "A Roman Comedy," 38. Other actors who performed the role of Coviello include Ambrogio Buonomo, Gennaro Sacco, Giacomo Rauzzini, and Molière. See Eugene H. Falk, "Molière the Indignant Satirist: 'Le Bourgeois gentilhomme'," *The Tulane Drama Review* 5: 1 (1960): 73-88. While Rosa's performance was imbued with personal idiosyncrasies, it was probably undertaken with full awareness that he was participating in a typology defined by both past and contemporary actors.

with Rosa himself.[139] Bernini seems to have made the association in a comedy entitled *The Fountain of Trevi*,[140] probably intended for performance at the Palazzo Barberini during the Carnival of 1644, which may have been in retribution for Rosa's public mockery. Carter summarizes the plot. Bernini, in the role of Dottor Graziano,

> "is persuaded by Cinzio, the favourite of a certain prince, to write and put on a comedy, because of his great reputation in this art. A certain cavaliere Alidoro, who is also a writer of comedies, an actor and painter, is then introduced by his servant Coviello, declaring his willingness to pay anyone who can get a glimpse of the secrets through which Doctor Graziano achieves his miraculous stage effects, and explain them to him. The 'secrets' are Bernini's theatrical machines. Each time he is frustrated, Alidoro grows more desperate and offers a larger reward. For his part, Doctor Graziano warns his workmen not to let any outsider see what they are building. After many failures, the comedy ends with Alidoro finally gaining access to the secrets, disguised as a painter, and with the help of the Doctor's servant."[141]

The character of Alidoro was clearly intended to allude to Rosa. In his earlier criticism of Bernini it is uncertain whether Rosa intended to disparage Bernini's elaborate stage apparatuses in particular,[142] but Bernini thought so, and intended in his response to defend his

[139] Carter, "A Roman Comedy," 38.
[140] This is the only surviving play by Bernini. See Cope, "Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*", 181.
[141] Carter, "A Roman Comedy," 39. That Alidoro was intended as a mockery of Rosa is suggested by certain features of Bernini's performance. As Cope notes, "Bernini uses dialects as the cue to his disrespect, his dismissal of Rosa. Alidoro/Rosa speaks a basic Tuscan, as much as this speech can be attributed to any character in Bernini's dialect melange or to any character in the *commedie ridicolose*. Coviello … manipulates Alidoro in his own plotting. Alidoro has been a playwright ('ho fatte de le comedie') and an actor. He is proud ('Non feci male'), but we perhaps may puzzle over his pride in having played not only the lover but women's parts ('Ho anche recitato più volte la donna')." Cope, "Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*", 184.
[142] Bernini has his interlocutors promote his status as an incomparable inventor: "Passano de secoli signor Gratiano avanti che la Natura dia al mondo de pari suoi, e pero hoggi che abbiamo questa fortuna bisogna che tutti cerchiamo di conservarlo". Graziano (Bernini) highlights the challenges of his hard work, himself, when he says: "Lè impossibel a poter fer sta comedia. Sien cos che rezercan tutt l'hom, e molto tempo. Mi son applicat a materie divers. Bisognaria haver do, o tre test ...". At the end of the second, act, he exclaims: "Le machine non se fan per fer rider, ma per fer stupir". Cope, "Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*", 182-4. Carter suggests as evidence for Rosa's criticism of Bernini's theatrical machinery his complaints in the satire *La Pittura* against the *Bamboccianti*, who indiscriminately considered all aspects of "real life" suitable for painting, "regardless of its aesthetic merit," choosing common "tavern scenes, factories and farmyards" over more sublime subjects – a criticism that could perhaps be applied to Bernini who "had no care for the drama of human nature, only an interest in imitating humans and nature." Whether or not Rosa criticized Bernini's stage machines in particular is not at issue, since Bernini, the characteristic egoist, assumed that his favoured skill equally intrigued his rivals. He "was right to sense that Salvator despised his tricks, even if he did not understand that the reason was one of aesthetic principle, not envy." Carter, "A Roman Comedy," 39. On the *Bamboccianti*, see Giuliano Briganti et al eds., *I Bamboccianti: pittori della vita quotidiana a Roma nel Seicento* (Rome: U. Bozzi, 1983); David A. Levine et al eds., *I Bamboccianti: niederlandische Malerrebellen im Rom des Barock* (Milan: Electa, 1991); and Wendy Thompson, "'Pigmei Pizzicano Gigani'. The Encounter between Netherlandish and Italian Artists in Seventeenth century Rome" (PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1997), 295-6, 348-50.

dramatic methods in general by presenting these machines as the most enviable aspect of his theatrical genius. Jackson Cope argues that Bernini formulated with his play a defense of his own artistic identity in the form of a complex commentary on the nature of (and relationship between) the practice and social status of the visual artist. Considering Rosa envious of his status and achievement, Bernini saw him as utterly hypocritical in aspiring for inclusion in elite court culture while at the same time adopting lowly street performance, threatening to undermine the long and painful climb of the artist into the highest echelons of society. While Bernini had lifted the *commedia ridicolosa* into a courtly and academic genre of theatrics, defined by his own brand of natural artefice, Rosa's "populist" strategy of mountebank performance both mocked and effectively reversed this achievement. Since Rosa had criticized Bernini's illusory brand of naturalism, in his vengeful response Bernini made Rosa "into a metonymic emblem of all that art had transcended," satirizing him as an artist incapable of that supreme form of art (Bernini's own) that entails "*industria*".[143] Rosa's envy expressed a desire to assert himself "upon the Cavaliere's attention, as if to prove his genius was comparable or to punish Bernini for his success".[144]

The theatrical productions of Rosa and his colleagues reveal the significance of the stage as a site for the making of professional selves – the veritable battleground of the "ceaseless struggle for status and prestige" that Norbert Elias identified among the members of early-modern court society.[145] In particular, the rhetorical tenor of Rosa's critique of Bernini asserted a specifically moral-philosophical identity – one that simultaneously aligned itself with and attempted to supersede its rival's erudition. Molinari sees in Rosa's censorious prologue a desire to distinguish himself from the "personal" mode of performance represented by Bernini's plays,

---

[143] Cope, "Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*", 184.
[144] Carter, "A Roman Comedy," 39.
[145] Elias, *The Court Society*, 63.

asserting in its place the pure form of poetic dramaturgy that adhered to both the Neapolitan prototype and Aristotelian rule of the "unity of action".[146] One is tempted to see in the specific terms of Rosa's and Bernini's rivalry a reflection of the 1636 debate at the *Accademia di San Luca* concerning the question of the appropriate quantity of figures in history painting.[147] The effort exerted by Castelli and Bernini in their responses imply that they regarded Rosa as a worthy opponent, his theatrical persona exerting an impact on the art establishment and opening an avenue for inclusion in its discourse.[148] Passeri's account of Rosa's critique of Bernini presents our artist as an intelligent participant and contributor to the academic world of art over which his rivals hold sway: like the *zanni* Coviello, Rosa could overcome the inferiority of his relatively low position in the pecking order of Roman painters with sharp, satirical wit. Rosa's critique of Bernini's excess originates from the same source as his manifold aesthetic criticisms and judgments: that ever-present sense of self-righteous and self-determined authority that permeates his attitude toward the creative profession in general. The satirical barb of his criticism, and the spirit of self-assertion and independence from which it originates, is thus situated both within and in defiance of the intellectual disputes of the Roman art establishment, revealing once again the conflicting nature of his desire for both inclusion and distinction.

---

[146] Molinari, "Il Teatro di Salvator Rosa," 224.

[147] On the debate, see Jonathan Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting. Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 186-90; M. Missimi, *Memorie per servire alla storia della Romana Accademia di San Luca* (Rome, 1823), 111. Roworth has also noted the parallel between Rosa's criticism and this debate. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 156. She points to other resonances between Rosa's ideas and contemporary academic thought: his criticism of the *Bamboccianti* in the *La Pittura* for their neglect of the "Idea", for example, recalls a similar critique by Andrea Sacchi and Francesco Albani. Roworth, *ibid*, 114-115; 351-2. Baldinucci records that, upon seeing a history painting "full of very confused figures," Rosa advised that a pastry cook rather than an artist would be better positioned to judge its merits. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 489.

[148] Passeri's anecdote constructs a dichotomy, in the grand tradition of art biography, between two artists as representatives of the art establishment and rebellion against it. Like Raphael and Michelangelo, Poussin and Caravaggio, or Agostino and Annibale Carracci, Bernini and Rosa are cast in the terms of the familiar contest: Bernini as the "Cavaliere" courtier-artist, skilled at the dissimulative courtly art of unflappable *sprezzatura* and presiding over the Roman world of art (and theatre) from a privileged position of dominance, and Rosa as the talented yet naïvely brazen opponent, admired by his biographer and friend for his nerve but ultimately admonished for the outcome of his actions.

I.5. Concluding Thoughts

In one sense, all press is good press. Although Rosa was already in Florence by 1644, if the news of Bernini's play reached him it would only have bolstered his sense of self-importance. The hostile nature of Rosa's strategy for success, however, fell flat in a setting dominated by Bernini and his supporters. Not one to let go of a grudge, Rosa's continued animosity toward Bernini and Castelli even after moving to Florence is evident in a caustic poem on the occasion of Castelli's death in 1642.[149] The restrictive space of the Roman art world of 1639 – where Rosa had managed to gain only a certain level of professional esteem – would only let Rosa push his freedom so far, and his perceived transgression of those boundaries resulted in an undesirable reputation.[150] Passeri's account illuminates the socio-centric nature of the *seicento* artist's self-fashioning: success is measured in large part by public reputation, and friends and partisans play a vital role in the defense of one's character and status. In Rome, Rosa's youthful experiments in reconciling autonomy with (good) fame were doomed to fail without the support of a substantial (and court-associated) social network, a requirement that he would find, alternatively, in Florence. The encounter with Bernini may very well have inspired Rosa to accept the invitation of Fabrizio Piermattei to come to Florence as a court artist;[151] indeed, the polemical nature of

---

[149] The poem "In morte d'Ottavian Castelli" was published by Festa and reproduced in full by Molinari. Festa, "Aspetti della Vita e dell'arte di Salvator Rosa da Documenti inediti," *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* XXI (1982); Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 226-229. BNCF MS Magl. Cl. VII 359, 16r-18r, *Poesie Diverse che ancora no sono alla stampa di diversi eccellentissimi Autori messe insieme da Astianatte Molino l'anno 1645*. Volpi also notes the "cutting" tone of Rosa's poem, in which he refers to Castelli as a sodomite, ignoramus and bastard. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 30.

[150] As Passeri says, "In qualche parte conseguì il suo intento in farsi nominare con queste sue Commedie, ma come cose disgregate dalla sua professione non gli partorirono troppo buon nome." Passeri, *Vite*, 423.

[151] It is unclear whether Piermattei invited Rosa on behalf of Gian' Carlo or Mattias de' Medici. Passeri says Piermattei suggested Rosa to Prince Mattias as an artist worthy of employment, while Baldinucci claims Gian' Carlo invited him upon seeing examples of his paintings in Rome. Passeri, *Vite*, 423; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448, 450. Volpi notes that Piermattei was friends with Antonio Abati, a poet at the court of Cardinal Brancaccio and also a friend of Rosa's "active as an agent in Rome more for Gian' Carlo than Mattias". On the other hand, Mattias was accustomed to exchanging his agents with his brother and was close to the Maffei family, who Rosa befriended during his Roman early years. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 30, 43 note 22. It is also possible that the invitation was extended on behalf of both brothers, or that the curiosity of one inspired the interest of the other.

Rosa's theatrics may have been what attracted the Medici's attention in the first place.[152] It was in his private academy in Florence, the *Accademia dei Percossi* – an organization comprised of courtly members and defined by the egalitarian and libertarian ideals of friendship – that Rosa was able to successfully restage his theatrical identity with a very different outcome.

[152] Volpi notes that Rosa's theatrical fireworks seem fully in keeping with the cultural ambience of the Florentine court. She also notes the interesting congruence of Rosa's arrival with the departure of Stefano della Bella from the Medici court in 1639. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 30.

Chapter II
Rosa and the **Accademia dei Percossi***:* **Academia** *as the Enterprise of Friendship*

Rosa's ambition to reconcile freedom with professional success found its most successful confirmation among academic friends in Florence. During an almost decade-long sojourn from 1640 to 1649, Rosa immersed himself in Florentine intellectual culture and the social networks that propelled it, actively cultivating a private academic space characterized by freedom and sincerity, in deliberate opposition to the courtly arena as a setting of constraint and deception. The practice of theatrical performance that Rosa had adopted as a strategy of self-definition and -assertion in Rome became a central feature of his private *conversazione*, founded with the express purpose of supporting his ambition and its accompanying identity.

Modeled, perhaps, on the gatherings of friends Rosa had hosted in Rome, the *Accademia dei Percossi* was probably established soon after Rosa's arrival in Florence. The *Percossi* operated in complex ways that reflect the conflict inherent in Rosa's person and position. A kind of liminal space, the *Percossi* was fundamentally and necessarily both within and without the court: its members maintained courtly ties as an enduring requirement for the achievement of professional success, but cultivated at the same time an ideal of friendship that sanctioned freedom from that very context. Academic friendship encouraged and facilitated Rosa's autonomy, while courtly membership and theatrical illusion sanctioned and buttressed it against the threat of failure in the courtly arena.

In arguing for the social foundation of Rosa's academic identity and its attendant freedom, the insights of sociologists offer a useful heuristic. In addition to the arguments for the social facilitation of individual agency of Elias, Warnke and Greenblatt, Michel Foucault's notion of a "fellowship of discourse" gives shape to a specifically academic context of sociality, in which

intellectual identity is constituted through group inclusion and ritual practice.[1] In the following discussion, this vision of a social self is forwarded as the basis of Rosa's academic experience and its role in defining his person.

II.1. A Tale of Two Cities: Florence as a City of Court and Academy

Rosa's acceptance of a court position in Florence was one of only two instances of his willing participation in the traditional system of patronage, both of which took place at an early stage in his career.[2] Later in life, Rosa would audaciously reject the court invitations of the Archduke of Austria, King Louis XIV of France, and Queen Christina of Sweden.[3] As a move contrary to his natural inclination, Rosa's decision to work for the Medici must have been made with good reason. The consequences of the run-in with Bernini may well have encouraged him to explore the opportunities offered by a new position. Passeri says that Rosa retreated from the incident into the "modest recreations of his friends," suggesting the significance of intimate solidarity for the bolstering of his self-confidence in a time of need.[4]

Rosa accepted Piermattei's admiring solicitations both in order to remove himself from the Roman relations that had caused him angst, and to improve his reputation.[5] Before he left, Rosa

[1] In Foucault's vision, the power or autonomous agency of the individual subject is essentially relational – the product of discourse or of participation in a series of communal exchanges and activities. This is a model that Karen-edis Barzman has applied with revealing results to a study of the sixteenth-century Florentine *Accademia del Disegno*. While there are important distinctions between the guild-based, institutional academy and a private academy like the *Percossi*, Foucault's social conception of the early-modern academic experience is applicable in both contexts. See Karen-edis Barzman, *The Florentine Academy and the Early Modern State. The Discipline of Disegno* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 181-182; Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Dorset Press, 1972), 225-226.
[2] The first was a position in the employ of his first major patron, Cardinal Brancaccio.
[3] For Rosa's rejection of Ferdinand of Austria in 1650, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 498 and Borelli, letters 45 and 245; for his decline of the Queen Christina's invitation in 1652, see Borelli, letter 128; for his rejection of Louis XIV in 1665, see Borelli, letter 306. Baldinucci says Rosa "refused the invitations of many crowned heads who extended extraordinary offers of hospitality ... only for the [reason] that because in [those places] figs were not to be found ...". Baldinucci, *ibid*, 502. Rosa's poor health may also have played a role in his refusals, particularly in the 1660's.
[4] Passeri, *Vite*, 423.
[5] Contrary to Passeri, Bernardo De' Dominici claimed that Rosa enjoyed a successful phase of work and reputation in Rome after the encounter with Bernini, before leaving for Florence – an account that Martucci considers as evidence against the popular belief that Rosa left in a hurry for Tuscany. Martucci's faith in De

established certain conditions with Piermattei, one of which may have been the privilege of living outside of the palace in his own house.[6] Instead of living at court, as was customary for court artists, Rosa rented a house of his own immediately after his arrival in Florence at the Canto Cini on Via degli Armaiuoli, near the Croce al Trebbio and not far from S. Maria Novella – a large house that was "well adapted to the extensive hospitality that he purposed offering to his circle of friends," and which still stands today.[7] This he may have done, as he had done in Rome, in an effort both to distance himself from the obsequiousness and fraudulence of court life to which he was so naturally averse, as well as to establish a position of relative professional independence.[8] Importantly, Rosa continued to receive a regular salary from his Medici patrons (who also paid for the rental of this house), in addition to being recompensed for the cost of each individual work of art he made.[9] Rosa's professional position in Florence, then, consisted in a complex mixture of freedom and indenture.

Florence offered Rosa an opportunity to start anew and re-launch a program of self-assertion that was fundamentally based in theatrical performance. Having experienced the failure of

---

Dominici as a "*buona fonte*," however, is worrisome in view of the fanciful and often fictional nature of his account. See Martucci, "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'," 653; De' Dominici, *Vite*, 223.

[6] Passeri, *Vite*, 423; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448, 450.

[7] Dentler, "Salvator Rosa and his Academy", *Florence* XIV: 3 (1953): 39-41. Dentler notes that Rosa lived at number 4208 Via degli Armaiuoli, although this numeration has since changed. The garden of Rosa's house can still be seen from inside the Banca Federico del Vecchio on Via dei Banchi, no. 5.

[8] Rosa had earlier executed his right to physical independence in the employ of Cardinal Brancaccio, moving out of his household into a rented house in the artist's quarter of Rome on the Via del Babuino, halfway between Piazza del Popolo and Piazza di Spagna. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 441. Neither Passeri nor Baldinucci mention explicitly Rosa's desire to be free of courtly control, but Baldinucci suggests Rosa's move was based in part on a desire to be among the many artists and intellectuals of the city for which he had affection. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 448.

[9] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 40. Rosa received eight *scudi* a month from Gian' Carlo until January of 1648, a salary, according to Elena Fumagalli, "non vertiginoso ma corrisponente al salario medio di un aiutante di camera dell'epoca (ruolo nel quale erano inquadrati a corte diversi artisti, benché ciò non risulti explicitamente per il pittore Napoletano). Fumagalli is currently studying Rosa's position as an "aiutante di camera," in conjunction with a project on the economic situation of artists at the Medici Court. Fumagalli, *ibid*, 126, note 65. Also see her forthcoming chapter in Philip Sohm and Richard Spear eds., *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Italian Seventeenth-Century Painters* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010). The Medici also granted Rosa a similar spatial liberty during a trip to Livorno in 1641, which Rosa undertook in order to see the ships in the harbour before beginning work on the two large port scenes for Gian' Carlo [Figs. 7, 8a]. Letters from Prince Leopoldo to his brother Gian' Carlo indicate his willingness to find private accommodation for the painter during the excursion. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 30; Fumagalli, *ibid*, 127, note 86.

this initiative in Rome, where he had attacked the most prominent member of the establishment, Rosa was anxious to garner the support of the court relations necessary for the ratification of professional identity and the acquisition of that good brand of fame. In effect, Rosa may have seen the move to Florence as a chance to try on the mask of Bernini himself – to play the game of the courtier and reap its rewards. Rosa took pleasure in the warm and venerable welcome of his Medici patrons, and made an effort to ingratiate himself to the courtiers by hosting dinner banquets at his house.[10] To his dismay, these parties did not always achieve their desired effect. Passeri says that after Rosa returned to Rome in 1649, he told him often that the same men who had been willing to indulge in Rosa's generous hospitality would snub him when out in public, an experience that taught him to be wary of "great men".[11] The motivation behind Passeri's comment can be interpreted in myriad ways, and the extent to which it reflects the reality of Rosa's Florentine experience is debatable. Its combination of self-pity and self-righteousness, however, seems typical of Rosa's characteristic grumbling. Rosa (via Passeri) does not name these rude courtiers outright, but they are probably not the same men who would become his closest friends and count themselves among the *Percossi*.[12] In a very different light, Baldinucci presents Florence as a place of amity and salvation, although his description of the city and its significance for Rosa is equally subject to his own "nationalistic" prejudices.[13] The city of Florence and Rosa's experience of it are best understood as a crux in the formulation and proliferation of his desired professional identity – a context in which both a conflict and its resolution co-existed side by side. In this sense, Rosa's

---

[10] Passeri, *Vite*, 424, Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448.
[11] Passeri, *Vite*, 424.
[12] The implication is that the men in question were not those who would become Rosa's close friends among the court and eventual members of the *Percossi*, and that their slight took place soon after Rosa's arrival in Florence. Rosa's words are also coloured (and given additional weight) by Passeri in support of his own project of biographical Roman *campanilismo*. Passeri's Roman bias may be reflected in his choice to record an anecdote concerning Rosa's preference for Rome to Florence. Rosa's comment may also indicate a contemporary Florentine prejudice against foreigners.
[13] Baldinucci makes a conspicuously eager dash through the account of Rosa's adolescence in Naples and early years in Rome in order to deliberate on his Florentine sojourn.

comment to Passeri raises two important considerations that delineate the establishment and practice of his private academy: firstly, his words reflect his own conflicted sense of pride and shame concerning his Neapolitan identity and the position of difference in which it placed him;[14] secondly, they underscore the two-fold nature of Rosa's Florentine experience as a city composed of friends and foes, sincerity and deception, academy and court – two sites that were contrasted in ideal terms as those of individual freedom and social conformity, but that were in reality much more fluid and interconnected in nature.

Rosa's comment to Passeri, like so many of his statements, reveals the conflict that tormented him for his entire career – the same conflict that has made him, in the eyes of many scholars, the precursor to the artists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: a simultaneous desire for a new level of creative freedom and independence on the one hand, and financial prosperity and fame on the other. This was an extremely difficult ambition, particularly for someone who was not temperamentally inclined either toward sycophancy or compromise.[15] Rosa's well-known animosity to courtly authority and sycophancy resulted as much (if not more so)

---

[14] Rosa expressed ambivalence toward his Neapolitan identity in his letters and poetry, praising its beauty or salubrious climate or slandering it – especially during the plague of 1656. As Salomon notes, "[e]ven though Rosa was integrated within Roman artistic and literary circles, he was seen as an outsider and always considered himself Neapolitan." Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 493-4, citing Nicola Spinosa, "Introduction", in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*. Rosa praised Naples in his book of maxims and letters. See Rosa, *Il teatro della politica*, 77, no. 644: "La città di Napoli si può chiamare una parte del cielo cascata in terra"; Borelli, letters 328, 331 and 332, where he expresses in 1666 his desire to return to his "native land" before growing old, or letters 108, 128 and 129, where he recommends the salubrious air of Naples and likens it to "paradise". He derided Naples in his satires. See *La Babilonia*, vv. 226-31, and *Il Tirreno*, vv. 166-174, 186, and 214-17. In a letter to Ricciardi of January 1650, Rosa blamed his friend's jealousies and lack of affability on his Florentine inclinations toward "suspicion", implying that Neapolitans were more trusting in comparison. Borelli, letter 49.

[15] These goals were each achieved to varying degree by certain of Rosa's forebears and contemporaries. The "Cavaliere" Bernini, for example, perhaps came closest to achieving the union of wealth, celebrity, and a unique degree of creative independence. His achievement, however, was due to a combination of factors and circumstances which were out of Rosa's reach, including, among other factors, the opportunities in his youth presented by his father and a formidable skill denied to most of his contemporaries. Bernini was also more willing than Rosa to play the game by its old rules, and was temperamentally inclined toward a certain compliance with authority, at least during the most formative period of his career.

from his own temperamental unwillingness toward submission as from external obstacles beyond his control.[16]

Rosa attempted to charm the Medici courtiers in the manner he felt most comfortable, from a position of relative independence and self-determinacy, only to engender animosity and condescension from men who were unwilling to let him play that long-established game with his own, unconventional rules. He did manage, however, to find other courtiers and prominent Florentine intellectuals who were not only receptive to but enthusiastic participants in this alternative realm. The *seicento* court and academy were opposed in extreme terms according to different social ideals: the court was a place of deceptions and divisions, while the academy was a place of truths and solidarities. In reality, however, the two realms were inexorably linked.[17] Rosa's words to Passeri suggest the artist's awareness of his own continued reliance on the sphere that dominated and defined the professional success of the artist (not to mention its more generally pervasive role in defining honor and reputation): the dinners that Rosa hosted at his house were aimed at maintaining that crucial connection between the worlds of academy and court necessitated by the quasi-emancipated artist, who was too vulnerable to achieve success entirely on his own. The egalitarianism of the academic enterprise, couched in the terms of friendship and camaraderie, remained an ideal (even in the context of the private, informal academy that lacked rigorous organization and statutes) that masked the true nature of its social dynamic, both within itself and in relation to the external pressures that impacted upon it.

Many of the members of the *Percossi*, including Rosa, maintained close ties to the Medici court. (As Passeri's anecdote indicates, many of the Florentine courtiers were still only willing to check their social snobbery at the door and then pick it up again on the way out.) The *Percossi* also remained closely aligned with the grand-ducal court by means of its theatrical performances at the

[16] The manifold instances of Rosa's animosity toward the court will be discussed in detail in chapter five.
[17] The connection between court and academy is an important feature of the *seicento* academy, in general.

Casino di San Marco of Gian' Carlo de' Medici (1611-1663) on the Via della Scala, located at the Orti Oricellari – a satellite of the court but an official residence nonetheless.[18] Rosa's relationship with Gian' Carlo offered a particular degree of freedom, and he continued to depend upon court patronage in spite of his outwardly-expressed animosity toward the authority it represented.[19] The Cardinal's sponsorship and the *Percossi*'s court memberships helped Rosa to transfer the independence he cultivated in the egalitarian setting of the private academy into the socially-stratified arena of the court where reputation and fame were to be found.

II.2. Rosa as *Virtuoso*: Academic Friendship and the Making of Rosa's Identity as a "Painter-Philosopher"

Rosa's early years in Naples and Rome provided him with significant and formative experiences and friendships. Cardinal Brancaccio, the young priest and *capo di maestro* Girolamo Mercuri, the connoisseur Niccolò Simonelli, and the band of actor-friends who participated in Rosa's early comedic performances and were part of his academic circles assisted in consolidating his early ambitions for independence.[20] But it was the nine years of Rosa's early adulthood in Florence that contributed most substantially to this objective. Rosa's Florentine academic friendships (especially that of Giovan Battista Ricciardi) were among the most important and enduring of his life, and they provided a model for all of his subsequent relationships. These friends also became the catalyst and vehicle for the creation and sustenance of Rosa's desired

---

[18] The Casino was given to Gian' Carlo by the Grand Duke Ferdinando II in August 1640, which he then made into his official residence in Florence. Fumagalli, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 46; and Novella Barbolani di Montauto, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 150, cat. 5. On the Casino and Gian Carlo's patronage in general, see Silvia Mascalchi, "Anticipazioni sul mecenatismo di Giovan Carlo de' Medici e suoi contribute alle collezioni degli Uffizi," in *Gli Uffizi. Quattro secolo di una galleria. Fonti e documenti* (Florence, 1982), 41-82.

[19] Rosa refers to Gian' Carlo as "my prince" ("mio Principe") in a letter of 1641 to Giulio Maffei. Borelli, letter 1. Fumagalli notes that, in spite of the brief interruption of Rosa's employ with the Medici in 1646 (indicated by his letters), during which he went to stay at the nearby villa of his friend Raffaello Landini, his experience of some financial difficulty may have inspired him to return to the court – a significant observation that suggests Rosa's continued economic reliance on court patronage. Fumagalli, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 62.

[20] This period of Rosa's life was relatively peripatetic: he left Naples for Rome in 1635, and lived there for only three years before traveling to Viterbo with Cardinal Brancaccio for two years, returning again to Rome for two more years before setting off for Florence in 1640.

identity as an inspired *virtuoso* “painter-philosopher”, a self-image inexorably entwined with his conception of personal and professional freedom.[21]

The Members of the *Percossi* and their Influence

Baldinucci recorded the *Percossi*’s cast of characters – a list, however, that was not comprehensive: the scientist and mathematician Evangelista Torricelli (1608-1647); the writer Carlo Roberto Dati (1619-1676); the poet and playwright Giovan Battista Ricciardi (1624-1686); the professor of moral philosophy Valerio Chimentelli (1620-1668); the writer and art collector Andrea Cavalcanti (1610-1673); the poet Francesco Berni;[22] the Venetian secretary and ambassador to Florence Paolo Vendramin (described by Baldinucci as in office during the time of war of 1642); the poet and composer Giovanni Filippo Appolloni (c. 1635-1688); the cardinal Volunnio Bandinelli (c. 1597-1667); the writer and musician Pietro Salvetti (d. 1697); the doctor Paolo Minucci (1623-1665); the poet and amateur artist Francesco Rovai (1605-1648); the art dealer Francesco Cordini; a certain Dottor Viviani (the unidentified brother of the renowned mathematician Vincenzo Viviani (1622-1703), who may himself have been a member); the Count Luigi Ridolfi; the Bolognese trader Francesco Maria Agli; Dottor Pier Filippo Tommaso Lasagnini; and the abbot and Grand Ducal secretary of state Giovan Filippo Marucelli (d. 1680).[23] De’

[21] Baldinucci noted this connection in his biography of the artist. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 497.
[22] A descendent of the more famous poet of the same name (c. 1497-1536).
[23] For the list of members, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 451-2. On Chimetelli, see N. Longo, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 24: 770-773. On Cavalcanti, see the entry by C. Gangemi in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 22: 608-10. On Cavalcanti’s relationship with Baldinucci and Florentine artists, see Catherine Monbeig Goguel, “Francesco Furini dans le prisme du dessin,” in Mina Gregori and Rodolfo Maffeis eds., *Un’altra bellezza. Francesco Furini*. Exhibition catalogue (Florence: Mandragora, 2007), 87. Also see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, “Vita di Primaticcio,” IV, 644; V, 451, 463, 482; VI, 338 (Appendix). The elder Francesco Berni (1496/8-1535) gained fame for his distinctive mocking or burlesque poems, which initiated a genre of poetry known as *poesie bernesca*. Baldinucci refers to the younger Berni as “dottor”. See Volpi, “Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti e riflessioni sul primo periodo romano e su quello fiorentino,” *Storia dell’arte* 120 (2008), 88. Borelli notes that Appolloni “wrote the booklets *Argia* (1655) and *Dori* (1661), set to music by [Marc]Antonio Cesti” . Borelli, letter 220. A “Francesco Viviani” is named as Vincenzo’s brother in his last will and testament, executed by Giovanni Battista Nelli. The Viviani family tree reconstructed by Nelli also names three other brothers: Paolo, Ippolito, and Prete Alamanno. Viviani’s unpublished testament and genealogy are reproduced by Giulia Grazi at http://members.fortunecity.com/giampabra/genealogia/nelli.html.

Dominici adds Pietro Sacchettti and Agnolo Popoleschi to the roster.[24] The painter and poet Lorenzo Lippi (1606-1664) and the poet and silk-merchant Antonio Malatesti (1610-1672) can also be added to the list.[25] The Volterran merchant Giulio Maffei (and perhaps his brothers, too) was likely to have participated in the *Percossi*'s activities when staying in Florence.[26]

United by a singular academic identity, the diversity of the members' professions conferred on the academy at the same time a sense of virtuosity that reflected Rosa's own ambitions to be known as a *virtuoso*, both in the sense of possessing *virtù* and exhibiting diverse intellectual and creative skills.[27] Unique in its Rosa-centric mission, the *Percossi* was also part of the more

---

[24] De' Dominici, *Vite*, 233.

[25] Described by Baldinucci as one of Rosa's closest friends in Florence, Lippi's name (along with Malatesti's) is included in Rovai's poem to the "*Accademia degli Improvvisi*" (written before 1647). Rovai appears to refer to Lippi with the name "LIPPO". See Appendix III.1. In Lippi's *Malmantile*, Malatesti appears as "Amostante Latoni". Lippi, *Malmantile*, Canto I, stanza 61. On Malatesti's friendship with Lippi and Rosa, see Eva Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale". Lorenzo Lippi's Poetics of Naturalism in Seventeenth-Century Florence" (PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 2007), 12-13, 61, 251ff and *passim*. Lippi also lived practically next door to Rosa, and had been an active participant in the comedic performances of the Compagnia della Scala prior to Rosa's arrival in Florence. See Arnaldo Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera Poetica e Pittorica di Lorenzo Lippi, con nuove indagini e con rime inedite* (Catania: Francesco Battiato ed., 1914), 11; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, V, 261ff. On the Compagnia della Scala (Compagnia dell'Arcangelo Raffaele) see D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 28; Konrad Eisenbichler, "The Boys of the Archangel Raphael. A Youth Confraternity in Florence, 1411-1785" (Toronto, 1998); and G. Conti, "La Compagnia della Scala," in *L'Illustratore Fiorentino* (1915). Egisto Bragaglia goes so far as to give Lippi a part in founding the *Percossi* itself, an interesting suggestion, though with no documentary basis. See Perelli, Bragaglia and Grossi eds., *Salvator Rosa*, 47. Lippi married Elisabetta Susini in 1646, the probable sister of Pietro Susini who was also a friend of Rosa's. De Rinaldis, *Lettere Inedite di Salvator Rosa a G. B. Ricciardi* (Rome: Fratelli Palombi Editori, 1939), 190, letter 154. Lippi also shared Rosa's preference for the role of the *zanni*. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, XVIII, 3-27; and Cinelli, "Vita dell'Autore," in Lippi, *Malmantile*, 6. On Lippi as an actor, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, V, 265; Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 205-6; and D'Afflitto, "La 'Conversione' di Lorenzo Lippi," *Paradigma* 4 (1984): 113, note 10. Baldinucci notes in his life of Lippi that he read passages of his epic poem, *Il Malmantile Racquistato*, completed around 1650, to friends at Rosa's house, and his inclusion in the poem of the names (in the form of anagrammatic epithets) of various members of the *Percossi* further suggests the likelihood of his membership in the academy. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, V, 266; Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 20. In the poem, Francesco Rovai appears as "Franco Vicerosa," Paolo Minucci as "Puccio Lamoni," Carlo Dati as "Alticardo," Baldinucci as "Baldino Filippucci," Pietro Susini as "Istrion Vespi", and Rosa as "Salvo Rosata". Lippi, *Malmantile*, Canto IV, 13 and V, 57; III, 26 and XI, 42; I, 47 and XI, 54; IX, 43; XI, 55; IV, 14, V, 57 and XI, 45. Malatesti wrote a poem for Rosa, entitled "To Salvatore for a Dinner," more than likely intended for the occasion of one of the academy's *simposie*. Alterocca, *La Vita l'Opera*, 15. BNCF MS Magl. VII 220, 236 and 376. Malatesti wrote poems in honour of Lippi, Rosa, Giambattista Vanni, Francesco Furini, Giovanni da San Giovanni, and Baldassare Franceschini ("il Volterrano"). On his poetry see Giulio Piccini, *Lettera Famliare di Antonio Malatesti a Lorenzo Lippi, fiore d'Amenità Letterarie* (Florence: Antonio Cecchi, 1867); Ettore Allodoli ed., *La Sfinge, Enimmi di Antonio Malatesti con aggiunta la Tina, Scrittori Italiani e Stranieri* (Lanciano?: Carabba Ed., 1913); Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opere*, 210-22; and Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 253-5.

[26] Ozzola, *Vita e opere*, 51, claims Antonio Abati and the composer Antonio Bandini were also members.

[27] A testament to Rosa's success in this endeavour appears in a letter of c. 1665 from the publisher Carlo Manolessi to Vincenzo Viviani, where he refers to Rosa as a "*pittore e Virtuoso*". BNCF MS Gal. 98 (1665

general phenomenon of *seicento* private-academic practice, which drew fluid boundaries between the otherwise disparate professions of science, literature, theatre and art.[28] The *virtuoso* – who was, in essence, also the "academician" – was in essence a product of collaboration, based on shared interests and on the "rehearsing and practicing" of certain skills that set them apart as a distinct community.[29] The image of the academic painter-poet or painter-philosopher to which Rosa aspired, then, modeled in part on artists like Nicolas Poussin and Peter Paul Rubens and shared as an aspiration among academic friends like Lorenzo Lippi and Roman colleagues like Pietro Testa, was also that of the *virtuoso*, a figure of diverse talents and pursuits.[30] Rosa's virtuosity is celebrated in a group of letters and poems by Rosa's academic friends, documents that demonstrate the significance of these relationships for Rosa and his identity. These texts will receive treatment in chapter three. Here I wish to consider the broader nature of the impact of academic relationships on Rosa.

Carlo Dati was perhaps the most diversely-inscripted academic among the *Percossi*, and one of the most interesting members in terms of his potential influence on Rosa. Well-known for his linguistic and literary interests, Dati was also closely involved in the Florentine scientific community: he had been a disciple of Galileo (1564-1642) and was close with the scientists

---

marzo 16-1666 nov 5) 37r-v. On virtue as a requisite quality of the Stoic philosopher, see John Sellars, *Stoicism*. (Chesham, Bucks.: Acumen, 2006), 32, 47, 156; and Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 246-8. In the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries "*virtuoso*" came to refer specifically to the skilled musician, but in the early-modern period it was a term of honour broadly applied to any person skilled in any intellectual or artistic profession. E. Reimer, "Virtuose," in *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie*; and Frederika H. Jacobs, *Defining the Renaissance Virtuosa: Women Artists and the Language of Art History and Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). On the *virtuoso* and the culture of honour (*honnêteté*) in the *seicento*, also see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 91ff; and Connors, "Virtuoso Architecture in Cassiano's Rome," in *Cassiano dal Pozzo's Paper Museum*. 2 vols. (Milan, 1992), 2 (Quaderni Puteani 3), 23-40.

[28] Other private Florentine academies, like the *Crusca*, *Apatisti*, and *Svogliati*, had members of diverse occupations.

[29] Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 160, 182.

[30] Struhal sees Lippi as among the few *seicento* artists who "so fully embody the idea of the poet-painter". Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale," 302, 348)

Torricelli, Lorenzo Magalotti (1637-1712) and Francesco Redi (1626-1697).[31] Deeply invested in the linguistic endeavours of the *Accademia della Crusca*, he was one of the founding and most diligent members of the late-seventeenth century *Accademia del Cimento*,[32] he belonged to the *Apatisti*, the *Svogliati*, the *Accademia Fiorentina* (formerly the *Umidi*), and the *Accademia del Disegno*, and in 1647 became professor of classic literature at the University of Florence.[33] Dati published texts on a wide variety of subjects – historical, political, literary, scientific, and even art historical. In 1663 he wrote to Rosa to consult with him about his *Vite dei Pittori Antichi*, which he had begun to research in Florence in 1647, sending him a manuscript copy of the work in its final stages.[34] Dati's expertise in classical languages and literature likely played a key role in spurring Rosa's interest in ancient art in particular, especially detectable in his work of the 1650's and

[31] He befriended Lorenzo Magalotti and Francesco Redi (1626-1697). Redi dedicated to Dati his *Esperienze intorno alla generazione degl'insetti* of 1668. Dati was also closely connected to the *Accademia dei Lincei* in Rome (Dati met Cassiano dal Pozzo during his visit to Rome in 1651), and wrote a eulogistic biography for Dal Pozzo after his death in 1657, entitled *Delle lodi del Commendator Cassiano dal Pozzo* (Florence, 1664).

[32] Dati joined the *Crusca* in 1640, taking the name "Smarrito", and became secretary in 1663. He initiated the third edition of the *Vocabolario* (1691) and wrote the *Discorso dell'obbligo di ben parlare la propria lingua* (1657), in which he resolutely claimed the supremacy of Florentine Italian. He also wrote a number of scientific works, including the *Lettera ai Filaleti della vera storia della cicloide e della famosissima esperienza dell'argento vivo* (1663), under the pseudonym Timauro Antiate. On Dati see M. Vigilante, "Carlo Roberto Dati," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 33: 25; Guido Andreini, *La Vita e l'opera di Carlo Roberto Dati* (Milano-Genova a Roma-Naples: Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1936); *Lettere di Carlo Roberto Dati* (Florence: Stamperia Magheri, 1825); Alfonso Mirto, "Rapporti Epistolari tra Cassiano dal Pozzo e Carlo Roberto Dati", in *Nouvelles de la Republiques des Lettres* 2 (2001); and Edward Rosen, "Carlo Dati on the Invention of Eyeglasses," *Isis* 44: 1/2 (1953): 4-10.

[33] Dentler, "Salvator Rosa and his Academy", 41. Dati was the first secretary of the *Apatisti* in 1640, and was later made "*apatista reggente*" in 1649. On the Apatisti, see Edoardo Benvenuti, *Agostino Coltellini e l'Accademia degli Apatisti a Firenze nel secolo XVII* (Pistoia: Officina tipografica cooperativa, 1910); and Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 101-110. In 1649 Dati was elected consul of the *Fiorentina*, founded in 1540 as the "Umidi" and devoted to the study of the Florentine language. By 1650 Dati was listed among the members of the *Accademia del Disegno*. Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 95.

[34] Archivio Borromeo, Isolabella, Archivio Dati, mescolanze 12, cc. 29v.-32r. For Dati's letter, see Bartolommeo Gamba ed., *Scelta di Prose di Carlo Ruberto Dati*. Accedemico della Crusca (Venezia: Tipografia di Alvisopoli, 1826), 173-6; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 90-91, 95-96. On Dati's *Vite*, published in 1667 and dedicated to Louis XIV, see F. Solinas, "Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657): il ritratto di Jan van den Hoecke e L'Orazione di Carlo Dati," *Bollettino d'Arte* 92 (1995): 141-164; and Gamba ed., *Scelta di Prose di Carlo Ruberto Dati*, 25-116. Dati may also have consulted with Lippi in compiling his *Vite*. Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 217. In a letter to Dati of 1667, Francesco Camelli (the Roman numismatist of Queen Christina of Sweden) remembered with affection an occasion when Dati had showed him some ancient coins in the company of Rosa. BNCF MS Baldov. 258 III 1, 3r, Letter from Rome, October 8, 1667: "Dal S.[o] Alt. Falconieri io ho ricevuto una copia del libro di Ills.[ma] delle vite de' Pittori antichi. Son rimasso invero confuso del favore, e maravigliato, ch'ella conseni viva la memoria della mia servitù, dopo tanti anni, che in gli la dedicai, quando insieme col S.[e] Salvator Rosa le mostra alcuni medaglion antichi, che mi trovava in quel punto addosso; ed ella all'incontro ci favori di recitarci alcun' versi della sua Candia, se ben m'ricerto. …".

1660's.[35] Dati's role in bolstering Rosa's self-image as a painter-philosopher is clear even as late as 1663, when he wrote to Rosa in Rome and praised him for his philosophical wisdom, noting its rarity among their contemporaries.[36]

Andrea Cavalcanti was also member of the *Crusca*, the *Svogliati*, the *Apatisti* and the *Urna*.[37] A writer and art collector who shared friendships with many prominent Florentine intellectuals like Dati, Antonio Magliabechi (1633-1714), Lorenzo Panciatichi (1635-1676), and Francesco Redi (1626-1698), Cavalcanti composed poetical, historical and scientific works, along with *novelle*, biographies and republications of works by other Florentine poets and writers.[38] His mastery of Latin would have proved particularly useful for Rosa, and he shared Rosa's own interest in a witty, satiric mode of writing.[39] The anti-clerical sentiment that infuses some of Cavalcanti's writings would also likely have struck a chord with Rosa.[40] Pietro Salvetti, a musician and writer

---

[35] Rosa's *Pan and Pindar* (1666, Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia) [Fig. 126], for example, is essentially contemporaneous with Dati's *Vite* (1667). Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 91.
[36] See note 34 above.
[37] The date of his conscription into the *Crusca* is unknown, although his involvement in Tuscan intellectual life is signaled as early as 1642 by the publication of an *elogium* on the funeral of Francesco de' Medici, *Esequie del serenissimo principe Francesco celebrate in Firenze* … il 30 ag. 1634. He recited a eulogy and sonnet at the *Svogliati* on March 24, 1639. Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998), 21; Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie d'Italia*, 5 vols. (Bologna: Arnaldo Farni, 1930), 5: 288. In 1640, the *Svogliati* met for a period in Cavalcanti's house. Maylender, *ibid*, 289. Like the *Percossi*, the *Urna* was "one of the many small circles of literary men that flourished in Florence during the *seicento*", focused on a form of confrontational criticism. C. Gangemi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 22: 609.
[38] Many of these works were only published after his death: they include the *Notizie intorno alla vita di Bernardo Segni*, in B. Segni, *Storie fiorentine* …, (Augusta, 1723, probably written c. 1660); the *Epigramma* e *Distico latini* in G. Nardi, *De rore disquisitio physica* (Florence [Florentiae], 1642), XVII; *Il vicario burlato*, a cura di P. Fanfani, (Florence, 1870); *Novellette intorno a Curzio Marginoli, poeta fiorentino* …, a cura di G. Piccini (Bologna, 1870); *Rime varie di Curzio da Marignolle con le notizie intorno alla vita e costume di lui…*, a cura di C. Arlia (Bologna, 1885); *La carità da frati* (Florence, 1871); *Novella inedita* … (the response of I. Soldani to the Siennese detractor of Dante), in G. Papanti, *Catalogo dei novellieri italiani in prosa* … (Livorno, 1871) II: CXVII-CXIX; *Due novella di A. C. per la prima volta stampate*, a cura di G. Papanti (Livorno, 1873); *Sonetti di F. Ruspoli… col commento di A. Cavalcanti* …, a cura di A. Bacchi della Lega (Bologna, 1876). Gangemi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 22: 610.
[39] Gangemi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 22: 609.
[40] Gangemi notes that some of Cavalcanti's compositions display a rather tame and "controlled" anti-clericalism. Gangemi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 22: 610.

who also ventured into the study of science and mathematics, was also a member of the *Svogliati*.[41] Francesco Rovai, a member of the *Svogliati*, the *Apatisti*, the *Alterati*, and the *Accademia del Disegno* was a poet and amateur artist who made some copies of Rosa's paintings.[42] Rovai's poem for the *Improvvisi* (likely the theatrical branch of the *Percossi*) is evidence of his active contribution to Rosa's academy and the personal identity of inspired autonomy to which it was ultimately devoted. (I will return to this important poem at the end of this chapter.) His poem, together with Baldinucci's anecdote concerning his artistic involvement with Rosa and Lippi, suggests his investment in the artistic circles of Florence.[43] As both a copyist and eulogist of Rosa's work, Rovai was an important proponent of Rosa's self-image.

Valerio Chimentelli, a professor of moral philosophy at the University of Pisa, was a member of the *Crusca* and the *Apatisti* and wrote two poems in honour of Rosa which he recited to the *Percossi*.[44] Evangelista Torricelli, primarily a scientist, mathematician and natural philosopher, was also an avid participant – like the other scientific members of Rosa's academy – in literary pursuits.[45] His interest in the Stoic and "lofty philosophical-moral mission" of the *Percossi* is demonstrated by the *encomium* he wrote for Rosa on the subject of "The Golden Age," a "condemnation of modern times" reflective of the sentiment in Rosa's own *Peace burning the Arms*

[41] Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 5: 288. On Salvetti's diverse interests, including geometry, mathematics, optics, music, and numismatics, see John Walter Hill, "Antonio Veracini in Context: New Perspectives from Documents, Analysis and Style", *Early Music* 18: 4 (1990): 550.

[42] None of Rovai's paintings have yet been identified. Baldinucci names Rovai among the many artists who copied the *Flight into Egypt* that Rosa made with Lippi. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459. Lippi refers to Rosa in his *Malmantile* as a "friend" of Rovai and a "man of his sort" (*uomo della sua tacca*). Lippi, *Malmantile*, 1779 edition, 90. Rovai was a member of the *Svogliati* as early as 1626, when he read an academic discourse on one of Petrarch's sonnets which was "universally acclaimed". He is also mentioned in the minutes of the *Svogliati* in July of 1638 and became the academy's consul in 1645. Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 15, 61. In the *Apatisti* he held the anagrammatic nickname "Rainero Fucasco".

[43] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459. Rovai wrote a poem in praise of Guercino: *Abigail, Pittura del Guercino da Cento*. BNCF MS Magl. VII 359, 36r.

[44] The *Report on Peace* and *The Birthday of the Rose*.

[45] Torricelli is credited as the inventor of the barometer. Acton, *The Last Medici* (London: Macmillan, 1980), 37.

of War (c. 1642-44, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 20].[46] Although he is nowhere mentioned among the ranks of the *Percossi*, Dati's friend Francesco Redi, a doctor, scientist and linguist, also appears to have been on close terms with Rosa; three of Rosa's own letters signal their friendship.[47] Redi was good friends with many the *Percossi*, particularly the members of the *Crusca* (to which he also belonged) and the eventual *Cimento*.[48] Although Rosa considered that Redi's erudition could be a bit "vain and obscure,"[49] they may well have bonded over a mutual interest in the pleasures of wine – the subject of Redi's most famous text, the *Bacco in Toscana* (1685). The influence of Redi and other members of the Florentine scientific community is detectable in the enigmatic iconography of his large painting of *Democritus in Meditation* of 1651-2 [Fig. 62], probably inspired by the interest in anatomy of friends among the followers of Galileo as well as the circles of the Roman Lincei and Neapolitan Oziosi;[50] this group of friends also seem a likely source of inspiration for the "shocking" and almost forensic interest in anatomy conveyed in Rosa's large *Prometheus* (mid-late 1640's?, Galleria Corsini, Rome) [Fig. 43].[51] Last but not least, Giovan Battista Ricciardi, a poet and

---

[46] D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 93. The poems of Rosa's friends show their shared interest in the writings of both ancient and Renaissance authors – especially Ariosto and Tasso. Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment in the Tuscan Academies, 1690-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 12. It is noteworthy that in Rosa's *Peace* no actual "arms" of war are visible: the pile of "arms" at the feet of the allegorical figure of Peace include a shield, protective body-armour (an arm, leg, a hand, and part of what appears to be a cuirass), and a helmet.

[47] Rosa and Ricciardi both appear to have been friends with Redi. See Borelli, letters 183, 184 and 186. Redi came to Rosa's defense concerning his authorship of the satires, and Baldinucci notes that he often travelled to Rome to listen to Rosa recite his satiric compositions at his house. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 492.

[48] Redi studied philosophy and medicine at the University of Pisa and attended the *Cimento* and its Roman counterpart, the *Accademia dei Lincei*. Harry B. Weiss, "Francesco Redi, the Father of Experimental Entomology," *The Scientific Monthly* 23: 3 (September 1926): 223-4.

[49] Borelli, Letter 183.

[50] Volpi argues that the unique iconography of Rosa's *Democritus*, which depicts the "doctor, scientist and anatomist" Democritus rather than the laughing or despairing philosopher, was inspired not only by conversations with Ricciardi (see Borelli, letters 86, 101, 119 and 127) and perhaps with Carlo de' Rossi, but also with the Roman current of egyptomania represented by Athanasius Kircher and the Roman *Wunderkammer*, and the scientific-anatomist interests of his Neapolitan and Roman friends. Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini", 80; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 36-7; Wallace, *The Etchings of Salvator Rosa* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 59-69; and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 273-302. Volpi notes that Redi's, Alfonso Borrelli's and Cardinal Brancaccio's interest in Marco Aurelio Severino's *Zootomia Democritaea* (Nuremburg, 1645), which seems to have directly inspired Rosa's iconography and which contains an engraving illustration very similar to Rosa's painting. Severino was also in contact with the *Lincei*, the court of Queen Christina of Sweden, and Redi, Torricelli and Dati.

[51] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 87. For the debate concerning the date and provenance of the Corsini *Prometheus*, see chapter three, 184, note 94. Volpi published a poem by Paolo Vendramin on the subject of

playwright from Pisa who shared Rosa's moral-philosophical interests and ambitions, was also a member of the *Accademia Pisana* and, later, the *Cimento*.[52] The significance of his friendship to Rosa and his professional identity will emerge over the following chapters.

The specific nature and degree of these friends' contributions to Rosa's identity are at times difficult to determine, but the congruence of their interests with his own suggest their importance to his self-manufacture in the academic setting. They offered Rosa a large pool of intellectual expertise from which to draw his own ideas, and their memberships in other academies brought the possibility of connections beyond the confines of his private *conversazione*.[53] In addition to their court connections, many of Rosa's fellow academics, such as Cavalcanti or Dati, also lent the added prestige of noble pedigree to the ranks of the *Percossi*.[54] United by passion for moral philosophy, satirical poetry, and comedic theatrical performance, Rosa's academic friends fused their diverse interests into the singular pursuits that defined the prerogative of Rosa and his academy, a prerogative that was further enhanced and encouraged by the witty and moral-didactic propensities of the broader network of Florentine academics.[55]

Rosa's *Prometheus*, which shows a particular preoccupation with Rosa's depiction of the entrails and the "horrific" aspect of the painting. Volpi, *ibid*, 87. I discuss this poem further in chapter three.

[52] Volpi, 'L'ordine delle immagini," 77.

[53] Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 193. Cavalcanti and Dati, for example, had close ties with Cassiano dal Pozzo. BNCF MS Baldov. 258 III 7. Clara Louise Dentler's description of Rosa's academy as "one of the most brilliant and famous in Italy" is somewhat extravagant considering that it only lasted for under a decade and is sparsely documented. But her comment raises the plausible notion that the academy expanded beyond its own confines, thanks to connections with academics in other parts of Europe. Torricelli, for example, had known Thomas Hobbes and Robert Boyle when they spent time in Florence, and both Viviani and Dati had known John Milton during his brief sojourn in the city. See Dentler, "Salvator Rosa and his Academy", 41.

[54] On Cavalcanti's illustrious family, see Gangemi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 22: 608. On Dati's nobility, see Vigilante, "Carlo Roberto Dati"; and Andreini, *La Vita e l'opera di Carlo Roberto Dati*, 6.

[55] It is also possible that members of the *Percossi* brought with them some of the rituals and discourses of the other academies to which they belonged. In particular, the disciples of Galileo may have introduced to the academy something of their empirical, experimental mindset, while the members of the *Crusca* likely brought their linguistic and bucolic ideals. One of the *Cimento*'s primary goals, founded on Galileo's precepts, consisted in replacing speculative procedure with physical experimentation, expressed in their motto "*provando e riprovando*" ("test and re-test"). Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 2: 7. Although the *Cimento* was formally established long after the *Percossi* had "disbanded" when Rosa left Florence in 1649, a consideration of the impact of the interests of Rosa's scientific friends, who were still working with Galileo until his death in 1642, is nonetheless worthy of further consideration. On the more general confluence between the scientific and artistic communities at the end of the *seicento*, particularly the shared interest in "evidential" theory, see Francesca Petrucci, "La 'ragione trionfante' alla corte medicea: il Gran Principe Ferdinando e Giuseppe Maria Crespi,"

It is important to note the *Percossi*'s literary rather than artistic focus. Rosa had no apparent desire to open a studio or take on pupils, at least not in any institutionally organized manner. Indeed, both he and his biographers suggest a general animosity on Rosa's part toward the prospect of disciples (although he was willing on at least one occasion to assist a young artist-friend of Ricciardi.)[56] Rosa's academy was designed, instead, to service his desired identity as the *virtuoso* "painter-philosopher," a status of comprehensive intellectual ability representative of the culmination of a long, laborious effort on the part of Rosa's artistic predecessors to achieve liberal status – in both the scholarly and "free" sense of the word.

Artibus et Historiae 3: 5 (1982): 112, 116; and C. A. Madrignani, "La poetica di Francesco Redi nella Firenze letteraria di fine Seicento," *Belfagor* 4 (1960): 407-8. On Redi's experimental philosophy, also see Paula Findlen, "Controlling the Experiment: Rhetoric, Court Patronage and the Experimental Method of Francesco Redi," *History of Science* xxxi (1993): 35-64. The "communal spirit" that Galileo's followers (and later members of the *Cimento*) considered intrinsic to their experimental method of scientific study reflected the spirit of academic camaraderie among the *Percossi*. The *Crusca*'s capricious practice of entertaining themselves with "*veglie*" or vigils – nocturnal readings, initiated by Dati, on various issues of language and Florentine literature, devised on the principle of academic camaraderie – may have held a strong appeal for Rosa. On the *veglie*, which were inspired by one of Rosa's favourite authors, Aulus Gellius, see Fontani, *Elogio di Carlo Roberto Dati* (Florence, 1794), 187; Vigilante, "Carlo Roberto Dati", 25; Gamba ed., *Scelta di Prose di Carlo Ruberto Dati*, 119ff; and Rosen, "Carlo Dati on the Invention of Eyeglasses," 9. Dati's comments on the ritual indicate how the practice of the solitary, isolated scholar may be transformed into a social event. The informal nature of the *Crusca*, which had "no fixed meeting place" and "used to assemble at the home of one or other of its members", also reflects one of the *Percossi*'s ideals. Rosen, "Carlo Dati on the Invention of Eyeglasses", 4. The rituals of the *Apatisti* and *Svogliati*, too, may well have inspired the witty and erudite exercises of Rosa's academy. On the *Apatisti*, see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 1: 219-226; A. Lazzeri, "Agostino Coltellini e l'Accademia degli Apatisti di Firenze," in *Universita, Accademia e Societa scientifiche* (1981): 237-245. On the *Svogliati*, see Maylender, *ibid*, 5: 287-289. Struhal suggests Rovai's poem for the "Improvvisi" indicates literary parody as central to the *Percossi*'s activities. Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 90. Founded in 1640 by Lodovico Coltellini "as a refuge of younger Florentines from what he considered stuffy pedantry in the other societies," the *Apatisti* was (like the *Percossi*) a sort of literary club who used anagrammatic pseudonyms and amused themselves with diversions like the *Sibillone*, a kind of intellectual game in which participants were called upon to deliver "an extemporaneous explanation, well padded with references to ancient and modern authors, of the meaningless response of a blindfolded child to a 'question' posed by the president." Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 4; Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 125. The *Svogliati*, which hosted its meetings in the private house of its founder Jacopo Gaddi, were noted for "their particularly convivial atmosphere" and, like the *Percossi*, they engaged in "sumptuous banquets." Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 8. On the *Svogliati*, see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 5: 287-289. From 1620 onward it was "incumbent upon the academicians" to host a "most honourable *simposio*".

[56] See Borelli, letter 349 (March 1669), in which Rosa asserts to Ricciardi that he never had a master, nor wanted any pupils of his own. Passeri emphasized Rosa's innovative style as all "his own" and "unattached to the heels of another". Passeri, *Vite*, 429. For Rosa's assistance of the young painter Francisco Martinotti (1636-1679) between 1668-70, who became his collaborator and copyist, see Borelli, letter 374. Baldinucci claimed Rosa had at least one student ("*allievo*") – a "certain Bartolommeo" who came to be known as "Bartolommeo del Rosa", whose works, usually in pictures of two or three *braccie* at most, were such successful imitations of Rosa's style that they were often believed to be his own, and he suggests that the Milanese painter Giovanni Ghisolfi may be considered Rosa's "disciple" – ignorant of how to make figures in his landscapes, turned to Rosa for assistance, and to his work as a model, until he was able to make them for himself. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 502.

The philosophical component of Rosa's identity as *virtuoso* "painter-philosopher" was the prevailing concern of his academy, but the "painter," too, remained an integral component of that persona. Although the practice of painting did not feature prominently as one of the *Percossi*'s activities, it was a popular subject of discussion (as the poems of Rosa's friends suggest), and Rosa's own pictorial production was inseparable from the philosophical aspects of his academic experience. A number of scholars have discussed the impact of Florentine literary and artistic traditions on Rosa's painting, but very little has been said about the role of friendship in certain instances of this influence.[57] Rosa's close relationship with Lorenzo Lippi, for example, resulted in a significant series of exchanges and influence between the two artists. Baldinucci describes Lippi as one of the most important figures in Rosa's early career, their bond founded on a shared inclination toward comedy, moral-satirical poetry, and painting – all of which they regarded as intimately connected endeavours.[58] Lippi participated in the literary, theatrical and even scientific

---

[57] On the impact of Florentine late Mannerism, and High Renaissance art (especially Raphael) on Rosa's Florentine paintings, see Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence," 192; and Mina Gregori and Monica Preti, in *Il Seicento Fiorentino. Arte a Firenze da Ferdinando I a Cosimo III.* Exhibition catalogue (Florence: Cantini, 1986); Mina Gregori ed., *Storia delle arti in Toscana: Il* Seicento (Florence: Edifir, 2001), 81, 133, 158 and *passim*; and D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, *passim*. An instance of Florentine influence that has not been noted by scholars is offered by Rosa's altarpiece *Christ Saving St. Peter from the Waves* [Fig. 103], which Baldinucci calls the "unico aborto de' suoi pennelli", painted for S. Felice in Florence and dated to the late 1640's. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 460. The close similarity of the composition to Cristofano Allori's earlier painting of the same subject (c. 1608-10, Collezione Bigongiari, Pistoia) [Fig. 145] for the Usimbardi chapel in the nearby church of S. Trinità suggests that Rosa saw Allori's painting, which may have been the first version intended for the Usimbardi chapel. Francesca Baldassari, *La collezione Piero ed Elena Bigongiari, il Seicento fiorentino tra 'favola' e drama* (Pistoia: Cassa di Risparmio di Pistoia e Pescia, 2004), 74. The final version, now *in situ* [Fig. 146], was left unfinished by Allori and completed by Zanobi Rosi. Baldinucci, "Vita di Cristofano Allori", *Notizie,* X. Allori's painting repeats a composition by his teacher Lodovico Cardi ("Il Cigoli"), dated alternatively to 1599 or 1607 and made for the church of Riottoli, near Empoli (Palazzo Pitti [Fig. 147]; another version is in the Accademia di Belle Arti, Carrara), and which bears an even closer resemblance to Rosa's painting. See Marco Chiarini ed., *Lodovico Cigoli, 1559-1613. Tra Manierismo e Barocco. Dipinti* (Florence: Galleria Palatina di Palazzo Pitti, 1992), 96; Mario Bucci et al ed., *Mostra del Cigoli e del suo ambiente* (Accademia degli Euteleti, Città di San Miniato: Cassa di Risparmio di S. Miniato, 1959), 93-95; and Franco Faranda, *Ludovico Cardi, detto il Cigoli* (Florence: Cassa di Risparmio di San Miniato; Rome: De Luca, 1986), 142.

[58] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 458. Baldinucci notes their similarity of spirit and says that it consisted in a mutual love of "maxims, bizarre ideas, fiery and lively conversation, and an inclination above all toward poetry more than anything else." As Alterocca noted, the "similitude" Baldinucci describes as the foundation for their friendship was more than likely based more in ideas than temperament. Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 12. On the connections between painting and poetry in the Florentine *seicento*, see Anthony Colantuono, "The Cup and the Shield: Lorenzo Lippi, Torquato Tasso and Seventeenth-century Pictorial Stylistics," in *L'Arme e gli amori.*

interests of Rosa's other academic friends: he was a member of the *Apatisti*, the *Accademia del Disegno*, and the later *Cimento*, and painted *pale* for two members of the *Crusca*; he also belonged to the Compagnia dell'Arcangelo Raffaele (known as "La Scala") and took part in the comedies of the well-known Misericordia.[59] However, unlike the rest of the *Percossi* (save perhaps Rovai), Lippi offered Rosa the camaraderie of a fellow visual artist. Lippi's influence on Rosa's painting is palpable in the *Arion on the Dolphin* (c. 1648, private collection, Milan) [Fig. 40], made as a pendant to Lippi's own *Orpheus* (private collection, Florence) [Fig. 134] for an unknown Florentine patron.[60] Scholars have suggested that Lippi inspired Rosa to move toward the "purist" style of the Florentine *seicento*, characterized by a simpler iconography and softer, more graceful forms.[61] The appeal to Rosa of the allegorical half-length figure paintings popular among Florentine artists of the first half of the seventeenth century (of which Lippi was an important exponent)[62] is evident in canvases like the paired *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* (early 1640's, National Gallery, London) [Fig. 10] and *Lucrezia as Poetry* (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford) [Fig. 11], the pendant allegories of *Music* and *Poetry* (1640's, Palazzo Barberini, Rome) [Figs. 18 and 19], and the elusive *La Menzogna* [Fig. 34].[63] Eva Struhal has argued that Lippi's and Rosa's reciprocal influence "revolved around a shared set of art theoretical ideas," including a concern over (and desire to

---

Ariosto, Tasso and Guarini in Late Renaissance Florence. Acts of an International Conference. Florence, Villa I Tatti, June 27-29, 2001. Vol. II, Dynasty, Court and Imagery (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2004).

[59] Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 11, 27; Volpi, 'L'ordine delle immagini," 77; D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 32. Lippi was inscribed into the *Apatisti* in 1633 with the nickname "Pierozzo Pelli". D'Afflitto, *ibid*, Regesto.

[60] The paintings belonged to the Ruccellai family until their sale in 1984. D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 254, 89-90.

[61] For the stylistic connections between Lippi and Rosa, see D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 89-101, 254; Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence," 191, 194; Preti, in *Il Seicento Fiorentino. Arte a Firenze da Ferdinando I a Cosimo III*, *Pittura*, 392, 398; and Giovanni Pagliarulo, "Appunti fiorentini e alcune ipotesi intorno al soffitto della Madonna dei Galletti a Pisa," *Antichità viva* 30: 4/5 (1991): 35. Rosa's Florentine phase is not, however, reducible only to the "purist" manner, but conveys instead an "almost bewildering diversity" explained (in Langdon's view) by the presence of a variety of artistic styles, including Cortona's Roman Baroque, the "lyricism" of Claude, the "macabre" tastes of Jacques Callot, the Late Mannerist Florentine tradition "with its taste for allegory and for shallow and crowded compositions", and the High Renaissance Florentine style which exhibited "clarity and correctness". Langdon, *Salvator Rosa: His Ideas and Development as an Artist* (PhD dissertation, University of London, 1975), 146.

[62] This genre of allegorical proliferated in the work artists like Carlo Dolci, Cesare and Vincenzo Dandini, Felice Ficherelli, Giovanni Martinelli, Baldassare Franeschini, Simone Pignoni, and Francesco Furini, among others.

[63] Langdon also sees in the pose and "melancholic air" of the female allegory of *Poetry* (for which Rosa likely used Lucrezia as a model) the possible influence of Francesco Furini. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence", 191.

reform) the contemporary state of painting, and "an attempt to clearly demarcate true art against artistic dilettantism and charlatanism."[64]

Baldinucci records a number of interesting anecdotes that offer insight into the nature of their reciprocal influence. According to the biographer, the two friends often found themselves alone together in the evening in Lippi's studio in the piazza S. Elisabetta.[65] Rosa frequently accompanied Lippi to the gate of Sangallo to see the "antipodes" (an ancient, mythological tribe believed to be living on the other side of the world who, in medieval tradition, were thought to have feet growing out of their heads), a "ridiculous invention of Lippi's" that consisted in lying down beside the river Mugnone, so that people walking on the other side appeared in their reflections to be walking upside down. The anecdote is meaningful not only in illustration of their shared sense of humour, but also for what it says about their mutual fascination with visual illusion.[66] This interest is further played out in two other anecdotes that underscore the role of friendship in the creation of art and identity. In the first, Rosa helps a frustrated Lippi to finish the landscape in a *Flight into Egypt*, producing a work of such renown that "many *dilettanti* came to Lippi's house to see it and copy it".[67] The story, which Baldinucci dates to 1642, is interesting in view of Rosa's disdain toward his renown as a landscapist, an identity that perpetually dominated his reputation in spite of his efforts to be known as a figure painter.[68] Even more significant here, however, is the

---

[64] Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements: Salvator Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference at the Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13, 2009).

[65] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459.

[66] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 458-459. Baldinucci's account, which lingers on an explanation of the visual optics of the trick, suggests that visual experience was an important aspect of the game.

[67] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459. Baldinucci lists among the copyists Francesco Rovai, the priest Francesco Boschi, a "certain Lorenzo Martelli" and Taddeo Baldini. Martelli accompanied Lippi to Innsbruck and may therefore have been a collaborator of his. Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 280, note 159. Rosa is not known to have made any painted versions of the theme, but Mahoney catalogues a drawing by Rosa of the "Rest on the Flight into Egypt" that he dates to the 1640's. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 306-7, no. 25.9.

[68] Baldinucci, who considered Rosa first and foremost a landscapist, noted his hostility toward his fame in this genre, frustrated by wealthy clients who always "threw themselves upon the small pictures, leaving the large ones". When a wealthy cardinal had the audacity to debate the price of some of his small landscape paintings, Rosa responded "They always want the little landscapes, always always the little landscapes"; and when his

suggestion of an openness on Rosa's part to a collaborative form of creativity, and a willingness to employ his least favourite talents in the service of aiding a good friend. The painting by Lippi and Rosa has been identified by Chiara D'Afflitto as the *Flight into Egypt* [Fig. 135] in the church of Sant'Agostino in Massa Marittima, the background landscape of which reveals "chromatic and atmospheric values" and the "bright colours of a summer sunset" in keeping with Rosa's style, and which bears a date of 1642 on the panel itself.[69]

The second anecdote describes a portrait of Rosa that Lippi purportedly painted only a few short days after they finished the *Flight into Egypt*. Rosa returned to Lippi's studio to find a group of *literati*, including the court architect and scenographer Alfonso Parigi (1606-1656), the writer Antonio Malatesti, and the doctor and astronomer Lodovico Serenai (1599-1685). Lippi placed a stool in a good patch of light and asked Rosa to sit down. He then proceeded to rapidly paint a very life-like portrait of his friend of which numerous copies were made, including one that Baldinucci claimed to keep "in memory of Rosa."[70] The painting consisted of a half-length portrait of Rosa "dressed in beautiful fabric with sliced sleeves, a small collar in the custom of those times, which

---

visitor inquired the price of one of his larger paintings, Rosa retorted: "For this one I want a thousand!", after which the cardinal promptly departed. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 477, 485. Rosa's identity as a landscapist dominates his biographer's accounts, as well as his posthumous reputation among his Romantic enthusiasts. The story of Rosa's "discovery" by Giovanni Lanfranco, for example, revolves around one of the artist's early landscape paintings.

[69] D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 94, and 226, cat. 55. D'Afflitto uses as her guide Baldinucci's contention that landscape painting was a "thing beyond [Lippi's] inclination", noting that the fifteen landscape paintings in his possession at his death were not likely by his own hand. There is little evidence in Lippi's pictorial *oeuvre*, sacred or profane, of an interest in this subject; but it is interesting to note that, as a collector, Lippi had a propensity for landscapes including the works of Flemish artists and probably works by Rosa himself. D'Afflitto, *ibid*, 162-3.

[70] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 460. Baldinucci says that the original portrait by Lippi (now lost) ended up in the possession of Serenai himself. Alterocca noted a resemblance to Rosa in the figure of Esau in Lippi's painting of *Esau Surrendering his Birthright* (c. 1642-44, Florence, Seminario Maggiore del Cestello), although Esau's face appears too broad in comparison with Rosa's secure self-portraits. Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 189. For the painting, see D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, cat. 65. For an alternative reading, see Friedrich Palleross, "Between Typology and Psychology: The Role of the Identification Portrait in Updating Old Testament Representations," *Artibus et Historiae* 12: 24 (1991): 104, citing *Il Seicento Fiorentino*, vol. I, 179. Alterocca also suggested, tenuously, that Rosa painted the landscape background in Lippi's *Esau e Giacobbe* (Florence, Oratorio di S. Benedetto Bianco). Alterocca, *ibid*, 194-195. D'Afflitto concurs with Pagliarulo and Contini's suggestion that a figure in Lippi's *Flagellation of Christ at the Column* (Pisa, Madonna dei Galletti; painted for Ascanio della Penna) (the figure on the right, with a turban and black beard) is a possible portrait of Rosa. She also considers that Rosa, a good friend of Penna's, may have helped Lippi secure the commission itself. D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 231. Lippi also painted a portrait of Evangelista Torricelli in 1647, although it has not been traced. D'Afflitto, *ibid*, 357.

showed him looking out at those who admire him."[71] (Perhaps in a manner akin to Lippi's own "friendly" gaze in his *Self-portrait* of (late 1640's, Corridoio Vasariano, Florence)[72].) With a noble and confident appearance (reminiscent of many of Rosa's own self-images), Rosa's identity is here created in a literal sense by Lippi himself, who becomes in the act the first of Rosa's "admirers" – an idea consistent with my interpretation of the name "*Percossi*", which I discuss below, as an expression of the mutual "infatuation" with Rosa that informs the academy's purpose.

Both anecdotes exemplify the biographical trope designed to highlight the most salient aspect of an artist's talents: Rosa the landscapist and Lippi the figurative painter, for example. But they also operate on a more genuine level as demonstrations of the kinds of exchanges that actually took place between Rosa and his friends, and the way in which that commerce could literally embody the relational processes that informed the making of individual identities. By lending Lippi his talents as a landscapist, Rosa literally injects himself – in his most readily recognizable persona – into Lippi's painting. By painting Rosa's portrait, Lippi returns the favour with an artistic act of memorialisation that, expressive of Lippi's own talents as a figurative painter is also, in another reading, an exemplary instance of social self-creation. Produced in the company of Florence's intellectual elite (two of them members of the *Percossi*[73] and all three with court connections), Lippi's portrait is a visual document of the social procedures of self-creation that were so essential to Rosa's Florentine experience. I will return later to another significant moment of congruity

[71] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 460.
[72] For the painting see D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, cat. 107. Alterocca suggested that the *Self-portrait,* with its quality of instantaneity offers a sense of dialogue (or companionship); the viewer has a sense that the artist is "listening or speaking", as if in anticipating a response to a joke or witty remark. Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 186-7.
[73] Serenai's close friendship with Rosa is evidenced in his own letters (see Borelli, letters 58, 60 and 67) and in the correspondence between them (and Giulio Maffei) concerning the final testament of their mutual friend Evangelista Torricelli. BNCF MS Gal. 131, *Discepoli di Galileo Tomo XXI, Torricelli Evangelista, Volume 1, Vita e Documenti. Notizie raccolte da Gio. Batta Nelli per servire alla vita del Torricelli*, 50-1, and MS Gal. 132, 154-9.

between Rosa and Lippi, in the context of two paintings on the subject of courtly deceit and academic freedom.

In addition to Lippi, there are two other Tuscan artists who, while they may not have participated in the activities of Rosa's private academy, likely exerted a significant impact on his work. The significance of Rosa's personal and professional relationships with Giovanni Martinelli (c. 1604-1659) and Baldassare Franceschini ("Il Volterrano") (1611-1690) has received little if any scholarly attention, despite the fact that (in Volterrano's case at least) Rosa's letters indicate a particular closeness. Martinelli, who worked mainly in the Tuscan vein of luminous and allegorical subjects, may have been in close contact with Lippi on a personal level, and could have been on familiar terms with Rosa.[74] Rosa's letters suggest the sincerity of his relationship with Baldassare Franceschini.[75] One of Rosa's letters from 1653 offers an insight into their respective opinions on the subject of art. Franceschini had come to visit Rosa in Rome, and the two men took a trip together to see St. Peter's. While they shared an appreciation for the edifice of the basilica itself, they disagreed over matters of painting. Unlike Rosa, Franceschini was "partial to a certain dryness [*seccagine*]" of style, and did not seem to like anything other than the work of Pietro da Cortona – an artist toward whom Rosa had earlier expressed disdain in his satire on painting, *La Pittura*

---

[74] Fiorella Sricchia, "Giovanni Martinelli," *Paragone* 39 (1953): 31. Rodolfo Maffeis also noted certain formal connections between Martinelli's and Lippi's work. Maffeis, "La Pittura di Stanza," in *Storia delle arti in Toscana*, ed. Gregori, 73-75. On Martinelli, see Antonella Nesi, "Un'aggiunta al catalogo di Giovanni Martinelli," *Paragone* 457 (1988): 62-65; D'Afflitto, "Giovanni Martinelli," in *Il Seicento Fiorentino*. Biografie, 114-11; Giuseppe Cantelli, "Proposte per Giovanni Martinelli," *Paradigma* 2 (1978): 143-145; Silvano Del Vita, *Giovanni Martinelli: un pittore emergente del Seicento Fiorentino* (Montevarchi 1600 - Firenze 1659), in *Memorie Valdarnesi*, Anno 165, Serie VII, 1999-2000, Fascicolo XII (Montevarchi, Accademia Valdarnese del Poggio, 2000). Langdon noted that Rosa's *Allegory of Music* [Fig. 18] revealed a debt to Martinelli and Lippi, while Volpi noted the close resonance between Rosa's allegories of *Poetry* and *Music* [Figs. 19 and 18] with Martinelli's portraiture. Langdon, *Salvator Rosa: His Ideas and Development*, 151; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 34. It is perhaps informative to compare a painting like Martinelli's *Allegory of Astrology* (c. 1640, Collezione Koelliker) [Fig. 194] with Rosa's own allegorical subjects of his Florentine years, in particular his portrait of a poet-philosopher for Ricciardi (c. 1656?, New York, Metropolitan Museum) [Fig. 64]. For Martinelli's painting, see Chiara D'Afflitto, in *Pittura Fiorentina XVII secolo, Collezione Koelliker*, ed. Mina Gregori (Turin: Camedda & C., 2005), 50-51.

[75] See Borelli, letters 58, 60, 61, 67, 70, 73, 162, 164, 168, 363. Franceschini also appears to have been friends with Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei. That the "Signor Baldassare" of Rosa's letters is Franceschini is evident from four letters of 1650 and 1653 where he is described a painter from Volterra.

(1650).[76] On other occasions, however, Rosa and Franceschini voiced their mutual admiration for each other's work.[77] They shared an interest in caricature, and a taste for moral-allegorical subjects: Ricciardi wrote a poem in honour of one of Franceschini's more serious paintings on the theme of "*Quiete*".[78] A poem by Antonio Malatesti recently discovered by Eva Struhal, which begins "O Baldassari, che non solo hai volto", refers to the frequent, likely informal, meetings between Lippi, Rosa and Giovanni Battista Vanni in Franceschini's studio.[79] Franceschini's friendship with Rosa continued after he returned to Rome: the Volterran (who was also close friends with the Maffei family)[80] often lent his expertise in assisting Rosa with his requests for materials and colours, and carried out "retouchings" of copies of Rosa's paintings that were sent to Florence from Rome.[81] Like Martinelli, Franceschini was also a proponent of the popular Florentine vein of allegorical and philosophical painting that exerted a profound influence on Rosa. The philosophical subjects of a number of Franceschini's paintings for the art dealer Francesco Cordini (who was also Rosa's friend and dealer) may suggest his more intimate involvement in the circle of Rosa's own academy.[82]

---

[76] Borelli, letter 162: "… essendoseli attaccato un certo che di seccagine. Né dimostra piacerli altra robba che quella di Pietro da Cortona: ma che si vuol fare." *La Pittura*, vv. 217-225; in Romei, *Satire*, 102-103, 265. On the date of the satire to 1650 rather than the alternatively proposed 1640-42, see Roworth, "A Date for Salvator Rosa's Satire on Painting and the *Bamboccianti* in Rome," *Art Bulletin* 63: 4 (1981): 611-617.

[77] See Borelli, letters 70 and 363.

[78] For Franceschini's caricatures, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 5: 151. On his fresco of "Quiete", part of a decorative program for Vincenzo Giraldi's palace on the Via de' Ginori, see Baldinucci, *ibid*, 170-1; Ricciardi's "Versi di Gio. B[a] Ricciardi, per una pittura" is BNCF MS Poligrafo Gargani 1686 – Riccia-Ricciardi: (6 luglio 1899), sheet 179.

[79] See Appendix IV.3. Struhal notes that the intention of Malatesti's poem "is to secure Baldassare's [and Rosa's and Vanni's] support against Don Tarsia, a worthless painter whom he condescendingly calls a decorator of kitchenware." Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements"; Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 264-266. The poem is also "an invaluable source for explaining the astonishing co-existence of highly heterogeneous artistic styles in an intricate social network of friendships among Florentine artists." Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 266.

[80] On Franceschini's relations with the Maffei, see L. Pescetti, "Lettere inedite di Baldassare Franceschini, pittore volterrano (1611-1689)," *Rassegna volterrana* VIII: 13 (1934): 27-46.

[81] During his stay at Monterufoli in 1650, Rosa wrote to Giulio Maffei, asking him to procure a particular kind of yellow pigment for him, and he relies on Franceschini's expertise in order to acquire it. Borelli, letter 62. In a letter of 1651, discussing Francesco Cordini's potentially unauthorized manufacture of copies of Rosa's *Pan and Syrinx* [Fig. 37] Rosa mentions that Franceschini had executed "retouchings" for these copies. Borelli, letter 86.

[82] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 66; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 5: 158. The close similarity of Rosa's recently attributed *Penitent Magdalene* (Collezione Koelliker) [Fig. 17] to two *Sibyls* by Franceschini

II.3. The *Accademia dei Percossi* as a "Place Apart": The Ideal of *Academia* as Refuge, Retreat and Rebellion

Both Baldinucci's and Passeri's accounts of Rosa's run-in with Bernini present the move to Florence as one characterized by hope and possibility. In Passeri's narrative, Rosa's introduction to Florence is portrayed as an outcome of his rivalry with Bernini, and the city itself is offered as a place for the salvation and resurrection of Rosa's reputation. Rosa's biographers present his move to Florence as inspired by a twin motivation of escape and opportunity, although modern scholars continue to debate whether or not Rosa was spurred in his move by a desire to "flee" Rome.[83] The "escapism" with which I am interested here, however, concerns less a pragmatic reality than an academic ideal – that broader, philosophical notion of freedom that consists of equal parts social contempt and leisurely diversion, and a key aspect of Rosa's conception of the liberated academic space. The surviving documentation of Rosa's Florentine experience provides ample evidence that he considered Florence (in particular that second, private academic Florence) in much the same way as his biographers presented it: as a significant turning point in both his personal and professional life, and as a place of both refuge and rejuvenation.[84]

(Collezione Conte Gaddo della Gherardesca, Florence) [Figs. 137 and 138] also points to a possible stylistic influence between the two artists. Safarik has dated Rosa's Magdalen to the "early years of the 1640's. Safarik, in *Mola e il suo tempo. Pittura di figura dalla Collezione Koelliker*, ed. Petrucci. Exhibition catalogue. (Ariccia: Palazzo Chigi, 2005), 130-131. Franceschini's *Sibyls* have been dated, tentatively, to 1671, on the basis of a correspondence of the pose of the two figures' heads with that of the kneeling female figure in the altarpiece of San Filippo Benizzi in the Annunziata, a work executed around that same year. *Mostra dei Tesori Segreti delle Case Fiorentine* (Florence: Comitato Femminile della C. R. I. e dal Circolo Borghese e della Stampa a Beneficio della Croce Rossa Italiana di Firenze, 1960), 47. Rosa's *Magdalen* also shows a debt to Guido Reni's paintings of female saints, and here it is worth noting that there was a copy of "una donna di Guido" among the paintings listed in Rosa's inventory. Inventory of Salvator Rosa, March 17 1673, ASR MS Archivio Capitolino, Auditor Camerae Notari AC 1671-1678, sez. 45 tomo 71 Tomaso Paulutius. C. 665-667, published by Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 96-7.

[83] Fumagalli disputes the suggestion that Rosa's departure was an "escape" from Rome. Scott had offered in evidence of Rosa's "escape [from] the persecution of his enemies" a passage from a letter by Francesco Mantovani (dated April 27 1641) to Francesco I d'Este in Modena. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 27. Fumagalli considers this an erroneous interpretation of the letter, derived from a note in Venturi, *La Real Galleria Estense in Modena*, 221. For the letter, see Jadranka Bentini, *Sovrane Passioni. Studi sul collezionismo estense*, 150, doc. 16.

[84] I am not the first to suggest that the *Percossi* was devised as a space of liberty. D'Afflitto, for example, noted that their comedies under the "benevolent protection" of Gian'Carlo "constituted a decisive occasion for escape from the political and social conformism of the court." D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 93.

The academy that Rosa founded and hosted in his house, physically removed from the court (but comprised of courtiers), was nurtured by Rosa and his friends as its ideal alternative. The *Percossi* is best understood as a *conversazione* or gathering of friends – a particular brand of private academy conceived as an informal group or network "of literary associates and friends" or a "sodality of scholars with shared interests who set store upon regular meetings and contacts with one another."[85] Characterized by a relative lack of formality, an often diverse membership, and a prevailing interest in stylistic concerns and the display of wit and novelty, this new type of academy usually met in the founder's home or in the house of a patron, and used the term *academia* as "a kind of vague synonym of *arte*, or *compagnia*, or *università*".[86] A veritable "microcosm" of "Italian sociability … formality, order and hierarchy," the *conversazione* was a highly performative space (given literal form in the theatrical pursuits of the *Percossi*), subject to the same "pressures of personal exhibition" as other social contexts.[87] The ostensible sense of "escape" it offered was largely an ideal. The illusion of this escape, however, was vital to maintain in the service of Rosa's independence, and numerous comments by Rosa, his friends, and his biographers suggest their conviction in this concept. This faith is particularly evident in the letters Rosa wrote to his Tuscan

---

[85] Chambers, "The Earlier 'Academies' in Italy," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger (London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995), 6, 13. Baldinucci described the *Percossi* as originating in a small gathering of friends who met in order to enjoy each other's company and conversation, and who "in a short time … decided to give themselves the form of an academy, under the name of *Percossi*." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 451. Many of the academies of the sixteenth century, and increasingly in the seventeenth century, began as informal gatherings of friends, including the *Svogliati*, the *Crusca*, the *Apatisti*, the Roman *Umoristi* (which Rosa himself participated in), and the *Accademia Veneziana*.
[86] Nikolaus Pevsner, *Academies of Art, Past and Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 72-77; Freitas, "Singing and Playing," 514. The diversity of professions that characterized the membership of the *Percossi* was more generally typical of other academic *conversazioni*, founded as alternatives to the institutional or guild-based associations of preceding generations. Hermann Schlimme, "Between Architecture, science and technology: the Accademia della Vachia in Florence, 1661-1662," in *Practice and Science in Early Modern Italian Building. Towards an Epistemic History of Architecture* (Milan: Electa, 2006), 61. Like the *Percossi*, the *Vachia* was "a forum where people of different professional backgrounds collaborated." Pevsner distinguished *conversazioni* from the institutional academies of the previous generation, characterized by "ambitious social aims," although a version of the same objective is present among many of Rosa's academic colleagues, and forms a central component of the *Percossi*'s own mission. Pevsner, *ibid*, 72-77.
[87] Elias, *The Court Society*, 53. The *conversazione* was "one of the most important venues for this kind of performance…aristocratic leisure time was among the most scrutinized by social peers and rivals." Freitas, "Singing and Playing," 511.

friends after returning to Rome which are filled with expressions of longing for the self-centered space of freedom he so sorely missed.

Rome is not Florence: Rosa's Nostalgia for the *Percossi*

The *Percossi*'s meetings effectively ended when Rosa left for Rome at the end of 1648. After he returned to Rome, he received many visits from his Tuscan friends, and returned to Florence and Volterra on at least three (but probably more) occasions.[88] Baldinucci mentions only the visit of 1661, when Rosa returned to Florence in April, along with Lucrezia and Augusto, to attend the wedding of Cosimo III de' Medici (1642-1723) and the Princess Marguerite Louise d'Orléans. On his return, Rosa's friends clamoured for his attention and invited him to stay at their homes, but he eventually decided to lodge with Paolo Minucci and to spend some time with Ricciardi at his villa at Strozzavolpe, near Poggibonsi.[89] Rosa's letters to Tuscan friends are filled with expressions of affection for his old *conversazione* and its intellectual stimulation. Even if (as Passeri might have us believe) Rosa desired ultimately to extricate himself from the court-dominated atmosphere of Florence, he lamented at the same time leaving behind friendships that had become so important to him. Some of his letters even express a longing for the city of Florence itself.[90] In 1661, Rosa reminds Ricciardi that there is "nothing more important in the world" than to

---

[88] Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini," 78. Rosa's friends also took pains to keep in touch with him. Andrea Cavalcanti appears to have acted as a conduit for a period between Rosa and Florentine friends like Carlo Dati. BNCF MS Baldov. 258 III 7, letters of February 14, 1650 and October 29 1651. In 1650 Rosa was in Pisa and Monterufoli; in 1659 he was again in Pisa visiting Ricciardi; and in 1661 he was at Ricciardi's villa at Strozzavolpe.

[89] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 498. At the request of friends, Rosa apparently extended his stay to almost a year.

[90] In a letter to Giulio Maffei of February 1649, for example, written only just after returning to Rome, Rosa writes of being "a little down on my luck" and having "an oppressed, bound spirit." Borelli, letter 23. In a letter to Giulio of 1653, Rosa recalls with fondness the football matches held in the piazza of Santa Croce. Borelli, letter 160. On other occasions, Rosa repeatedly reminds Ricciardi of his craving for the regional Tuscan wine, using its quality of *terroir* or "sense of place" to symbolize his longing for his Florentine sodalities of years past: "Scrivetemi … come il vino vi riesce, havendo in mano mezzo un carratello di Caprarola che ne incaca il Monte Pulciano, e quanti Chianti si trovano, a segno tale che la Signora Lucretia ogni volta che si vede l'anfora in mano si crede d'essere a Fiorenza", he writes to Ricciardi of 1652. Borelli, letter 141. Rosa's partiality for, and association of friendship with, the wine of Florence is also made apparent in another, much later letter to Ricciardi of 1666, in which he says he will drink a toast to his Florentine friends, "tutto ch'el vino non sia di Fiorenza". Borelli, letter 328. Rosa's expressions of longing for his Florentine friends were intended partly in the service of

come and visit Florence (and above all to see Ricciardi and his Florentine friends) again.[91] He often asks after the "Gentlemen of the Academy" in his letters to Ricciardi – a probable reference to Ricciardi's own academic association in Pisa which included Rosa's friends, but a comment that hints at his desire for continued inclusion in that group.[92]

The importance of place for Rosa in connection with friendship is significant both in terms of the contrast he makes between Tuscany and Rome and the distinction he often draws between the crowded city and the liberating countryside.[93] This contrast features in certain of Rosa's enigmatic Florentine landscape paintings, such as the *Ponte Rotto* (c. 1645-8, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 33] he painted for Ricciardi, where two figures deliberate over whether to follow a path across a crumbling bridge into the unseen wilderness or to take the road toward the city in the distance.[94] In

---

flattering and maintaining those relationships, and Rome was important to Rosa as a place of friends, even it was not the same kind of experience. See my discussion in chapter five. In a letter to Ricciardi of February 1666, Rosa showed his approval of the urban renovations taking place in the city, encouraging his friend to visit him there. Borelli, letter 318.

[91] Borelli, letter 244.

[92] See Borelli, letters 52, 126 and 127. In a letter of March 1652, Rosa laments being excluded (in the role of Coviello Patacca) from his friends' comedies. Borelli, letter 126. Ricciardi also had his own group of academic friends in Pisa among the *Accademia degli Stravaganti*, for whom he composed a number of comedies. See Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 242. The group, which seems to have met at Ricciardi's house, was likely constituted in part by various of the remaining members of the *Percossi*. In a letter to Giulio Maffei in Volterra, dated May 18 1650 (Borelli, letter 56) Rosa explains that he will have to detain himself a little longer in Rome in order to see a comedy by "some Cavalieri of this city", possibly a recital which was presented on May 22, the Sunday that followed Rosa's letter to Giulio, by the *Stravaganti* which had among its members two friends of Ricciardi's, Caspar Leoli and Giulio Pesciolini. See Borelli, letter 56, note 1. On the *Stravaganti*, see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 5: 272-274; on Ricciardi's theatrical interests, see N. di Muro, "Il teatro di Giovanni Battista Ricciardi (1623-1686). Il linguaggio comico del Trespolo," *Biblioteca teatrale* 49/51 (1999): 145-193.

[93] Rosa frequently contrasts the irritations of the city and urban life to the delights of the countryside (especially the Volterran villas). See Borelli, letters 3, 94, 240 and 252. The contrast became increasingly common in his later letters, during his repeated illnesses. See letters 254, 325, 328, 330, 369, 375, 381, and 386. The "pestilential" atmosphere of Rome had earlier been a cause of concern for Rosa due to the actual experience of plague in that city from the summer of 1656 to 1657. On the Roman plague, see letters 198, 202, 209, 210, 211, 216.

[94] The painting has been interpreted as a pictorial commentary in which alternative forms of landscape become metaphors for moral choice. Di Montauto, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 164, cat. 12. A similar motif appears in the enigmatic *Lo Spavento* (c. 1645-48?, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 26], whose two conversant philosophers appear to discuss the superiority of experience over knowledge, advising a *contadino* to take a secure path through the landscape rather than a more dangerous one. Salerno, *L'Opera completa di Salvator Rosa* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1975), cat. 71; and Montauto, *ibid*, 158, cat. 9.

his letters Rosa is beckoned not only by the produce of the Tuscan vine, but the very air of the region continues to tantalize him from Rome – that "cursed" and "pestilential" land of "Babylon".[95]

Rosa's negative academic experiences in Rome in the 1650's also underscored the value of his Tuscan friendships, and his epistolary comments show that both the reality and ideal of his Florentine experience presented a standard by which all successive academic relationships were to be judged. Rosa belonged to a number of academies in Rome, including the *Fantastici* (the Imaginative), the *Intrecciati* (the Interwoven), the *Umoristi* (the Humorists), and the *Accademia di San Luca*.[96] The antagonistic persona that Rosa had found acceptance for in Florence garnered only resentment among these Roman academics – a resentment that *he* considered to be based in an envy of his talents. The members of the semi-official literary *Umoristi* accused Rosa of plagiarizing his satires from other authors (among them his brother Giuseppe and his friend Ricciardi),[97] and the

---

[95] See Borelli, letters 235 and 230.

[96] For Rosa's membership in the *Fantastici* see Borelli, letter 161. On the *Fantastici*, see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 2: 346-8. Other members of the *Intrecciati*, a literary academy sponsored by Cardinal Brancaccio, also included Rosa's friends Passeri, Antonio Abati, Jacob Alban Gibbes, Filippo Ghirardelli, and Agostino Favoriti. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 128-9; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 45; G. Carpano, *Fasti dell'Accademia degl' Intrecciati* (Rome, 1673). On the *Intrecciati*, see Maylender, *ibid*, 3: 336-338. Agostino Favoriti and Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio were also members; in 1652 Brancaccio was president of the academy. Volpi cites in evidence of Rosa's frequentation of Rome (and its academies) during his Florentine sojourn a poem by the artist, a *Sonetto sopra il luogo, dove morì Giuda*, which he read to the *Intrecciati* at a meeting on April 5 1645 at which Abati was also present. Volpi, *ibid*, 128. Rosa was listed as a member of the *Accademia di San Luca* in 1651, together with Poussin, Velasquez, Bernini, Sandrart, Algardi and Claude. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 369, note 82; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 103; G. J. Hoogewerff, *Bescheiden in Italie* ii (1913): 129-130; M. Missirini, *Memorie … della Romana Accademia di S. Luca* (1823), 472.

[97] Rosa's letters of these years are filled with comments on his experiences at the *Umoristi*, founded in 1603 by Paolo Mancini under the protection of Cardinal Francesco Barberini. Members of the academy during Rosa's time included Passeri, Carlo Bentivoglio, Francesco Melosio, Agostino Favoriti, Giovan Francesco Savaro del Pizzo, Giovan Filippo Ghirardelli, and Orazio Quaranta. See Borelli, letters 46, 48, 129, 175, 176, 292. Rosa recited a composition to the *Umoristi* in 1650 and was invited to read his satire *Timone* at the next Carnival, omitting, however, certain "licentious" passages. Borelli, letter 47. By 1652 their relations had soured dramatically, and he wrote to Ricciardi of their accusations that he had plagiarized his satires from Ricciardi or his own brother Giuseppe. Borelli, letters 153, 175-177. In 1654 he recited his satire *Invidia* (1652-3) at the request of Camillo Rubiera, a poet from Modena, the subject of which treated his "sufferings" at the hands of his critics (especially Favoriti and Savaro) and inspired Rubiera to come to his defense. Borelli, letter 177. Favoriti (1624-1682), a writer, poet and secretary to Cardinal Flavio Chigi, had been a good friend of Rosa's who recited a sonnet in praise of one of his battle scenes at the *Accademia degli Intrecciati* in 1651. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 104; Borelli, letter 176. He used the pseudonym "Ippolito Sciribandolo", under which he wrote a pamphlet criticizing Ghirardelli's play *Il Costantino* (1652), which had been performed in February 1653 and for which Rosa had provided the etched frontispiece. Rosa became embroiled in the argument between Ghirardelli, Favoriti, Savaro (who Rosa calls "Partenio" in his letters and the *Invidia*). Borelli, letter 175. In James Alban Gibbes' *Carminum Iacobi Albani Ghibbesii, Pars Lyrica* of 1668 (for which Rosa also supplied the frontispiece) the author dedicates

artistic community of Rome, represented by the *Accademia di San Luca*, scoffed at what they perceived to be an arrogant and self-indulgent attitude: jibing at the academy (probably in 1652[98]) for refusing to admit a talented surgeon-painter, Rosa sneered that they had overlooked a potential member who could "cure their distortions [*stroppiature*]."[99] Once again, in Rosa's mind, the public denigration of these Roman academics were expressive of envy rather than the result of any hostile provocation on his own part, and he responded by exhibiting at the Pantheon the following March a painting of a rock, hoping that his jealous critics might break their teeth on it.[100] The experience of these academies, many of them more formally structured and regulated than his own, in combination with the more competitive atmosphere of Rome itself, presented Rosa with a frustrating and ultimately unsatisfactory alternative to the egalitarian and self-centered brand of academic *conversazione* he had found among the *Percossi*.

Reconciling Rebellion with Conformity: The Function of the Private *Conversazione*

The ostensible freedom of the *Percossi* was manifested in a number of ways: it was geographically separate from the Medici *palazzi* (a distinction made even more profound in the

---

a poem to Rosa that is inspired by the same spirit of vitriolic diatribe against common detractors. His reference to Rosa's depiction of "the loathsome face of Zoilus" may be an allusion to Rosa's earlier attack on Favoriti. As Langdon notes, "this kind of personal attack is rare in Rosa's satires." See Langdon, "Two Book Illustrations," 698-99. On the dispute, see Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 104-8; Limentani, "La Satira dell'Invidia di Salvator Rosa e una polemica letteraria del Seicento," *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 134 (1957): 570-585. The argument culminated in 1654 with the circulation of two anonymous pamphlets accusing Rosa of plagiarism and of being an atheist, denouncing his unlawful relationship with Lucrezia. Scott, *ibid*, 105. On the *Umoristi*, see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 5: 370-381.

[98] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 102-103.

[99] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 442. Scott suggested the reference to the curing of handicaps (*stroppiature* indicates "crippling" or "distorted limbs") was particularly meaningful in view of the widespread criticism of Rosa's inability to paint nude figures. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 103. The comment apparently spread like wildfire among the artists in Rome who, taking great offense, conspired against Rosa with nasty comments about both his person and his work to the point that, Baldinucci says, they also blocked him from gaining any public commissions. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 442; for the art-theoretical implications of Rosa's comment in the context of contemporary ideas about depicting the human form, see Philip Sohm, "Baroque Piles and Other Decompositions," in *Warburg Institute Colloquia, 6. Pictorial Composition from Medieval to Modern Art*, ed. P. Taylor and F. Quiviger (London and Turin, 2000), 58-90. In addition to condemning, perhaps, his colleagues' Mannerist proclivities, Rosa may also have mocked the academic mode of artistic instruction in which the "dismembered" body parts that comprised instructional manuals "were intended as building blocks for…a step-by-step method of rote learning." Sohm, *ibid*, 74.

[100] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 442.

gatherings in Volterra and the surrounding villas of the Maffei and Ricciardi); it was relatively unregulated and free in its administrative structure[101]); it was privately funded (primarily from Rosa's own pocket but also from the contributions of other members[102]); it was characterized and promoted as a place of philosophical escape and retreat; and its activities were all aimed at promoting liberty and inspiration via friendship. The activity of theatrical performance among the *Percossi* (as in other, later theatrical academies like the *Infuocati* and *Immobili* which were also sponsored by Cardinal Gian' Carlo) provided an important link between the academic and courtly realms of Florentine life.[103] An important difference between the theatrical productions of these academies and those of the *Percossi*, however, was that the former were conducted by organizations solely reliant upon the financial support of their protector, and were staged primarily as elaborate instruments of propaganda for the Medici.[104] The *Percossi*, conversely, was not entirely dependent on the financial support of Gian' Carlo, and its satiric-comedic performances were aimed (in large part) at the promotion of the personal agenda of both the academy and its host.

Academies of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries varied widely in their degree of attachment to state sponsorship. While the development of the private *conversazioni* suggests the possibility for an academic space increasingly detached from authoritative control, the state-sponsored academy – defined by Amadeo Quondam as a "a celebratory machine that formed part of the theatrical scenery of the Court"[105] – continued to prevail into the late seventeenth century.[106] A

---

[101] Quondam, *La Funzione delle Accademie nella Cultura Odierna*. Accademia Spoletina. Atti del Convegno organizzato per il V Centenario della fondazione dell'Accademia (1477-1977). Spoleto, Palazzo Ancaiani, 10 dicembre 1977 (Spoleto: Edizioni dell'Accademia Spoletina, 1979), 24.
[102] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453.
[103] Acton, *The Last Medici*, 50, 78. The *Immobili* were founded by Gian' Carlo in 1649 and housed in what is now the famous Teatro della Pergola, while the *Infuocati* were sponsored by Don Lorenzo, who provided them with a house on the Via del Cocomero (now via Ricasoli) for their meetings and performances. On the *Immobili*, see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 3: 162. On the *Infuocati*, see Maylender, *ibid*, 3: 279-80. Also see William Holmes, *Opera Observed. Views of a Florentine Impresario in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 13-14.
[104] Holmes, *Opera Observed*, 9; Piperno, "Opera Production to 1780," in *Opera Production and its Resources*, ed. Lorenzo Bianconi and Giorgio Pestelli, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
[105] Quondam, *La Funzione delle Accademie*, 25.

sense of freedom came to be an important and defining feature of the *conversazione*, hosted in the private homes of founding members and characterized by the ideals of philosophical amity. Indeed, Rosa was not the only member of the *Percossi* whose attitude suggests a desire to promote this particular academic principle. The *Crusca*, to which a number of the members of the *Percossi* belonged, had both independence from authority and friendship as its founding principles.[107] The same is true of the Roman *Accademia dei Lincei* (founded 1603), whose founder Federico Cesi built friendship and autonomy from the court into the statutes of the academy itself. Cesi's own professed loathing for the artefice and deception of courtiership – a role that he regarded as adverse to the mastery and perfection of knowledge – was tempered, however, by an awareness of the continuing necessity to appease those same authorities.[108] For all academies, private or state-sponsored, this freedom was still circumscribed by a need to participate in the enduring social brand of self-fashioning, dominated by aristocratic ideals. Taking as a principle Foucault's theory that

---

[106] Cochrane noted that the Florentine academies of the sixteenth century developed alongside "the triumph of political absolutism and the collapse of the urban republics". In the early part of that century, most of the academies, which were "modeled on the Accademia Fiorentina," had appeared "in all the cities of Tuscany under the direct or indirect sponsorship of the government." Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 29-32. The state-run academies of the seventeenth-century are epitomized in perhaps their most extreme form by the French Academy of Paris. Heavily controlled by the state, the French Academy was dominated by the quasi-dictatorial Jean-Baptiste Colbert who commanded in 1663 that all court painters join the academy at the price of losing their rights. Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 88-9, 109.

[107] Dati, Chimentelli, Torricelli and Bandinelli were all members of the *Crusca*. See J. R. Woodhouse, "Borghini and the Foundation of the Accademia della Crusca," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chamber and Quiviger, 165, who notes that the *Crusca* emerged from an "independent group of individuals attempting to avoid the constriction of a conservative academic and political strait-jacket." The success of the *Crusca* is a rather unique instance of "private cooperative enterprise"; the *Vocabolario*, for instance, was only published via the "individual subscriptions of its own members" rather than with the assistance of state sponsorship.

[108] Outspoken in his antagonism toward the papal court, Cesi favoured an ideal modeled on monastic isolation and study. He wrote to the mathematician Francesco Stelluti: "'I live alone as a hermit, shut up continuously in my cell. … I loathe the court and courtiers like the plague, as they are all traitors.'" Inspired by the Oratorians, "he described the *Lincei* as a *congregatione*, stressing the importance of love among the fellows." Antonio Clericuzio and Silvia de Renzi, "Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy in the Early Accademia dei Lincei," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 177, 179, citing Gabrieli, "Il Carteggio Linceo", 36-41. Also see Dooley, *Italy in the Baroque. Selected Readings* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1995), 24. In his "Free Inquiry and the Accademia dei Lincei" (1616), Cesi claimed that courtiership consisted only in the display of a *semblance* of knowledge, so it was an impediment for men seeking to perfect their knowledge. He connected friendship among academics to the acquisition of knowledge and freedom from the Court. Dooley, *ibid*, 24-37. However, he also acknowledged that the spirit of camaraderie and cooperation fostered among members "will benefit the public and princes alike", recognizing the enduring requirement to participate in and to appease the state.

"[p]ower is constituted in the social exchanges and relays between, and among, individuals and corporate groups," Barzman has argued that the image of liberty and independence granted to Giorgio Vasari and his *Accademia del Disegno* should be seen instead as an experience of attachment to the sponsorship of a patron, Cosimo I de' Medici (1519-1574).[109] Among the *Percossi*, the discourse and rituals of friendship that grant individuals a sense of self-agency are actively cultivated in order to mitigate a continued reliance on court association. In an academy managed by friends, who also happen to be courtiers, Rosa's distinctively antagonistic brand of autonomy is free to assert itself – even in the form of satirical commentary on the court itself.

Academies of the *seicento* also continued to profit from the assistance of wealthy patrons.[110] Rosa's biographers make clear the importance of Gian' Carlo's sponsorship of the *Percossi*'s theatrical performances,[111] and a line in Rovai's poem to the "Improvvisi" suggests the significance of the Cardinal's involvement in their activities, as well as the members' acknowledgement of its import: "Praise a vigorous Young Man to inspiration,/ who RULES OVER [SIGNOREGGIA] every extemporist."[112] The line is in keeping with the kind of praise customarily directed toward an illustrious patron, and perhaps Gian' Carlo was present at the meeting when Rovai recited his poem to the academy. Rovai's use of the bold-letter "SIGNOREGGIA," however, aligns Gian' Carlo with other members of the academy who are given similar name-based epithets in the poem, suggesting perhaps that the Cardinal played a more active role in the group.[113]

---

[109] Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 31.
[110] Dooley, *Italy in the Baroque*, 3.
[111] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 452.
[112] See Appendix III. 1. Scott suggested that the "Signore" was Gian' Carlo himself. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 58.
[113] The implication of Gian' Carlo "ruling over" the academicians may also have been a humorous jibe, in view of his generally relaxed approach to his position of authority: his love of leisure and extravagance was well known, and he may have shared in the *Percossi*'s vision of the academy of friends as a welcome respite from courtly pomposity. Gian' Carlo's extravagance resulted in an enormous debt of more than 135,000 *scudi* at the time of his death in 1663, at the age of 52. Mascalchi, "Giovan' Carlo de' Medici. An Outstanding but Neglected Collector in Seventeenth-Century Florence," *Apollo* CXX (1984): 268. On Gian' Carlo's "too-visible and loud licentiousness" see Acton, *The Last Medici*, 29-30, 46-47. For "all those young bloods, virtuosi, makers of mirth, the rumours of whose riotous living rendered them unacceptable to the Grand Duchess [Vittoria della Rovere]," Gian' Carlo's court was "a refuge ... from boredom" where they could join in his hunting and gambling. Like his

Most of the *Percossi* were courtiers, some more enthusiastic than others. Carlo Dati, for example, was in most respects a consummate and dedicated courtier, “endowed with an unshakeable faith in the principle of authority and in the virtues of compromise and diplomacy.”[114] Towards the end of his life he was made the official librarian of Leopoldo de’ Medici (1617-1675) and Gian’ Carlo.[115] Rosa mocked Dati for his courtly affectations, calling him the “Florentine Plato” “all decked out in velvet from head to toe, all pretension, all smoke, and eager to appear well-read in the presence of this sky”.[116] Torricelli’s close relations with the Medici, and with Leopoldo in particular, afforded him a promotion to lecture in mathematics at the *Accademia del Disegno*.[117] In 1657 Vincenzo Viviani would go on to co-found the *Accademia del Cimento* with the financial support of both Leopoldo and Ferdinando II (1610-1670).[118] Most of the other members of the *Percossi* also had, or would acquire, positions that were closely tied to a court context.[119]

The Medici patronage that facilitated Rosa’s arrival in Florence and his first professional successes in that city had also provided him with the opportunity to meet many of the men who would become members of his own academy. One may also argue that the ideal of “escape”

---

uncles Lorenzo and Cardinal Carlo, Gian’ Carlo was “dedicated to pleasure”, especially that of women and was naturally averse, even after receiving his cardinalate, to the pretences of courtly life.

[114] Perini, “Carlo Cesare Malvasia’s Florentine Letters,” 279. Dati was a loyal courtier in the service of the Medici, as well as Louis XIV of France. Repeatedly invited to the court of Queen Christina of Sweden, he prevaricated over the invitation until she abdicated her throne in 1654. Vigilante, “Carlo Roberto Dati”, 25.

[115] Vigilante, “Carlo Roberto Dati,” 27. Dati also replaced Volunnio Bandinelli as tutor of Cosimo III de’ Medici.

[116] Borelli, letter 115: “Già comparse il fiorentino Platone tutto vellutato dal capo a’ piedi, tutto pretensione, tutto fumo, e finalmente tutto avido di comparir letterato al cospetto di questo cielo.” Rosa mocked Dati’s pretentiousness in another letter to Ricciardi of the same month. Borelli, letter 117.

[117] Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 95. Torricelli “must have been teaching [at the Accademia del Disegno] by 1645; his name appears in an entry of October 1646, when his ‘reappointment’ was confirmed for yet another year.” He was also made the “chief philosopher and mathematician” to Ferdinando II. Acton, *The Last Medici*, 37.

[118] Other *Percossi* and friends of Rosa who joined the *Cimento* included Dati, Redi, and Lorenzo Magalotti.

[119] Salvetti would become a prominent court musician and music teacher to Ferdinando II; (see Hill, “Antonio Veracini in Context,” 549-550); Marucelli was an Abbot and “resident with the Most Christian King for the Most Serene Grand Duke”, as well as his Secretary of State; Vendramin, as the Venetian ambassador in Florence, was by virtue of his position active at the Medici court; Apolloni would later work in the household of Cardinal Flavio Chigi (1631-1693), nephew of Pope Alexander VII; Bandinelli would become the tutor of Cosimo III de’ Medici (see Acton, *The Last Medici*, 44), and Minucci was the secretary of Mattias de’ Medici (1613-1667).

offered by the private *conversazione* was impossible without the reality of courtly obligation ever-present in the background. The influence and control of the court was a ponderous and conflicted issue for Rosa, whose philosophical principles required him to disdain it while relying on its support for economic and reputational profit. As an alternative to the existing professional structure, Rosa's private *conversazione* was also in many ways based upon and intimately connected to that same paradigm.

The Imagery of Philosophical Salvation: The Academy and Villa as Utopia

The ideal of the academy as a form of philosophical sanctuary held a strong appeal for Rosa's contemporaries. It is part of the history of the art academy in particular as an institutional manifestation of the creative rights and independence of the artist, freed from the constraints of guilds and traditional patronage.[120] But it was also taken up by other types of early-modern academies. Cesi, for example, promoted the scientific *Accademia dei Lincei* as a kind of utopian idyll or refuge.[121] This was the same brand of escapism that appealed to Rosa and his friends – an ideal of intellectual leisure in a space both superior to and removed from the multitude. For Rosa, the cultivation of the utopian academic ideal was also integral to his self-image as painter-philosopher. Indeed, "retreat" had long been touted as a vital pursuit of the artist-philosopher who, according to Leonardo, should seek out only the company of friends who shared his intellectual interests or otherwise resign himself to spending time alone.[122]

This form of academic escapism has close parallels with the ideal cultivated among the Romantics. It is perhaps best understood in connection with Elias's definition of a more general sociological strain of "romanticism" prominent in early-modern court societies, a form related to

[120] Vasari, for example, contrasted the peaceful enjoyment of retreat in the wilderness with the "chains" of Medici patronage. Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 247.
[121] Dooley, *Italy in the Baroque*, 24-37.
[122] Edward MacCurdy ed., *The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci* (Connecticut: Konecky & Konecky, 2003), 904.

but distinct from Romanticism proper: the metaphysical ideal of idyllic escape and freedom from constraint, accompanied by a bucolic image of Nature as the paradigm of liberty.[123] Rosa's investment in this image is suggested by his biographers, the writings of his colleagues, and his own textual and pictorial production.[124] Significantly, Elias sees in the early-modern "romantic" courtier a conflict that echoes Rosa's own:

> "the illusory character of the pastoral Utopia rests ... on the fact that its representatives, while wishing to lead a simple and natural shepherd's existence opposed to life for a court aristocrat, wish at the same time to preserve all the refinements of human intercourse … that distinguished them as civilized aristocrats from the rough uncivilized shepherds. It is characteristic … of romanticism … that within it people seek to escape civilizing pressures and are unable to do so because these pressures are part of themselves."[125]

Rosa's "escapist" proclivity toward a philosophically-ascetic, utopian existence on the one hand, and his desire for the luxury, wealth and fame that only urban life can offer on the other reflects in Elias's view the more typical experience of the early-modern courtier. Rosa was not unique, then, for having both a silver basin in his bathroom and a mouth full of philosophical disdain for the riches of the world, nor for deriding his friend Dati for his fancy clothes and pretentious airs while at the same time complaining about the difficulty of finding a good servant.

The *Percossi* found their ideal escape in a variety of concepts and practices. Theatrical performance was paramount among their activities of satiric moralization and "veiled dissent"[126] toward the same court that continued to support its very practice. As I noted in chapter one, the

---

[123] This is the same image that informs, in varying ways appropriate to each period, the escapist desires of Marie Antoinette or the pastoral landscapes of Poussin and Watteau. Rosa's own work, dominated by an ideal image of Nature as a place of escape and solace, places him easily in Elias's category of "romantically inclined" courtiers for whom "the negatively valued features of the present from which they long to escape appear magnified in the foreground … In the image of the idealized people of earlier stages of development into whom they project their longings … everything that they desire, that they consider the antithesis of the unwarranted features of their own society is magnified in the foreground … The role that ideal images of bucolic life play in the court society of the *ancien regime* illustrates this function of a lost past age as an antithesis to the pressures and deficiencies of the present. The idea of the simple rustic life is often linked to the wishful image of a freedom and spontaneity that were once present and have now vanished." Elias, *The Court Society*, 225-228.

[124] Langdon detects Rosa's vision of "retreat" in his landscape paintings, in which "a new emotion, of the natural sublime, derives from the blending of a long established tradition of the *locus horrendus* or *terribilis*, with a new sense of the awesome otherness of the natural world revealed by the new science" of Athanasius Kircher, in particular. Langdon, "Claude and the Roman Landscape," 131-2; *idem*, "A Theatre of Marvels," 179-192.

[125] Elias, *The Court Society*, 264.

[126] D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 93.

cathartic and sublimative function of theatre offered a particularly salient experience of "escape".[127] The *Percossi*'s academic dinners, too, should be regarded as another liberating academic practice. Together with the composition and recital of satirical poetry – especially Rosa's work, which was characterized by a particular sense of self-righteous invective – these activities show the *Percossi*'s distinctively escapist and inspired objective, which turned on a set of related images: the Golden Age, the Mount of Parnassus, the Garden of Hesperides, the philosopher's *orto*, and the concept of solitude in friendship.

Rosa's image of academic escapism and social solitude received its strongest affirmation in the villas of the Volterran countryside, owned by the Maffei family and Rosa's friend Ricciardi.[128] According to Baldinucci, it was only when he desired to be "somewhat more by himself" (that is, free of the Medici court) that Rosa left Florence to spend time in Volterra.[129] This ideal is implicit in Rosa's late Florentine philosophical works such as the Hartford *Lucrezia as Poetry* [Fig. 11] and the two allegories of *Music* and *Poetry* [Figs. 18 and 19] which proclaim Rosa's desire to champion the "neglected arts" of poetry and music that are "forced to flourish far from the *palazzi* in the rustic

[127] See Schyberg, "The Art of Acting," 65, 68. In his *Poetics* Aristotle defended theatrical performance against Plato's criticism, by arguing for its integral social value as a form of "catharsis". Modern social theorists emphasize the social function of theatre as a "sublimation of certain social situations that idealizes them, parodies them, or calls for them to be transcended" – a simultaneous "embodiment" of social conflicts and "escape" from them. (Gurvitch, "The sociology of the theatre," *Les letters nouvelles* 35 (1956): 196-210, in *Sociology of Literature and Drama*, ed. Elizabeth and Tom Burns, trans. Petra Morrison (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 76; cited in Goodlad, "Approaches to Popular Drama through the Social Sciences", in *Western Popular Theatre*, ed. Mayer and Richards, 240. The performances of the *commedia dell'arte*, too, offered a form of escapism to their practitioners – "a kind of enchanted Cytherea where lovers never lose their happiness, and are never troubled by domesticated love or by the communion of souls or deceits in the household budget. All the inhabitants of that land lead a care-free, sprightly, and fantastic life to the accompaniment of quaint, seductive music." Duchartre, *The Italian Comedy*, 293. The idea of theatre as "release" is also reflected in Rosa's comment, as Formica, that performing may alleviate the suffering of the summer heat. Passeri, *Vite*, 421. It is also possible to see in the distinctively "liberated" and "utopian" behavior of the *zanni* genre favoured by Rosa a reference to texts on the utopian land of Cuccagna, characterized by the "gastronomic delights" that are also featured in the Percossi's *simposie*. See Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 126.

[128] On Rosa and the Maffei, see Lucio Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti". On the Volterran villas of the Maffei, see Silvano Bertini, "Sulle orme di Salvator Rosa nelle campagne volterrane," *Volterra* 1, (1972): 11-14. He identifies in Rosa's *La Pittura* an indication of his love for life in Volterra: "Sotto ogni ciel padre commune è il sole / La state all'ombra e il pigro inverno al fuoco. / Tra modesti desii l'anno mi vede / pinger per gloria e poetar per gioco." Bertini, *ibid*, 11; Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 129-132.

[129] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461.

and simple life of the countryside, in severe poverty", the same theme that pervades his satires.[130] The principle is also apparent in many of Rosa's drawings in which isolated pairs of figures sit or stroll in the idyllic countryside.[131] In one especially intriguing example, [Fig. 24] dated by Mahoney to the 1640's, Rosa depicts two figures – one of them who appears to be drawing on a large sheet of paper – accompanied by a dog (that familiar symbol of fidelity) seated on a hillock in front of a ruined building with a tall tower reminiscent of Ricciardi's villa at Strozzavolpe.[132] While he affectionately mocked the Maffei as "mountain people" [*genti di montagna*] in a letter to Ricciardi of 1652,[133] he also described the villa of Monterufoli as "the Garden of Hesperides", the "salvation of my nature", and referred to the villas collectively as a "little Parnassus" [*Parnasino*].[134] A common metaphor in the poetry and art of Rosa's contemporaries, Parnassus also appears in Rosa's satires as the cherished place of the poet's and painter's inspiration.[135]

The likelihood that Rosa extended this metaphor to the *Percossi* in Florence, too, is suggested by Baldinucci's image of the academy's meeting space as a sort of idyllic interior garden. During the winter, Rosa hosted his *conversazione* "in rooms that were overly dressed and

---

[130] Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 35, 44 note 70.
[131] See for example Mahoney, *Drawings*, nos. 21.1, 21.14, 35.1, 35.2, among others.
[132] For Ricciardi's villa, see Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 129; Aldo Arcangeli, *Il castello di Strozzavolpe* (Poggibonsi: Nencini, 1960).
[133] Borelli, letter 118. Rosa belittled the Maffei for their comparably unrefined customs, but he also noted that Giulio Maffei was "the best" of his rustic clan.
[134] Borelli, letters 22, 52, 111. The Garden of Hesperides was Hera's orchard of immortality-granting apple trees, guarded by a hundred-headed dragon named Ladon. Rosa also refers to Strozzavolpe as "Constantinople". Borelli, letter 228.
[135] It appears in *La Poesia* and in the late and decidedly pessimistic *Il Tirreno* of 1657 it is made the place of the painter's moral righteousness and invective from which he preaches with his paint-brushes. Rosa, *La Poesia*, vv. 93-100 and v. 864; *Il Tirreno*, vv. 598-600. See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 9, 263; Rosa, *Il Tirreno*, v. 583. Antonio Abati's *Ragguaglio di Parnasso contra i Poetastri, e Partegiani delle Nationi* (1646) and Traiano Boccalini's *Ragguagli di Parnasso* both "satirized politics and the current state of poetry", and likely influenced Rosa's own compositions. Roworth, *ibid*, 29, 46. On this form of satire, see G. B. Marchesi, "I 'Ragguagli di Parnasso' e la critica letteraria nel secolo XVII," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* XXVII (1896): 78-93; Croce, "Due illustrazioni al 'Viaje del Parnaso' del Cervantes," in *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del Seicento* (Bari, 1911); Limentani, *La Satira*, "La Satira in Parnaso - Antonio Abbondanti e Nicolo Villani," 85-112. On the *seicento* iconography of Parnassus, see Ann Sutherland Harris and Carla Lord, "Pietro Testa and Parnassus," *Burlington Magazine* CXII (1970): 15-20; Cropper, "Bound Theory and Blind Practice: Pietro Testa's Notes on Painting and the *Liceo della Pittura*," *JWCI* 34 (1971): 262-296. Cropper describes Testa's etching *The Triumph of the Virtuous Artist on Parnassus* as a "celebration of the arrival of the artist-sage on Parnassus … [a] meditation on the theme of his own triumph over ignorance and vice. Cropper ed., *Pietro Testa*, 224, cat. 102.

perfumed", while in the warmer months they sat in the rooms on the ground floor, "in which one could see every part colourfully adorned with various greenery, even the floor itself, such that it seemed to whomever entered to be a true *boscaglia* which, in addition to being beautiful to look at, also brought a most pleasant coolness to the persons who gathered there in great number."[136] Rosa's house was akin to the philosopher's "*orto*" or garden, the ancient "place of meditation, discussion and academic conversation amongst friends,"[137] an image of intellectual retreat equally apposite for the Volterran villas.

The connection between nature and philosophical practice also characterized the *simposie* or academic dinners hosted by the *Percossi* in emulation of their ancient forebears. As Marc Fumaroli has described, the ancient *symposium* was a "*fête d'amitié*" in which the sharing of knowledge in conversation was born from nature itself, "in opposition to the rhetoric of the public eloquence, which subjects the gifts of nature to art."[138] The liberating function of the *symposium* is an intrinsic byproduct of the "libations" that were a central feature of these dinners, during which drinking to excess was promoted as part of the philosophical ritual of academic community and a route to the attainment of knowledge.[139] It is hard to imagine that Rosa's dinner parties were as wildly indulgent as those of the Roman Bentveughels, the *Accademia dei Vignaiuoli* (also in Rome), or Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo's Milanese *Accademia della Valle di Bregno*,[140] but they

---

[136] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 454. A *boscaglia* is a "patch of shrubs, generally low to the ground and consisting of many branches", but can also refer to "a thick and tangled forest" ("macchia di arbusti, generalmente bassi e molto ramificati; anche, bosco fitto e intricato.") *Grande Dizionario Garzanti*.

[137] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 223.

[138] Marc Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence à l'Age de la conversation, la conversation de la rhéthorique humaniste dans la France du XVIIe siècle," in *Art de la lettre, Art de la conversation: à l'époque classique en France*, ed. Barnard Bray and Christoph Strosetzki. Acts du colloque de Wolfenbüttel, Oct 1991 (Klincksieck, 1995), 37.

[139] The ancient Platonic *symposium* has been variously translated as "drinking together" or a "drinks-party". Stephen Miller notes that although the drinking at these ancient gatherings could sometimes "get out of hand," this was not always the case. The wine served was quite weak, usually mixed with water. Miller, *Conversation. A History of a Declining Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), 40. Drinking to excess is a feature of Plato's *Symposium*, but the three main interlocutors continue to hold a conversation. Miller, *ibid*, 41.

[140] The *Bentvueghels*, the gathering of Flemish and Dutch artists in Rome, were notorious for their excesses of revelry and drinking, especially during their initiation processions to the Mausoleum of Santa Costanza (believed

nonetheless engaged in the same tradition of philosophical joviality and inspired wit. One is tempted to see this expressed in Rosa's painting of a *Bacchanal* which he executed in Volterra and subsequently took to Rome where Passeri saw it. (The painting is perhaps identifiable with the canvas sold by Christie's [Fig. 53], which corresponds in large part with Passeri's description and is dated by both Salerno and Mahoney to the 1640's).[141] A subject with a built-in tension for Rosa, the *Bacchanal* may express both a genuine fascination with certain philosophical aspects of the bacchanalian ideal as well as an implicit condemnation of its effusive and immoral qualities.[142] Indeed, the iconography of the Christie's painting, which appears to depict a bacchic drinking ritual, has a markedly celebratory tone.[143] Rosa's inclusion of his signature ("Rosa") on the altar in the foreground is perhaps a conspicuous self-identification with the more lofty (rather than lascivious)

---

to have been the ancient temple of Bacchus) where they performed a "mock christening" to welcome new artists. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 8; Thomas Kren, "*Chi non vuol Baccho*: Roeland van Laer's Burlesque Painting about Dutch Artists in Rome," *Simiolus* 11: 2. (1980): 63-80. The *Vignaiuoli*'s recitals of improvised and burlesque poetry were often "accompanied by much drinking", and members "adopted nicknames proper to the cultivation and enjoyment of wine." Lynch, "Lomazzo and the Accademia della Valle di Bregno," *Art Bulletin* 48 (1966): 210. Lomazzo's academy adopted Bacchus as their "patron" and adopted outlandish behavior which was seemingly intended to mock the serious literary pursuits of contemporary academies. See Lynch, "Lomazzo and the Accademia della Valle di Bregno," 210-211.

[141] Passeri, *Vite*, 424-5. For the painting, see Salerno, *L'opera completa*, 90, no. 83; Mahoney, *Drawings*, 343, fig. 25. Also see Mahoney (339-43) for a detailed consideration of arguments for and against the Christie's painting as the lost canvas.

[142] Scott sees in Rosa's *Bacchanal* an attempt to rival Poussin and his *Triumph of Bacchus* of c. 1635 (Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Missouri): while Poussin "absorbed from classical reliefs the authentic spirit of antiquity, [and] produced robustly convincing revels … Rosa, with inappropriate modesty, drapes his bacchants as they weave a disappointingly tame dance round the statue of the wine god, like inhibited members of an amateur dramatic society." Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 93. Rosa famously condemned the *Bamboccianti* and their clients in his *La Pittura* for prizing lowly, vulgar subjects, including nudity and bacchanals (vv. 247-8, 253-5, 259, 685ff). His anxiety over Bacchic imagery may also appear in his *"Genius"* etching [Fig. 99], where Rosa devised the figure of "satire" as female, rather than male satyr, in order to emphasize its personification of the literary genre rather than the lustful mythological creature. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 78. His prudish inclinations are also conveyed in Passeri's description of Rosa's *Phryne and Xenocrates* (1662-3, private collection) [Fig. 117] where Rosa depicts Phryne (contradicting historical accuracy) as clothed rather than nude. Passeri, *Vite*, 399. Rosa himself expressed concern over the potentially "lascivious" tone of the subject of *Pan and Pindar*, noting that feared transgressing "the error that I have condemned of others" in his satire. Borelli, letter 330.

[143] Mahoney identified the "drinking ritual" in the painting. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 341. Passeri's description of the painting suggests a joyous image, perhaps in emulation of its most famous precursor, Titian's *Bacchanal of the Andrians* (1518-19), a distinctively celebratory depiction of Bacchic revelry its creative potential – an especially ironic connection in view of Rosa's inclusion of Titian in his list of artists to be condemned for their lasciviousness in the *La Pittura* (vv. 703-705). On the creative aspects of bacchanalia, see John Moffitt, *Inspiration. Bacchus and the Cultural History of a Creation Myth* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), 148-150.

aspects of its ideal.[144] Rosa mentions a painting of the *Bacchanal* in a letter to Ricciardi of 1652, but says nothing much about it save the equivalence of its measurements to the *Heroic Battle Scene* intended for King Louis XIV of France (1652, Louvre, Paris) [Fig. 60]. At the end of his letter, however, he offers an oath to the god of wine that suggests at least a humourous interest in the bacchic muse: "forgive me if I am brief in writing to you", he says, "since I have of late a head so full of irritation that I seem to be Alletto, I swear to Bacchus!"[145] That Rosa referred to the *Bacchanal* in order to describe the Louvre *Battle* to Ricciardi suggests that his friend was very familiar with the earlier painting, and, perhaps, had a hand in devising its iconography. Ricciardi himself seems to have had a penchant for bacchanalian themes – his inventory of 1687 lists at least eight paintings of bacchanals or related subjects.[146] Rosa's scene of bacchic revelry also appears to be set in the distinctive landscape of Volterra which, so closely connected in his own mind to his beloved Tuscan *conversazione*, also suggests an incorporation of aspects of the ancient pagan practice into his academic ideal.

Other evidence of Rosa's adoption of Bacchic symbolism comes from his self-celebratory etching, *The "Genius" of Salvator Rosa* (c. 1660-64) [Fig. 99], where the central figure of his *Genio* (or "spirit") is crowned with Bacchic ivy. As Richard Wallace argues, this form of poetic crown was the most suitable type for an inspired satirist since it symbolized the "fame and immortality appropriate to '*poeti allegri*' and '*poeti Dithiramboci*'," and thereby proclaimed "his belief in the intuitive, irrational, inspired and mysterious qualities of his own genius."[147] Roworth

[144] I have not been able to examine the painting myself. In photographs, it appears to be signed on the altar: "Rosa." See Mahoney, *Drawings*, 343.
[145] Borelli, letter 144. Aletto ("l'Inquieta", or "the Restless one") is one of the three Furies.
[146] For Ricciardi's inventory of April 22 1687, see Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, doc. CLXXVI; ASF MS Notarile Moderno. Notaio Antonio Del Vigna. Protocollo n. 21316, 178v-180. The inventory lists eight bacchanalian subjects, none of which are explicitly identified as by Rosa (93, 178v; 94, 179v; 95, 180). Other possible examples are furnished by a 1763-66 list of prints by William Wynne Ryland and Simon Watts, which includes a "Sileno in un gruppo di satiri" after a drawing by Rosa (see Meroni, *ibid*, 119), and a drawing of a Sleeping Venus with various Satyrs by Rosa in Carlo de' Rossi's inventory of 1683. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de' Rossi," Inventory of Carlo de' Rossi, 371, 177v.
[147] Wallace, "The Genius of Salvator Rosa", 480 and note 65.

offers a different interpretation of Rosa's concept of inspiration, seeing it as a purposeful and rational expression of his spirit of satiric castigation rather than the irrational, mysterious or spontaneous brand promoted by Platonic (and Bacchic) theory, and taken up by the Romantics. It was only until after Rosa returned to Rome, however, that he devoted himself wholly to the convictions of moral Cynicism and Stoicism.[148] In Florence, Rosa's interest in a bawdy and burlesque brand of poetry and related imagery[149] – including the influence of the *Bamboccianti* that he was later to reject (despite their continued impact on his work) – suggests that his concept of inspiration, too, may have incorporated certain aspects of Platonic theory. That Rosa may have looked to Platonic theory in combination with the Stoic philosophy of Seneca or Juvenal, particularly in connection with a bucolic ideal of academic escapism, is suggested by a drawing Rosa made on the back of a letter by Lippi to their mutual friend Ascanio della Penna, a courtier, art collector and amateur painter from Pisa [Fig. 25].[150] In the drawing, Rosa includes an allegorical

---

[148] See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 33ff, 354 and *passim*. As Struhal has noted, the extent of the influence of the "Florentine intellectual climate" on Rosa's transition from a follower of the *Bamboccianti* to a "pittore di cose morali" "has been interpreted in contradictory ways. Limentani, for example, suggests that Rosa's interest in the literary genre of satire and his artistic development were decisively stimulated by his exchange with Florentine poets and intellectuals. Other authors have played down the importance of the Florentine context for the evolution of Rosa's artistic personality and on the contrary have assumed that the Neapolitan influenced the city's artistic context. Scott … thinks that Florence had little impact on Rosa's artistic career". Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 277. See Limentani, *La Satira nel Seicento*, 115; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 55-77.

[149] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 23ff; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 33; Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 28ff; Gregori, "Nuovi accertamenti in Toscana sulla pittura 'caricata' e 'giocosa'," *Arte antica e moderna* 13-16 (1961): 400-416.

[150] Pagliarulo, "Appunti Fiorentini," 35-40. Pagliarulo published the letter in the context of establishing Lippi's and Della Penna's close relationship and their mutual involvement in the decoration project for the church of the Madonna dei Galletti, Pisa. The letter was earlier described by Della Penna's nineteenth-century biographer, Baldassare Orsini, in his *Memorie dei pittori perugini* of 1802, and republished in 1875 by Adamo Rossi who, like his predecessor, saw it among the papers of della Penna's heirs. Rossi identified the drawing on the verso as by Rosa. Rossi, "Lettera al Cav. Ascanio della Penna," in *Giornale di erudizione artistic pubblicato a cura della R. Commissione Conservatrice di Belle Arti nella Provincia dell'Umbria* (Perugia, 1875), 317-18; also see Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 403-4. When he first recorded the letter in 1802, Orsini noted the drawing on the back and identified Rosa "seated on a rock, writing a letter with a salutation to Sig. Cav. della Penna; and […] another figure of a young man, who writes on a rock". The script of the letter in the other figure's hand (presumed to be Lippi) appears to repeat the opening of the letter written to Della Penna on the recto of the drawing itself. (It is barely legible: "Al Sigr. Cav. della Penna salute. La Solitudine… Liceo per gli animi… che la fortuna non…") See *Zeichnungen alter Meister aus deutschen Privatbesitz*. No. 33. Exhibition catalogue (Hamburg, Stuttgart, Bremen, 1965), 14-15. In the letter to Della Penna, the opening greeting, date, and name of the author are missing, but – to judge by the author's self-revelation in the letter as a painter-poet on intimate terms with Rosa – he is likely Lippi. Pagliarulo, *ibid*, 39. Pagliarulo appears to have been unaware of the drawing on the verso of

self-portrait and a portrait of Lippi, the two friends lounging on an enormous rock in the solitude of the countryside. The figure seated on the ground (Rosa) has a book by Juvenal in his lap, and books by Seneca, Plato and Statius are perched on top of the stone[151] – implying that Rosa was, at least at this earlier stage, interested in a broader range of philosophies than his later bias toward Stoicism suggests. The high finish of the drawing suggests it is among the many examples of graphic images that Rosa gave to his friends as gifts, and it signals (in combination with Lippi's letter on the reverse) the mutual affection among Rosa's Florentine companions for the ideal of countryside retreat.[152] The image was likely inspired by Poussin's (and perhaps Guercino's) images of the *Arcadian Shepherds*,[153] but in Rosa's and Lippi's version the pessimistic tenor of the melancholic sentiment implicit in the theme is replaced with an optimistic and pleasurable vision of social solitude: "Lippi" is perched atop the large rock happily writing the letter to Della Penna, while "Rosa" carves a Latin inscription on the rock's face, "*Hic aevi mihi prima dies*" ("for me, this day is the beginning")[154].

---

the letter, published by Mahoney and dated on stylistic grounds to the 1640's. Mahoney, *Drawings*, no. 24.22. Mahoney, too, was apparently uninformed about the letter on the back of the drawing, although he was correct in (tentatively) identifying the otherwise "illegible" salutation being written by the young man (now presumed to be Lippi) on the scroll as an address to a "Cav. Della Penna (?)". Also on the letter and drawing, see Leandro Ozzola, "Salvator Rosa auf dem Lande," *Cicerone* I: 22 (1909): 691-693; Meder, "Die Handzeichnung," 506 and fig. 210; D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 93 note 86, 154, note 148; Walter Regel and Hartmut Köhler, *Hoch gerühmt, fast vergessen, neu gesehen: der italienische Maler und Poet Salvator Rosa* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2007), 36-9. The drawing appeared in an exhibition in 1965, with an attribution to Rosa and the title "*Der Kunstler Mit einem Freund*". *Zeichnungen alter Meister*, 14-15.

[151] The names are hard to make out in the drawing. The German catalogue of 1965 cited the Juvenal, Seneca and Plato while Ebert-Schifferer identified the book by Statius. *Zeichnungen alter Meister*, 14-15; Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 69.

[152] Ebert-Schifferer labels the drawing "Rosa in campagna" and considers it to depict the Volterran landscape, which Lippi characterizes in the letter as '*horidezze*', "a place far from the vices of the world, propitious to moral reading … and to the composition of satire." Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 69.

[153] Poussin, *Arcadian Shepherds* (1627, Chatsworth); Poussin, *Et in Arcadia Ego* (1637-8, Louvre, Paris); Guercino, *Arcadian Shepherds* (c. 1618-22, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Rome). Volpi also noted that the drawing seems directly inspired by Poussin's *Arcadian Shepherds*. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 44 note 57. On the melancholic, *memento mori* component of the "Et in Arcadia Ego" theme, see Morgan, "Guercino's 'Et in Arcadia Ego' and Eighteenth-Century Landscape Design", in *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, ed. David R. Marshall (Melbourne: The Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne; Florence: Centro Di, 2004), 195.

[154] Mahoney, *Drawings*, no. 24.22.

The utopian image of Parnassus also held a particularly strong appeal for Rosa and his fellow academics. The home of the Muses and site of inspiration for the poet, musician and intellectual, Parnassus is employed not only by Rosa in reference to the Volterran villas, but also appears in Rovai's poem for the *Improvvisi* as a site of inspirational revelation for the academy's members, to whom the muses open all of their secrets.[155] (Parnassus, it should be noted, was sacred not only to Apollo but also to Bacchus.[156]) The subject of the Golden Age, popularized in texts widely read by Rosa and his contemporaries such as Torquato Tasso's *Aminta* and Lodovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*,[157] and adopted with a self-celebratory purpose by various members of the Medici and other early-modern dynasties,[158] also appears in the poetry and art of Rosa and his academic friends. Rosa's interest in the theme is most potently expressed in his paintings of *Peace Burning the Arms of War* [Fig. 20], the now-lost *Landscape with the Figure of Painting* (or "Satire on Painting"), and *The Return of Astraea* (or *Justice Among the Peasants*) (c. 1640-45, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) [Fig. 21].[159] The latter of the two paintings was inspired by Virgil's narrative in the *Georgics* on Astraea's departure after taking refuge among the common people of the countryside during the decline of the Golden Age, a possible allusion to the coming of

[155] See Appendix III.1. "Le suore di Parnaso egli confessa / E gli apron queste ogni secreto loro."
[156] Panofsky, *A Mythological Painting by Poussin in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm* (Stockholm: Nationalmusei Skriftserie, 1960).
[157] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 223.
[158] Wolfgang Prohaska, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 118, cat. 13; Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 58; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 32. On the popularity of the "Golden Age" among the Medici, see Gombrich, "Renaissance and Golden Age", *JWCI* 24: 3/4 (1961): 306-309; Thomas Puttfarken, "Golden Age and Justice in Sixteenth-Century Florentine Political Thought and Imagery: Observations on Three Pictures by Jacopo Zucchi," *JWCI* 43 (1980): 130-149; and Janet Cox-Rearick, *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art: Pontormo, Leo X, and the Two Cosimos* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), chapter 1, 127ff. Leopoldo and Ferdinand II de' Medici were also eager to reincarnate this ideal, as embodied in the large fresco cycle of the life of Lorenzo the Magnificent in Palazzo Pitti by Lippi, Furini and Giovanni da San Giovanni. See Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 7-8; Mina Gregori e Rodolfo Maffeis eds., *Un'altra bellezza: Francesco* Furini (Florence: Mandragora, 2007); E. McGrath, "From Parnassus to Careggi: A Seventeenth-Century Celebration of Plato and Renaissance Florence", in *Sight and Insight: Essays on Art and Culture in Honour of E. H. Gombrich at 85*, ed. J. Onians (London, 1994), 191-220. The metaphor of the Golden Age was also popular at the court of Charles I in England. Roskill, "Van Dyck at the English Court: The Relations of Portraiture and Allegory", *Critical Inquiry* 14: 1 (1987): 192; and Graham Parry, "The Court of Charles I," in *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester, 1981), chapter 9.
[159] The paintings may date to his later Florentine phase. Prohaska, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 118, cat. 13.

a second Medici "Golden Age" with the future Cosimo III. The similar theme of all three paintings suggests a programmatic interest in the subject on the part of both Rosa and his patron.[160] The subjects of these paintings also feature in poems by Rosa's academic friends for recital at the *simposie* or dinners of the *Percossi*. One of these, Torricelli's *Encomio del Secol d'Oro*, is indicative of the inspiration Rosa received from (and gave to) his academic friends. In a long-winded prose in which he cites from Juvenal, Ovid, Seneca, Lucretius and Pliny, and concludes by praising the merits of Rosa's painting, Torricelli explicitly likens the academy's members to the inhabitants of the Golden Age.[161] His poem also refers to the ideal of the "*vita boscherecca*", the simple life in the wilderness, far from the corruption of the court[162] – a pivotal metaphor in Rosa's academic ideal.

Fumaroli has explored the metaphorical significance of the myths of Parnassus and Arcadia for the academic culture of the *seicento*, as outlined in Giovan Battista Alberti's *Discorso dell'origine delle Accademie publiche e private* of 1639. Alberti describes Parnassus, Arcadia and Academy as three interrelated "allegorical constellations" which stem from the moral idea of the "*otium literatum sire studiosum*" – the "*bios theoretikos* (the contemplative life, or life of thought) appropriate to the well-read humanist."[163] Each of these three concepts has its own distinctive "*locus amoenus*": "the timbered mountain, the pastoral landscape, and the garden, which

[160] On the thematic connections between these paintings, and on the now lost *Landscape with the Figure of Painting* (cited in the inventory of the Casino di San Marco in 1647) see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 32; Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore*, 45.

[161] For the full text of the *Encomio del Secol d'Oro*, see Appendix VII. 2.

[162] "Se nel secolo detriorato, nondimeno in una vita boscareccia et imitatrice di quella primaria età ..."

[163] Fumaroli, "Academia, Arcadia, Parnassus: trois lieux allégoriques de l'éloge du loisir lettré", in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 18. The idea of the academy as Parnassus was also featured in one of the *Bamboccianti*'s ceremonies: Joachim von Sandrart describes one of the *tableaux vivants* which the group of artists constructed for one of their extravagant induction ceremonies of 1628 for which they created a "Parnassus" out of whatever furniture and lanterns they could get their hands on, creating shadows that imitated the mountain of Apollo and his Muses. Kren, "*Chi non vuol Baccho*," 70, from Sandrart, *Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey Künste von 1675*, ed R. Peltzer (Munich, 1925), 27-28.

can be easily superimposed on the library, the studio, the gallery."[164] The "bucolic" vision of the academy was popular in the *seicento*, taken up for example by Giovanni Pozzi as his ideal conception of the *Accademia della Crusca*. Fumaroli traces the origins of Alberti's comments to Petrarch's *De vita solitaria* and *De otio religioso*, where he drew a moral outline of literary man, encouraging his withdrawal into a kind of ideal hermitage and "interior landscape." Importantly, however, for Petrarch the "*bios theoretikos*" was not merely a metaphorical space of interior thought, "where the solitary well-read man can contemplate and grow spiritually or find refuge," but requisitely involved other persons – especially friends.[165] The fundamentally communal nature of solitude was a central tenet of Stoicism. Seneca argued that retirement did not constitute privacy but community – a "*res publica magna et vere publica*" in which the Stoic-in-retreat "does not cease acting in the world" but remains an involved participant in its fray.[166] Seneca also considered conversation and sociability vital activities in the service of attaining that higher form of knowledge.[167] The idea is reflected in early-modern commentaries on the academy, such as Stefano Guazzo's treatise on conversation: he concurred that "truth comes from a communal

---

[164] "The idyllic, Eden-like space, the arcadian garden, the "*locus amoenus*" is a *topos* of classical origin from Plato's *Phaedrus* to Cicero's *De oratore*, and after its consecration by Boccaccio in the *Decameron* it became the essential frame for most of the Renaissance dialogues (such as the *Asolani*, to cite the most illustrious example)." Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 223.

[165] Fumaroli, "Academia, Arcadia, Parnassus," 18-20. As Fumaroli summarizes, "[F]riendship, that is a very selective friendship founded on a common literary ideal, renders [the *bios theoretikos*] contagious and sociable; the itinerant interior hermitage of Petrarch attracts around the spiritual master disciples and friends, with whom he bonds by conversation, correspondence, the exchange of office, and literary cooperation".

[166] Schifflett notes that "the literature of Stoic retirement was much more than a literature of privacy." The "cosmopolitan" ideal of Stoicism is clearly voiced in Seneca's *De Tranquilitate Animi*, 4. 1-4. See *The Workes of Lucius Anneus Seneca*, trans. Thomas Lodge. 2nd edition (London, 1620), 639; Andrew Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton. War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 5-6. In the *Dialogues*, Seneca considered the benefits of both solitude and socialization: "The young should train themselves […] to bear solitude and to profit by society: since the wise man is never dependent on his friends, though none can take better advantage of them." Seneca, *Dialogues*, ix, 17, 3; E. Vernon Arnold, *Roman Stoicism* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1958), 366. Cicero made a series of similar comments. See Cicero, *De Amicitia*, XXIII 87-88, 35.

[167] "The first thing which philosophy undertakes to give is fellow-feeling with all men; in other words, sympathy and sociability. We part company with our promise if we are unlike other men." Seneca, *Moral Epistles*, trans. Richard M. Gummere. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917-25), I: Epistle V. In epistle VI, "On Sharing Knowledge", he noted "No good thing is pleasant to possess without friends to share it."

intelligence",[168] praising the social experience of the academy and its activities over isolation, and arguing that the "primacy of the living voice wins out over the solitary life of study and over the melancholia of the solitary life."[169] The selective sociality that defines the academic experience as a "refuge" is also reflected in the notion of the academy as a "secret society", open only to a select few who are united in their similitude and in their pursuit of elaborate, distinctive rituals.[170]

Solitude in Friendship

The theme of escaping from the city to take refuge in the countryside villa, "protected from intrigues of the courts and from the tribulations of war", was one of the most recurrent subjects in classical literature, and it found a renewed popularity among the Neo-Stoics of *seicento* Florence.[171] A poem entitled *Lascia la corte per la villa* by Orazio Ricasoli Ruccellai, a Florentine writer and scientist who mixed in the same intellectual circles as Rosa, succinctly expresses the popular ideal of the villa as space of refuge, virtue and peace. Not only does he contrast the villa directly with the court, but he characterizes it as a distinctively *social* space of isolation – a place of solitude in friendship.[172] This is the same image that informed Rosa's vision of the *Percossi*.[173]

The moral-satirical tenor of Rosa's desire for solitude is reflective of the more general cultivation among early-modern academies of an sense of "isolation from and disdain for the

---

[168] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 185.
[169] *Ibid*, 205. Vasari attributed to Michelangelo (one of Rosa's most important models) a preference for a selective sociality over isolation: Michelangelo was forced to seek solitude for the purposes of study, but preferred to spend time with his many friends. Vasari, *Vite*, Bettarini and Barocchi eds., 6: 109-11.
[170] Roberto Ciardi, "'A Knot of Words and Things': Some Clues for Interpreting the *Imprese* of Academies and Academicians," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth* Century, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 51-52.
[171] D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 154.
[172] Ruccellai stresses the joy of conversation in the ideal refuge of the countryside: "Tolto al grave tenor de'verdi affanni/ Men vivo in solitaria erma foresta / Schivo l'orgoglio pur d'atra tempest / Ch'agitò il viver mio ne' piu verd'anni. / Non mai novella di ruine, e Danni / Qui me giunge a inquietar torbida, e mesta / Ne trovo in vile albergo, o in umil vesta / Tela di frodi, o fabbrica d'inganni. / Piu dolce è il conversar tra gl'olmi, e i faggi, / Che per entro a cittade alta, e superb / Soffrir ogn'or degl'emuli gl'oltraggi …"). BNCF MS Palatino, 263, *Poesie di diversi del XVII secolo*, 25; also cited in D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 154.
[173] Langdon also noted the appeal of the ancient ideal of "*locus amoenus*" to Rosa and his *seicento* contemporaries, particularly in connection with Rosa's vision of landscape. Langdon, "A Theatre of Marvels," 179 and *passim*.

multitude", based in large part on the ideal of the Platonic Academy, believed to have been located "among peaceful woods and pleasant fields … a mile away from the city of Athens".[174] Carlo Dati had expressly advocated the emulation of Plato's Academy as a prototype for both the *Crusca* and the *Accademia Fiorentina*.[175] The same ideal was also being cultivated among the Medici, and held a particularly strong appeal for Ferdinando II, whose distaste for the pomposities of court spurred a desire to "live apart from the Court, in the villas at Petraia or Castello, among the pleasing and playful Epicurean [discussions] of his companions, and at the hunt,"[176] and for his brother Gian' Carlo who (as Baldinucci implied) likely shared Rosa's own longing for academic escapism.[177] His Casino di San Marco – a site with a long history of *doctum otium* and the former location of the Florentine Platonic Academy[178] – was outfitted along with its garden in a manner befitting this ideal, sufficiently replete with fantastic grottoes, fountains, and exotic plants to capture the imagination of the English politician and traveler Sir John Reresby (1634-1689) who saw it in 1657.[179] Along with a collection of easel paintings, Rosa contributed to the decoration of the

---

[174] Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 23; citing Scipione Bargagli, *Delle lodi dell'accademie* (1569). On the "reformist" impulses of early-modern academies, see Carl Goldstein, "The Platonic Beginnings of the Academy of Painting and Sculpture in Paris," in *Academies of Art*, *between Renaissance and Romanticism*, ed. A. W. A. Boschloo ('S-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij, 1989), 186; and Dempsey, "Some Observations on the Education of Artists," 559.
[175] Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 4. See Carlo Dati, *Prose Fiorentine*, pt. 3, vol. 2, 152-153.
[176] Carlo del Bravo, "La 'fiorita gioventù' del Volterrano," *Artibus et Historiae* 1:1 (1980): 61. Also see Acton, *The Last Medici*, 32-33 and *passim*. The idea also appealed to Grand Duke Ferdinando's grandson, Ferdinando III de' Medici (1673-1713), who was encouraged to cultivate it by Francesco Redi. Petrucci, "La 'ragione trionfante', 112. Salvino Salvini (1667-1751) claimed that Redi was himself significantly invested in private companionship.
[177] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448.
[178] C. B. Ceppi and M. Confuorto eds., *Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento. Il Potere e lo Spazio*. vol. I. *Effimero e Giardino*, sezione a c. di M. Fagiolo (Milan: Electa, 1980), 42.
[179] Acton, *The Last Medici*, 47. Reresby described in detail the elaborate waterworks, rare plants, and garden decorations, including the large statue of a giant (Antonio Novelli's brick and stucco sculpture of *Polyphemus*, the Cyclops of Homer's *Odyssey*, mentioned by Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 5: 72-4), the small "pleasure house" (the Casino) in the middle of the garden where the Cardinal kept his art collection and entertained his mistresses. Sir John Reresby, *The Memoirs and Travels of Sir John Reresby* (London: Edward Jeffery, 1813), 88. On the *quattrocento* and *cinquecento* origins of the gardens, see Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 230.

apartment of the Casino in 1644, in collaboration with Pietro da Cortona, with paintings (now lost) on the subjects of "the winning of happiness and tranquility".[180]

Rosa's letters are filled with statements of his desire for philosophical solitude. These are made most often in reference to the villas of the Maffei and Ricciardi in Volterra and its environs, although Rosa's frequent association of *conversazione* with that ideal brand of friendly solitude suggests that he applied it equally to the villa- and the city-academy. From 1641 onward, Rosa was invited on various occasions to spend time with his friends at Monterufoli, Barbaiano and Strozzavolpe.[181] According to Baldinucci's account, the invitations to Volterra coincided with Rosa's desire to be "somewhat more by himself"[182] and to move into his own home, free from the restrictions and regulations of the court. Volterra provided Rosa with a further level of removal from the context of the Florentine court, but one that still consisted of the same Florentine friendships he cherished so dearly. At Barbaiano, "it was his usual custom to spend a single hour of

---

[180] Mascalchi, "Giovan' Carlo de' Medici", 271; see G. Briganti, *Pietro da Cortona* (Florence, 1982), 272 fig. 289, and 344; Chiarini and K. Noehles, "Pietro da Cortona a Palazzo Pitti, un episode ritrovato," *Bollettino d'Arte* III (1967): 233-9. Between 1641 and 1645, Rosa also contributed a number of easel paintings to the Casino, including the two large marine seascapes now in the Palazzo Pitti, the *Landscape with Travellers Asking the Way* (London, National Gallery, Sir Denis Mahon collection), the *Alexander and Diogenes* (private collection), and the *Cincinnatus at the Plow* (private collection). Fumagalli notes that the 1647 inventory of the "giardino" records seventeen paintings attributed to Rosa. Another inventory of 1663, made at Gian' Carlo's death, records that a number of these works were then dispersed, and also mentions a (now lost) "Paesaggio con la Pittura" of four *braccie*. The other works, which are not recorded in the 1647 inventory, included a small *tondo* representing "una baronata di 5 figurine" which accompanied a "Cavadenti" by Pieter van Laer, and three small paintings of landscapes and marine-scapes on stone ("su pietra di paragon e di Mugnone 'riauti' dal pittore"). Fumagalli also notes that Rosa "decorated furnishings with landscapes, on canvas and panel, for the ceilings of some of the rooms in the Casino, which in 1663 were on loan to the cavaliere Silvio Alli in order to be copied". Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 45-46. The "vast decorative campaign" at the Casino also involved the Bolognese painter Angelo Michele Colonna. Fumagalli, *ibid*, 46-47; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 30. For the later 1666-67 inventory of the Casino, see Paola Barocchi and Giovanna Gaeta Bertelà eds., *Collezionismo Mediceo e Storia Aritstica*. vol. II, tomo III. Il Cardinale Carlo Maria Maddalena, Don Lorenzo, Ferdinando II, Vittoria della Rovere. 1621-1666 (Florence: Studio per edizioni scelte, 2002-2007), 1095-1159. On Gian' Carlo's art collection, also see Mascalchi, "Giovan' Carlo de' Medici," 268-272.

[181] The Barbaiano farm is in the region of Ariano, and was purchased by the Maffei family for 300 *fiorini* in 1516 who built a villa on the site. R. S. Maffei, "Ville e castelli volterrani," *Rassegna volterrana* II (1925): 52-3. Baldinucci's chronology implies that Rosa first went to Volterra in 1642, but Rosa's own letters indicate that he was travelling to the villas in 1641 and probalby before this date. See Borelli, letters 1, 2. Baldinucci notes that Rosa was often visited at the villas by friends from Florence and other places. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461, 463. From at least 1642 onward, Rosa was also spending time with his friend Raffaello Landini in his villa in Valambrosa, near Florence. Rosa's letters indicate that he spent time with Landini, "a Florentine gentleman and dilettante painter" in 1642 again in 1646; see Borelli, letters 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 22.

[182] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461.

the morning in the small wood, returning later to the villa to draw, read and study good books." He would then enjoy lunch with various learned gentlemen, often including Ricciardi, followed by a short rest after which he would return to his studies. Two hours before sunset he would go out for a walk with his friends until it was time for dinner. After the meal he would "propose some beautiful question, or introduce some speech" depending on what he had been reading that morning. At the end of the hunting season, the party returned from Barbaiano to the town of Volterra, where they spent time reciting improvised comedies.[183] Lucio Festa suggested that the *provveditore* Raffaello Maffei in particular, who favoured a more refined and serious brand of performance, would have shared in Rosa's love of theatrics.[184] At the end of Carnival, Rosa traveled with the Maffei to Monterfuoli, where he wrote at least three of his satires and read them aloud to the *conversazione*.[185] It is also at Monterufoli that Rosa painted his *Self-Portrait as an Artist* as a gift for the Maffei (the painting in the Corridoio Vasariano is now considered a poor copy of a lost original[186]), along with a number of other works including the decoration of a *gravicimbalo* with a

---

[183] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461-2. Baldinucci notes that Rosa spent three years at Monterufoli.
[184] Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti," 2.
[185] Baldinucci claimed that Rosa "composed the majority of his satires" at Monterufoli. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462. Martucci argued that Rosa composed four of his satires (*La Musica*, *La Poesia*, *La Pittura* and *La Guerra*) at Barbaiano." Martucci, "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'," 657. There is disagreement among scholars over which of the satires were written in Florence, but it is generally agreed that they are *La Musica, La Poesia,* and *La Guerra* (the last dated to 1647). Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 277.
[186] Fumagalli argues convincingly that the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* in the Vasari corridor is a copy of the now missing original, noting its poor quality and stylistic traits that seem inconsistent with Rosa's other paintings. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 57. The painting entered the Medici collection in 1682, but the description in the *Quaderno della Guardaroba* does not correspond exactly to the Vasari Corridor canvas: "Un quadro in tela alto braccia 1 soldi 7,2 largo bracci 1 soldi 1,8 dipintovi di sua mano il ritratto di Salvadore Rosa di mezza età con barba e basette nere, con abito colorato e pelliccia sopra, con penna e pennello nella mano destra e nell'altra pennelli, con tavolozza et altri pennelli." ASF MS GM 870, 158v, 27 Oct. 1682. The figure in Rosa's painting has his "penna e pennello nello mano destra," but is missing the paintbrushes in the other hand, as well as his "tavolozza e altri pennelli". Fumagalli, *ibid*, 130, n. 159. This discrepancy suggests that the painting is a copy with a few changes. Traces of the original are lost in the records by the mid-eighteenth century, and the engraving by Giovan Domenico Campiglia, which formed part of the series of self-portraits of painters, reproduces the example now in the Vasari Corridor. Fumagalli, *ibid*, 68. As Fumagalli has noted, this self-portrait was identified on the basis of an epistolary exchange between the Grand Ducal secretary Apollonio Bassetti and a correspondent in Siena, Camillo Capponi, with a self-portrait by Rosa in the property of the Maffei family, offered by them to the Grand Duke Cosimo III in 1681, who was then looking for a painting of the artist for the collection of self-portraits begun by Cardinal Leopoldo. Chiarini, *Artisti alla corte granducale* (Florence: Centro Di, 1969), 39, cat. 47; cited by Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 130, n. 158. There is also a letter by Giovanna Maffei addressed to Capponi, in which she cites a self-portrait by Rosa in the

memento mori image of a death's head [Fig. 48] that, according to Baldinucci, "was esteemed a rare thing."[187] At Barbaiano Rosa also made a series of *trompe l'oeil* wall-drawings of "little stories and figures" that appeared to be set "in frames hung on nails."[188]

Rosa frequently wrote to Giulio Maffei and Ricciardi of his longing for a seclusion that was not entirely isolated, but characterized by a communion with close friends. A letter to Giulio of 1649 is filled with typical expressions of longing:

> "Oh how much I yearn, my dear Giulio, for the past year, so well suited to the inclinations of my spirit, assuring you that not a day passes that I am not transported by the thought of the meditations of these moments of solitude, always beloved to me, and above every other thing [I think] of the incomparable love and punctuality of your friendship … But I hear myself say that if what I write were true and it came truly dictated from the heart, why not leave Rome, why not return again to the peace of the woods? Oh Holy God, how much I wish to be in other fortunes, or that you were a little more alone, as I would want to be, confined with you."[189]

In another, earlier letter to Giulio of 1641 Rosa expressed his wish to visit friends at Barbaiano "in order to enjoy your happiness" as well as to "escape the sight of men".[190] Similarly, in a letter to Ricciardi of 1653, he writes: "I swear to you by that sacred bond that is bound up in friendship, that I think of nothing other than how I have enjoyed your company in two solitary places [*romitorii*] … of Monte Rufoli and Barbaiano … for any effort that my actions could ever make, I will never achieve those delights which, in these two places, I have enjoyed by means of your most cordial and

---

property of the Maffei family, which is to be given to the Grand Duke. For the letters see Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 73-76. The letters say little about the painting, the circumstances of its production, or its donation to the Maffei.

[187] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462. Baldinucci valued the completed *gravicembalo* as "worth no less than one-hundred *scudi*" – a high price indeed. The other paintings included various "beautiful landscapes and views", a battle scene that he brought back with him to Rome, some small "*mascherate*" or masquerades, a *Sacrifice of Abel* (Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome) and a painting of Queen Esther. Baldinucci also noted that Rosa spent a great deal of time drawing the Volterran landscape, enough that he made a "very large volume" of those drawings. He also worked on some of his etchings at Ricciardi's villa at Strozzavolpe in 1660. See Borelli, letters 240 and 270.

[188] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462.

[189] Borelli, letter 35: "Oh quanto sospiro Giulio mio care, la vita dell'anno passato, tanto uniforme all'inclinationi del mio animo, assicurandovi che non passa giorno che non mi lasci trasportare col pensiero alle meditationi di coteste per me sempre care solitudini, e sopra ogni altra cosa all'incomparabile amore e pontualità della vostra amicitia … Ma sento dirmi che se quel ch'io scrivo fusse vero e veramente venisse dettato dal core, perché non lasciar Roma, perché non venir di nuovo alla pace delle selve? Oh Dio Santo, bisogneria o ch'io fussi in altre fortune, o che voi fostivo un po' più solo, che vorrei confinarmi con te".

[190] Borelli, letter 3: "Con tuto ciò mi sforzerò di far tutto il possible non già per godere delle vostre delitie, ma per fugire la vista degl'huomini."

most virtuous company."[191] Again, to Ricciardi, Rosa writes of his desire "to find myself in a desert in your company, on whose communion depends the entire happiness of my spirit";[192] "without you the rooms at Strozzavolpe would be most tedious for me, since the goal is none other than to enjoy [your company] because you are all that I desire";[193] and, writing to Ricciardi from Rome, "without you, I find in the solitudes a certain wanting and desire."[194] Ricciardi appears to have shared Rosa's opinions concerning solitude, as is indicated in another letter of 1659 in which Rosa writes "… I console myself with your last (letter), in which you declared to me that your taste was not inferior to mine concerning the delight of solitude."[195]

Statements of this kind pervade Rosa's correspondence, and show that the positive, creative ideal of solitude that Rosa sought was not the complete isolation of the hermit alone in the woods but rather a form of "solitude in friendship." There is ample evidence that Rosa considered complete isolation detrimental: writing to Giulio in 1641, he sought sympathy for his state of "solitary wretchedness";[196] in 1651 he described his home on the Trinità dei Monti in Rome as a "*solitaria abitatione*", longing for Giulio to pay him a visit;[197] and in 1652 he complained to Ricciardi of his loneliness in Rome, claiming to live the life of a hermit.[198] Rosa even goes so far as to describe foreign courts as "lands of solitude", consoling Ricciardi that he would sooner reject the

---

[191] Borelli, letter 169: "ti giuro per quel sacrato vincolo che ci lega in amicitía, che non ho luogho topico nella memoria che il riflettere che ho goduto voi ne' due romitorii accennatovi di Monte Rufoli e Barbaiano … per qualunque sforzo che potesse mai fare la mia attività, che non saria mai per consequire quei diletti che in questi due luoghi ho goduti mediante la vostra cordialissima e virtuosissima compagnia."
[192] Borelli, letter 235: "ch'altri non sono ch'el trovarmi in un deserto in vostra compagnia, dalla cui comunione dipende l'intera felicità della mia anima …"
[193] Borelli, letter 236: "la stanza di Strozza Volpe senza di voi a me riuscirebbe noiosissima, poiché il fine non è altro che il goder voi che sete il tutto d'ogni mio desiderio …"
[194] Borelli, letter 258: "senza voi trovo nelle solitudini un non so che da desiderare …"
[195] Borelli, letter 230: "mi consolo con l'ultima vostra, nella quale m'asserite non essere il vostro gusto inferiore al mio intorno al diletto della solitudine."
[196] Borelli, letter 1: "Considerate, caro Signor Giulio, come resterò io poveraccio solo."
[197] Borelli, letter 97: Rosa makes a similar comment in a letter to Ricciardi (Borelli, letter 117).
[198] Borelli, letter 118.

invitation of the Austrian emperor than to leave his friend behind.[199] A poem by Rosa set to music by his friend Marcantonio Cesti also offers a sorrowful lamentation of solitude.[200]

Rosa may well have been attracted specifically to Petrarch's and Seneca's endorsements of a selectively social brand of philosophical practice. He cites from the writings of Petrarch and Seneca on numerous occasions in his letters, and certain instances reveal his knowledge of their writings on the subject of solitude.[201] Rosa's familiarity with Seneca's *De vita beata* and *De tranquilitate animi*, for example, is evident from a letter to Ricciardi of 1656;[202] and in 1663 he cited from Petrarch's *De pensier in pensier, di monte in monte* in order to express his longing for the "divine solitudes" of Ricciardi's villa at Strozzavolpe.[203] He would surely also have been familiar with Petrarch's musings on solitude in the *De Vita solitaria*.

Rosa's pictorial *oeuvre*, too, points to his vision of academic utopia as an escape to the wilderness of nature, in a specifically social form of isolation. The *Philosophers' Grove* (or *Diogenes Casting Away his Bowl*) (c. 1642-44, Florence, Palazzo Pitti) [Fig. 23a], painted during his Florentine sojourn for the marchese Carlo Gerini,[204] is a particularly revealing example. The painting treats a pivotal story in the life of one of Rosa's favourite ancient philosophers, the Cynic Diogenes of Sinope (4th century BCE), who was inspired to seek an even greater philosophical asceticism and cast off the last of his worldly possessions – a bowl – when he saw a young boy drinking from a stream with his bare hands. In the *Life of Diogenes* by Diogenes Laertius (who shared his protagonist's name), the story is recounted under the heading "Living According to

---

[199] Borelli, letter 245.
[200] Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 47. "Hor son pur solo, e non è chi m'ascolti,/ altro ch'il mio dolore./ Uscite pur, sospiri miei sepolti,/ dalla tomba del core ..."
[201] Petrarch is the most oft-cited authority from among a list of authors (including Homer, Choerilus, Lucian, Ovid, St. Augustine, Boccaccio, Guillaume du Choul, Ariosto, and Tasso) that Rosa quotes in his letters, and he seems to have been considered particularly apt in the context of friendship. For Rosa's quotations of Petrarch, see Borelli, letters 201, 252, 311, 356, 364, 383; for the other authors, see for example letters 69, 98, 114, 146, 196, and 238.
[202] Borelli, letter 201.
[203] Borelli, letter 296.
[204] Baldinucci records that Rosa painted this work for Gerini along with a pendant of *Crates Throwing his Money into the Sea* [Fig. 22]. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 456-7. The *Crates* is now in a private collection in the UK.

Nature", and friendship is featured as an integral part of the lesson to be learned: Laertius concludes his tale by noting "Diogenes used to reason thus: 'All things belong to the gods. The wise are friends of the gods, and friends hold things in common. Therefore all things belong to the wise'."[205] In the central grouping of figures in Rosa's painting, the young man with long dark hair and trimmed beard and moustache is likely self-referential (if not an expressly physiognomic self-image).[206] Not only does Rosa identify himself as a member of Diogenes' circle, but he places their encounter in the relative solitude of the wild and liberated space of nature, far from the urban space of the city which is positioned in the distant background on the left-hand side of the image. Rosa infuses a favourite philosophical subject with a highly personal and self-celebratory image of his own academic ideal, one that his patron may well have shared.[207]

That Rosa's friends shared his own escapist vision of the villa and countryside is also suggested by Lippi's comments in his letter to the *cavaliere* Della Penna, where he describes his time at one of the Maffei villas in the company of Rosa:

> "Here you go, Sig. Cavaliere, with two words and only a few strokes of the pen I write to you of the time I have spent for the past eight days in the villa of the Signori Maffei with our most delightful and most virtuous Rosa. Here, far from the city – that is from vice – we live all to ourselves. Here, absorbed in painting and poetry the days seem to grow in number rather than shorten. Here, in sum, far from every troublesome thought we give the hours to the spirit [*genio*] that transports us in one moment to read some moral author among the waters and the shadows of the crags, and, in another, atop some mountain outcropping, to make a satire of the world …"[208]

---

[205] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, Life of Diogenes.
[206] Various scholars have also made this observation. Fumagalli and Daprà see in this likely self-portrait an indication of Rosa's desire to proclaim himself a disciple of Diogenes and his brand of Stoic philosophy. Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 59; Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 174, cat. 17.
[207] Fumagalli notes the likely congruence of interest between Rosa and his patron in the subject of the painting, suggesting the further possibility that Gerini frequented the *Percossi*. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 71, 174, cat. 17. Gerini also owned Rosa's first version of *Fortune* [Fig. 28].
[208] Pagliarulo, "Appunti fiorentini," 33-43. "… Eccovi Sig. Cav. in due parole et in pochi tratti di penna accennata la vita che da otto giorni in qua passo nella villa delli Signori Maffei con il nostro dilettissimo e virtuosissimo Rosa. Qui, lontani dalle citta, ciò è da vizii, viviamo a noi medesimi. Qui fra la pittura e la poesia si guadagnano e non si consumano i giorni. Qui in somma astratti da ogni pensiero molesto doniamo l'hore al genio che ora ci trasporta a leggere qualche autore morale fra l'acque e l'ombre dei fossati, hora sopra qualche monte rilevato a far satire del mondo…".

The idea of the "*vita rustica*", as an ideal vision of the villa experience, informs three poems by Rosa's academic friends and a poem by Rosa himself, recently published by Volpi.[209] The private academy, intimate and informal (especially in the country villa), was for Rosa and his friends a space in which the solitary and social intertwine. Rosa's own words concerning his craving for a social brand of solitude present a particular fixation on the notion of presence and absence in relation to place, and his letters show that his desired identity as an inspired, antagonistic and independent painter-philosopher relied on spatial, as much as relational, experience. In his correspondence from Rome to Tuscan friends afar, Rosa's lamentations for distant friendships suggest an attempt to reconstruct presence in poetic terms, bringing the academy of friends that moved from Florence to the Volterran villas of Monterufoli, Barbaiano and Strozzavolpe to his own house in Rome. This impulse toward an actual physical reunion is an important theme that I will return to in the next two chapters.

II.4. The *Percossi* as a Place of Friends

The "double face" of "private" and "public" life that Elias identifies as a feature of early-modern court society – where "[d]epending on the occasion, one face may be more strongly accentuated than the other" – remains true for the private academy, where the "relaxation, amusement and conversation" of intimate and sincere relationships co-existed alongside the utility of "social demands and pressures which are experienced as duties".[210] Rosa and his academic

[209] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 93-4. Volpi publishes Antonio Abati's *L'autore tornando di Milano a Firenze trovò che Lorenzo del Frate suo amico era in villa, e che gli cadevano i* capelli (BNCF MS Magl. VII, 357, 469); an epistolary poem for Lorenzo Lippi by Antonio Malatesti on the subject of the *Vita Solitaria* (previously published as the *Lettera familiare di Antonio Malatesti a Lorenzo Lippi descrivendogli la sua vita,* pubblicata da Giulio Piccini, Firenze 1867); Marco Lamberti's *Capitolo di Marco Lamberti* (BNCF MS Magl. VII 873, 316.2.); and Rosa's *Che la vera feliciti non consiste nell'abbondanza delle ricchezze ma nella penuria dei desiderii* (BNCF MS Magl. VII, 870, 154). Lamberti emphasizes the enjoyment of conversation in solitude among friends at a villa in the country, while Malatesti's letter to Lippi repeats many of the sentiments expressed in Rosa's letters on the subject of the villa, and in particular the idea of solitary isolation as undesirable.

[210] Elias, *The Court Society*, 53. On the conflation between "public" and "private" in the early-modern period, see Elias, *ibid*, 115: "... for the people of court society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries such a division, in the broadest sense of the word, did not yet exist. The success or failure of behaviour was not decided in the

friends cultivated friendship, as an expression of sincerity, in an attempt to supersede those ever-present, undesirable obligations. Rosa's spatial conception of the academy was informed by the ancient notion of *academia* as physical "place" of friendship. This idea is implied in Baldinucci's narrative, which gives an emphatically laudatory account of Rosa's "affectionate" Florentine academic experience. While Passeri passes over Rosa's Florence sojourn as a mere interlude in a predominantly Roman career,[211] Baldinucci presents Florence as a place of friendship and new beginnings for the artist, emphasizing the formative significance of the city for the early phase of his career.[212]

Rosa's letters attest to the affectionate nature of his Florentine relationships. These documents allow us to determine with a degree of certainty the nature of certain of these bonds. The most intimate and sincere friends included Ricciardi, Lippi, and the Maffei brothers Giulio and Ugo. The nature of Rosa's other friendships is harder to establish. Rosa was frustrated with Cordini, for example, and questioned his loyalty on more than one occasion, but his erstwhile expression of affection for him and his offer of paintings as "gifts" to the art dealer are perhaps evidence of the heartfelt (if complicated) nature of their bond. Rosa's affection for Cavalcanti, Bandinelli, Appolloni, Minucci, Vendramin, and Salvetti is expressed in the greetings he sends to them in his letters via Ricciardi, after returning to Rome in 1649.[213] Dati clearly continued to value his friendship with Rosa, visiting him in Rome in 1651 where they spent time composing *canzone*

---

professional sphere, then influencing private life, but behaviour at every time and every day could decide a person's place in society; could mean social success or failure."

[211] Passeri neglects to mention either the *Percossi* or any of its members.

[212] Shortly after arriving in Florence, Rosa found his "affection for our city was growing even more" and that this love was helped along by his habit of forming friendships with the most "sublime talents" and "greatest *literati*" of the city "with whom he always wanted to use all of his most intimate custom." During his time in the city, Rosa was "loved by the professors of the arts, beloved by friends, and useful to all". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461.

[213] See Borelli, letters 48, 57, 67, 85, 108, 178, 192, 210, Cavalcanti came to visit Rosa at the Maffei villa of Monterufoli in 1650, bringing with him "some samples of wine and stayed to dine" with Rosa and his family. Borelli, letter 57. Two letters of Cavalcanti to Dati of 1650 and 1651 show his own regard for Rosa. BNCF MS Baldov. 258 III 7. Rosa also turned to Bandinelli for help with the problems he encountered over Lucrezia's husband. Borelli, letter 192.

and sonnets together, buying books, and visiting other scholars in the city.[214] Torricelli is only mentioned once in Rosa's letters, but his own affection for Rosa is clear from his will: to his "*carissimo amico*" Rosa, he left a "glass sphere decorated with white cypress" that he hoped Rosa would keep in memory of him.[215] And when Rovai died in 1648, Rosa earnestly and affectionately lamented his passing in a letter to Giulio Maffei.[216]

Academia and *Amicitia*: A Historical Context for the *Percossi*

Friendship is integral to the philosophical basis of the academic enterprise. The notion of an emotive bond is embedded in the very word "philosophy," which in Greek means "love of knowledge."[217] Seneca, whose musings Rosa often pondered, conceived of philosophy as consisting in friendship and aspiring toward a sense of community.[218] As Fumaroli has observed, to participate in philosophy was to link oneself in friendship not only to colleagues and contemporaries, but to the greater community of thinkers from the past in a kind of trans-historical "sodality" of shared purpose – the *res publica litteraria*.[219] Guazzo summarized the idea in his *La Civile Conversazione*, noting that "among all companionships, there is none more stable, nor more

---

[214] See Borelli, letter 115. Dati also expressed interest in Rosa's *Democritus* [Fig. 62] and his satire *La Pittura*.

[215] BNCF MS Gal.131, 50-1 and MS Gal.132, 154-9. Torricelli's last will and testament of October 14 1647, written by Ludovico Serenai (also Rosa's friend), records the gift to Rosa as the second item in the list of possessions left by the scientist: "Item: lascia per ragion di legato e in ogni miglior modo al Sig.^{e} Salvator Rosa suo Cariss.^{o} amico una spera con suo adornamento di cipresso bianco, chi d.^{o} Sig. Testatore portò di Venezia, e vuole che gli sia consengata e mandata franca d'ogni opera, e Gabella, acciò la tenga per memoria di esso Sig. Testatore." (43v) He also left belongings to Serenai and Giulio Maffei. The correspondence between Serenai, Rosa and Maffei regarding Torricelli's will is BNCF MS Gal. 132, *1647-1651: Discepoli di Galileo, Tomo XXII, Torricelli Evangelista*, Vol. 2, *Carteggio Familiare*, 154r, 156r, 159r-v. A letter to Rosa from Serenai of October 19 1647 (159r-v) accompanied the glass sphere; a postscript in Rosa's own hand at the bottom of the letter indicates his receipt of it and expresses his sincere affection for both Torricelli and Serenai. Rosa mentions Torricelli in only one of his extant autograph letters, dated July 1645. Borelli, letter 7.

[216] Borelli, letter 22. "Il Signor Rovai morì e credetemi che sono in maniera tale atterrito che i Monti Rufoli mi parranno gl'Orti Esperidi alla salvatichezza della mia natura."

[217] Jean Claude Fraisse, *Philia: La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1974).

[218] Seneca, *Epistulae*, vii, 5, 4 and 6, 4; cited in Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 366-367. "In the companionship of well-chosen friends", writes Seneca, "there grows up the 'common sense', which is an instinctive contact with humanity as a whole, making each man a partner in the thoughts and needs of all around him. This feeling is a principal aim of philosophy."

[219] Fumaroli, "The Republic of Letters", 145; Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 188.

closely connected, than that of men of letters, whose love for each other is greater than that given to relatives or brothers".[220]

As a community of philosophers, the academy was itself ideologically inscribed as a place of friends. At base, the academy was a "collective," a place where productivity and action was facilitated by the group rather than the individual.[221] The shared interest that bonded individual members together and defined the academy's objective (most cogently expressed in the plurality, and implicit exclusivity, of the names of *seicento* academies), produced a sense of communal identity in which the academic self came into being only in relation to others. Like the ancient dictum that states that true friends share all good things in common, the members of the academy partook of the singular identity that was codified by their common title.[222] Throughout its long history, the academy has usually been described in some sense as a gathering of learned friends.[223] The significance of this relationship to individual academics is often indicated by the affectionate or collegial terms of address used among them: the members of Lomazzo's *Valle di Bregno*, for example, referred to each other as "*compá*",[224] meaning companion, fellow, or friend. For John

---

[220] Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, a cura di Amedeo Quondam (Ferrara: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1993), 157. "[P]er certo fra tutte le compagnie non vi è alcuna più stabile, né più strettamente congiunta, che quella de' letterati, i quali s'amano più fra loro di quell che facciano i parenti e fratelli…"
[221] On the "collective" nature of the academy, see Quondam, *La Funzione delle Accademie*, 22-3, 27.
[222] Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 184.
[223] Surprisingly few scholars have explored the role of friendship in the history of the academy. Nikolaus Pevsner's now canonical (albeit problematic and outdated) text on the subject has very little to say on the particular nature of the relationships shared by members of the various academies he describes. Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 91. There is some discussion of the more general importance of the social experience to the academy in the writing of scholars who trace the practical and etymological history of the early-modern academy: see Chambers, "The Earlier 'Academies' in Italy," 1, 3; James Hankins, "The Myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence", *Renaissance Quarterly* 44: 3 (1991): 434, 435; *idem*, "Cosimo de' Medici and the 'Platonic Academy'," *JWCI* 53 (1990): 144, 152, 154ff; Karel Bostoen, "Italian Academies in Antwerp: Schiappalaria and Vander Noot as 'Inventors' for the Genoese Community," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 195. Marsilio Ficino, for example, wrote a sort of "catalogue" of friends – an *amicorum nostrorum catalogus* – who all shared "a common devotion to the 'liberal disciplines'." He divided them into three categories: "friends" (*consuetudine familiares*), "pupils" (*auditores*), and "disciples"; his "friends" were "neither pupils (*auditores*) nor disciples but *confabulatores* with whom he would discuss and be advised on matters pertaining to the liberal disciplines". Hankins, "The Myth of the Platonic Academy," 443. Early-modern academics regarded friendship as an important stimulus for the formation of the academy, and as one of the principles which had to be maintained between members in order for the academy to function.
[224] Lynch, "Lomazzo and the Accademia della Valle di Bregno", 211.

Milton, who visited Florence in 1638 to 1639 and befriended members of the *Apatisti* and *Svogliati* (to which members of the *Percossi* also belonged), these private types of academies were "a custom there most praiseworthy in its preservation not only of learning, but also of friendships."[225] Milton's description of his new Florentine academic friends as "*amici*" and "*sodales*" is symptomatic of the inseparability of scholarship and friendship in the *seicento* conception of the academy as "virtually synonymous with *amicitia*."[226]

The academy was conceived ideally as a "mask of social reality" in that it both permitted and conferred a certain equality amongst its members that did not exist in the outside world. All members were ostensibly "equal" or "alike", their parity resulting from and sustained by the democratic principle of friendship itself.[227] This was the lofty ideal of philosophical practice, modeled in part on the initiative of "egalitarian leveling" and the familial nature of relationships practiced by the confraternities and religious associations from which the early-modern academy took much of its inspiration.[228] In reality, the relationships of academicians could – and often did – fall short of this objective, and Rosa's academy was no exception.[229] For this reason, the ideal (if

---

[225] Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 6. On Milton's membership in the *Apatisti*, see Edoardo Benvenuti, *Agostino Coltellini e l'Accademia degli Apatisti a Firenze nel secolo XVII* (Pistoia, 1910), 272.
[226] Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 9; citing Frank A. Patterson ed., *The Works of John Milton* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931-40), 12: 48.
[227] Quondam, *La Funzione delle Accademie*, 22.
[228] Ciardi, "'A Knot of Words and Things'," 46. The early-modern academic ideal of solidarity was derived from the medieval model of confraternal brotherhood, in which the fraternal bond of the friars was considered to mimic or even to supersede that of blood relatives. The Florentine *Accademia del Disegno*, for example, born from the ancient *Compagnia di San Luca*, carried on its religious tradition of conducting funeral services for its members. Francesco Adorno ed., *Accademie e Istituzioni Culturali a Firenze*. Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria', Studi LXV (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1983), 17. On Michelangelo's funeral and academic *esequie*, see the *Esequie del divino Michelangelo Buonarotti celebrate in Firenze* .... (Florence: Giunta, 1564), translated into English by Rudolf Wittkower as *The Divine Michelangelo: The Florentine Academy's Homage on his death in 1564* (London: Phaidon, 1964.) The Roman *Lincei* instituted a rigorous and "cathartic" procedure for admission in which prospective members were required to "regard each other as brothers, united by a bond stronger than that of just mutual esteem: that of love and fraternity." Dooley, *Italy in the Baroque*, 23; Clericuzio and De Renzi, "Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy," 177. Barzman sees the same ideal at work in the circle of Galileo's followers. Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 158. The same ideal may well have appealed to Rosa and his fellow *Percossi*, particularly in view of the fraternal affection Rosa professed toward his most important academic friend: Ricciardi. Rosa frequently lamented the ill fortune that Ricciardi was not born his brother. See Borelli, letters 123, 163, 258, 370.
[229] Although friendship amongst academicians was an obligatory ideal, it was not to be expected that all members of an academy would be "true" friends. The obligatory cooperativeness of academicians could manifest itself in a

not the reality) of friendship (the "Laws" of friendship that Rosa frequently holds his friends accountable to in his letters, for example) had to be maintained at all cost.[230] Friendship was itself a popular subject of discussion in early-modern academic circles.[231] Rosa's letters reveal his profound conviction in friendship as a system of reciprocity, regulated by a give-and-take sense of generosity and obligation and aimed at maintaining a balance or equivalency between friends. Among the *Percossi*, whose members occupied a variety of hierarchical levels within the Florentine intellectual elite, the cultivation of the egalitarian ideal of friendship produced an important sense of equality. Within the academic microcosm, Rosa was able to completely invert his position in the pecking order of real society, shaking off its restrictions and constraints by becoming the *principe* by whom (and toward whom) all of the academy's activities and interests were directed. For Rosa, the egalitarian ideal of academic *amicitia* meant the very real creation of a position of social dominion and individual autonomy. As ruler of his own social realm, Rosa co-opted the only

---

number of ways, and the nature and degree of their often fluid and changing relationships is frequently difficult to determine. Baldinucci's indication that the *Percossi*'s finances were supplemented to a significant degree from Rosa's own purse signals one level of "inequality" that lay beneath the ostensibly ideal equality of the members. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453.

[230] For Rosa's repeated epistolary references to the "Laws" or the "Court" of friendship, and other related metaphors, see Borelli, letters 29, 45, 49, 52, 66, 104, 119, 169, 183, 193, 203, 230, 254, 271, 286, 301, 318, 341, 342, 343, 346, 348, 349, 352, 379, 381, 385 and 386. Rosa apparently discussed the subject with the servant in Minucci's house during his stay in Florence in 1661. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 499. The idea, taken up by many early-modern authors, derives from ancient authorities like Petrarch (*De vita solitaria*, 104-5) and Cicero (*De amicitia*, XIII 44, 20) who both discuss the "laws" of friendship. That friendship required "regulation" suggests the potential for distrust and insecurity among friends. In *seicento* practice, it indicates not only a humanist prerogative but a need to differentiate true friendship from other forms of social relationships. It also expresses the broader *seicento* conception of an ideal state of decorum in social conduct, attitude, behavior and even speech to which all upstanding members of society were expected to strive – the severe "regulation" of which is cogently conveyed by Cardinal Richelieu's program of social policing in which "insolence and breaches of politesse came to be regarded as crimes against the state." Elizabeth C. Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations': The Art of Interaction in Seventeenth-Century France* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988), 8; Orest Ranum, "Courtesy, Absolutism, and the Rise of the French State, 1630-1660", *Journal of Modern History* 52, (1980): 426-51.

[231] In his list of studies to be carried out by members of the *Accademia Fiorentina*, Salvino Salvini noted lessons on poetry and literature, the active and contemplative life, and the subject of friendship itself. Michel Plaisance, "L'Académie Florentine de 1541 à 1583: permanence et changement," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 133-134, citing Salvini, *Fasti consolari dell'Accademia Fiorentina* (Florence, 1717), 246. Many poems written by Rosa's academic friends (eulogistic and otherwise) often treat of the topic. (I discuss these poems at length in chapter three.) Rosa seems to have planned a satire on Friendship: in a letter to Ricciardi of March 1654, Rosa says his critics have claimed that he wrote satires on the subjects of Friendship and Nobility," both of which he noted were "tutti due motivi da me celebrati per belli da far satire, discorrendo di sì fatte materie con i medesimi gli anni passati." Borelli, letter 176. Friendship is also a prominent theme in Rosa's *Teatro della Politica* which may have been composed as a source of ideas for his satires.

position that truly conferred liberty (at least in an ideal sense[232]) in the *seicento* – a role that achieved its highest and most successful expression within the confines of the academy's activities, but that gave its practitioner an increased confidence to push its boundaries into the outside world.

The Friendly Activities of the *Percossi*

Baldinucci implies that Rosa's academy had a relatively open organization. No record of rules or statutes for the *Percossi* or its practices survives. Yet one has a sense that certain rituals were deemed essential to their organization, including the public performance of improvised comedies, the staging of elaborate private dinners or *simposie*, and the composition and recital of satirical poetry. The *Percossi* was not unique in making these activities central to their purpose: the Siennese *Rozzi*, for example, composed *strambotti* (eight-line verse) and eclogues, and gained notoriety for their Carnival comedies;[233] the Paduan *Infiammati* "encouraged their members to submit plays for production before select guests;" and the Florentine *Umidi* elected a *principe* each week during the pre-Lenten season who was required to arrange a banquet "with an appropriate celebration such as a verse competition or performance of a comedy by members of the academy."[234] Among the *Percossi*, however, these activities (especially theatrical performance) were ritualized in the service of defending, validating and promoting Rosa's professional identity. The intimate setting of Rosa's house, which replicated the *Percossi*'s public performances in the more private form of poetic recital,[235] allowed him to cultivate a distinctive identity in the safe and

[232] Elias, *The Court Society*, 144.
[233] The Siennese *Intronati* also performed plays, although theirs were of a more lofty, arcadian brand, while the *Rozzi*'s performances were "rustic" ("villareccie e rusticane") in comparison. On the *Intronati* see Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 3: 350-362.
[234] Radcliffe-Umstead, "The Erudite comic tradition of the *Commedia dell'arte*," 37.
[235] Indeed, Baldinucci tells us that the public performances staged at the Casino were motivated by a desire to "share with the public some reflection of their private activities." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 452: "Avvenne poi che desiderando gli accademici di far godere anche al pubblico qualche reflesso de' loro privati trattenimenti, deliberarono di fare in certi mesi dell'anno alcune bellissime e bizzarrissime commedie all' improvviso, per entro il palazzo, abitazione del serenissimo principe cardinale di Toscana, detto il casino da S. Marco, sotto la protezione del serenissimo principe cardinale Gian Carlo."

free space of friendship and gave him the confidence to re-launch that identity anew on the public stage of the court.

Theatrical Performance: "The Play's the Thing"

In Florence, the literal brand of performance so integral to Rosa's identity and its assertion became a defining feature of his private *conversazione*. More than this, the establishment of an academic context for Rosa's theatrical interests lent further justification to a practice that had probably lacked the same level of organization in his earlier Roman years. In Florence and Volterra, the acerbic nature of performances that had engendered controversy in Rome found not only acceptance but active encouragement. It is noteworthy in this context, however, that during his Florentine sojourn Rosa seems to have curbed the particularly vitriolic type of attacks on individual rivals that he had instigated in Rome (and would take up again, soon after his return in 1650),[236] a restraint that surely contributed to his achievement.

The theatrical performances of the *Percossi* are best understood as part of the more general *seicento* development of a semi-professional brand of theatre, "a phenomenon parallel to the official theatre and which involved artists not only in the scenographic but also performative sense."[237] Very little is known about the actual plays staged by the *Percossi*, save the few comments by Rosa's biographers.[238] Molinari has attempted to reconstruct the theatre of Gian' Carlo's Casino

---

[236] For Rosa's run-in with the Roman *Accademia di San Luca*, and the controversy engendered by his satires among the *Accademia degli Umoristi*, see 91, note 97, above.

[237] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 64. For a discussion of this phenomenon among the "civili conversazioni" of early *seicento* Florence, see Sara Mamone, "Tra tela e scena. Vita d'accademia e vita di corte nel primo Seicento fiorentino," *Biblioteca teatrale* 37-38 (1996): 213-228, and *idem*, "Il sistema dei teatri e le accademie a Firenze sotto la protezione di Giovan Carlo, Mattias e Leopoldo principi impresario," in *Teatro e spettacolo nella Firenze dei Medici*, ed. Elvira Garbero Zorzi and Mario Sperenzi (Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2001), 83-113. On Gian' Carlo de' Medici's theatrical activity, see N. Michelassi, "Il Teatro del Cocomero di Firenze: uno stanzone per tre accademie (1651-1665)," *Studi Secenteschi* XL (1999): 149-186; and *idem*, "Schede secentesche XXI- Memorie dal sottopalco: Giovan Carlo de' Medici e il primo teatro della pergola," *Studi Secenteschi* XLIII (2002): 347-355.

[238] As Hermann Schlimme has indicated, the non-institutionalized nature of these private academies, such as the *Percossi*, has meant that their activities are not so well recorded. Schlimme, "Between Architecture, science and

based on the documentary record of its appearance, noting its earlier *cinquecento* history as a site for open-air theatrical performances and the likelihood that Rosa contributed his own stage-designs and backdrops to the existing playhouse scenery.[239] But not much is known about the nature of the performances themselves; what little information remains comes from Baldinucci, who claims to have been a first-hand witness.[240] He describes the plays as consisting of the mixed form: "*soggettti nobili e gravi, non senza l'aggiunta di parti ridicoli*." They included the most potentially outlandish masks of the *commedia*: Pasquella, Pascariello, and the Dottor Graziano, who together elicited such laughter from the audience that one was "in danger of cracking, or of meeting some other accident."[241] Despite their moral-satirical bent, the *Percossi*'s performances were also highly comical. Usually staged during Carnival season, their "beautiful and very bizarre improvised comedies" were "carried off very well, which was an astonishing thing", says Baldinucci.

Most of the performances were devised by Rosa, although some were composed by Dati. The members of the academy adopted recurring roles, the most frequent performers being Salvetti, Dati, and Ricciardi.[242] Of the other members, Dottor Viviani played the part of Pasquella, a role of which Baldinucci says he had "been consistently the best inventor"; Luigi Ridolfi played the part of "an awkward peasant"; Francesco Cordini played the role of a "sly and clever servant woman"; Francesco Maria Agli, a septuagenarian who traveled expressly from Bologna in order to participate, played the part of Dottor Graziano "marvelously"; Giovan Filippo Marucelli and Dottor Pier Filippo Tommaso Lasagnini ("a young person of great genius") played the parts of the maidens. The Count Luigi di Giulio Altoviti, a member of "one of the most illustrious families

---

technology: the Accademia della Vachia in Florence, 1661-1662," in *Practice and Science in Early Modern Italian Building. Towards an Epistemic History of Architecture* (Milan: Electa, 2006), 61.

[239] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 230-1. Rosa's involvement in designing stage scenery is also suggested by Ricciardi's request in 1654 that Rosa send him the scenic drawings for comedies he was staging in Pisa. See Borelli, letters 178, 180, 182.

[240] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 452.

[241] *Ibid*, 452. On the "mixed form" of comedy, see Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 233.

[242] Baldinucci does not mention their particular roles.

of Tuscany",[243] took up the position of *direttore* or manager, a job that caused him significant frustration when the persistent demands for tickets from the city's *cavalieri* and intelligentsia outweighed the space available in the theatre of the Casino, as they apparently often did.[244]

A similar, though more intimate, brand of comedic performance was practiced among Rosa's friends at the Maffei villas in Volterra. Baldinucci recounts that the party at Barbaiano devoted their evenings to "the reciting of comedies" in the "improvised manner", especially during Carnival. Here, Rosa chose the concept for the comedy and frequently played the part of Coviello Patacca, while Ricciardi and the others took the more serious roles. Mariotto Lisci, a nobleman of Volterra, also played the role of a servant, while the surgeon Luigi Ceccherelli played the part of the fool Parasacco, "singing on his lute certain ridiculous songs, playing the role with gusto and marvel."[245] Some indication of the nature of these performances and their production may be culled from one of Rosa's nostalgic reminiscences in a letter to Ricciardi of 1668:

> "Oh God, what recollections are these! I swear to you that I have never seen a scene, nor do I ever hear recited a comedy, in which I do not remember the particulars of those times, of those hours, and that happy Carnival, that does not entirely delight me and sweetly transfix me in your company. … Oh how much I yearn for those most brilliant pastimes, those being the only days that I can consider to have been truly happy. I am moved by the contemplation of those [times when we would] rise at midnight for the devising of future subjects. The assistance of that young boy around the bed in drying up the sweat; that precious applause of the women, who did not forget to be kind even during sleep, and above all else your most genial company, perfect in all aspects."[246]

---

[243] Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, 46.
[244] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453. "In somma piacquero tanto a ognuno i parti di questo nobile congresso, che Luigi di Giulio Altoviti, che ne aveva avuto il carico di provveditore, a gran fatica potea difendersi dalle tante e calorosissime iustanze, che venivangli fatte del continovo de' cavalieri e studiosi di questa città, per essere in esso ricevuti."
[245] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 461-2; Pascoli, *Vite*, 69-70; De' Dominici, *Vite*, 237.
[246] Borelli, letter 355: "Oh Dio, e che ricordanze son queste! Vi giuro che non veggo mai scena, né odo recitar mai comedia, che non mi sovenghino le specie di quei tempi, di quelle hore, e di quel beatissimo Carnevale, che non tanto mio diletto in vostra compagnia dolcemente io trapassai. … Oh quanto più di voi son da me sospirate quelle genialissime ricreazioni, essendo stati quelli i soli giorni ch'io posso aditar per veramente felici. Mi intenerisco nella contemplazione di quelle levate a mezzanotte per la fabbrica del futuro soggetto. L'assistenza di quella gioventù intorno a quel letto, per rasciugarmi il sudore; quei preziosi plausi delle dame, quali non lasciavano d'esser cortesi neanche fra il sonno, e sopra ogn'altra cosa la vostra a me genialissima compagnia, in tutte parti perfettissima."

In addition to the rather entertaining image of the encouragement provided by the "women" during these late-night sessions of inspired dramatic creativity, particularly noteworthy is the suggestion that these dramatic compositions consisted in a collective effort, inspired (as Molinari intuits) "by specific creative energies, materialized in the improvisation and sustained by the canonical structure of fixed parts subdivided among the different participants".[247] In addition to an improvised form of theatrics, however, the members of Rosa's academy also performed scripted comedies, many of which were composed by Ricciardi, who attempted to infuse the written word with the spontaneity of speech.[248]

Insight into the nature of the *Percossi*'s performances may also be gleaned from Lorenzo Lippi's *Il Malmantile Racquistato* in which he describes Rosa's comical performance as Coviello Patacca: "always when he moved or spoke, made jaws unhinge [with laughter]."[249] Another passage in the *Malmantile* concerning "Rosaccio" – a humorous character based on Rosa – suggests the highly satirical nature of Rosa's performance as a charlatan.[250] Further (but, again, limited) testimony regarding the *Percossi*'s performances comes from an anonymous chronicle of the Carnival of 1643, an account that suggests the academy's comedies had gained a significant degree

[247] Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 234.
[248] *Ibid*, 242. "Angelo Fabroni, in his *Historia Academicae Pisanae* (Pisa, Mugnaino, 1795, 130) reveals a testimony – probably from the 1650's – that shows how, even far from the *Accademia dei Percossi*, Ricciardi maintained (as a comedy-writer) a particular tie with the spoken word more than the written one, and the demand to 'improvvisare' the script before drafting it."
[249] Lippi, *Malmantile*, IV. 14. "Salvo Rosata, un uom della sua tacca, / perocché anch'ei s'abbevera in Permesso / e pittor passa chiunque tele imbiacca, / tratta d'ogni scienza ut ex professo / e in palco fa sì ben Coviel Patacca, / che sempre ch'ei si muove o ch'ei favella, / fa proprio sgagherarti le mascella."
[250] "Rosaccio con altissime parole, / movendo il pie', racconta che a pigione/ fa per quel mese dar la casa al Sole / e nel Zodiaco alloga lo Scorpione,/ così sballando simil ciance e fole/ si tira dietro un nugol di persone,/ fa per impresa, in mezzo all'intervallo,/ di due sue corna un globo di cristallo." Lippi, *Malmantile*, III. 63; see Rak, "Cade il mondo," 93 and 96 notes 20-21. Paolo Minucci's annotations to the Malmantile contain an amusing description of *Rosaccio*. See Lippi, *Malmantile*, ed. Luigi Portirelii (Milan: Dalla Societa Tipografica de' Classici Italiani, 1807), 158, III, stanza 63.

of renown by that date and which also supports an argument for their evolution from a small, informal *conversazione* into an academy two years, at most, after Rosa arrived in the city.[251]

In Florence and Volterra Rosa played the characters of Coviello and Pascariello – the latter of which, says Baldinucci, was acted with such skill that not enough could be said about it.[252] That the *Percossi* were not only receptive to Rosa's theatrical persona but amenable to being crafted into a veritable project for its dissemination is suggested by Francesco Rovai's poem to the *Improvvisi*, which illuminates the Rosa-centric mission of the academy and of its dramatic performers in particular. Weaving together an elaborate metaphor of the passionate, fiery, inspired talents of his fellow academicians, Rovai's poem evinces the centrality of Rosa himself to his academy and its (un-written) "constitution" of moral-satirical furor and philosophical inspiration:

> "It is the Rose that each of you follows,
> And it is the reason that we all flourish,
> Inflaming and moving you all, and giving your vitality fire."[253]

With Rovai's poem as evidence, Scott has suggested the possibility that some of the members of the *Percossi* comprised a theatrical sub-group known as the "*Improvvisi*".[254]

---

[251] See Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa," 236; ASF MS Misc. Medicea 304, fascio III, inserto 4, nono foglio non numerato. "Firenze 23 Gen.o 1643, [...] Hieri nel Casino di S. A. Rev.ma gl'Accademici Percossi recitorno la loro p.a. Commedia, e L'immaginativo del loro valore era così accreditato, che vi concorse gran quantità di Dame, che non erano invitate e che mai in tal feste s'erano più viste; alla p. a. Porta stave il s.re cav. Bartolini, ch'era così cortise, ch'a 20 hore hano impiere tutto il teatro, e di genti ancora, che per non conoscerle si suol credere fussero forestieri; alla Porta delle Dame ci stava il S. Cav. del Borgo, ed i suoi amici hebbero vantaggio d'essere amessi fra le Dame, ma qualche d'uno d'eta canuta scordatosi l'obbligo, ch. devono i cav.ri alle Dame, ed qualch. Giovanetto ancora che non riconoscendo altro debito, che il potere mirare le Dame, non volsero udire, ne ammettere persuasione alc.a in dare Luogo a molti [...] che per haver mandato via La carrozza, s'hebbero a trattenere nel salotto, molte stettero ritte mescolate coi cav.ri ch'anch [...]." Molinari suggested the "prima" comedy to which the author refers "could be the public debut of the *Percossi*," indicated by the suggestion of the spectator's "great expectation" in anticipating the performance. Yet another possible account of the *Percossi*'s performances may appear in the diary of Giovanni Poggi Cellesi, a gentleman of the camera of Grand Duke Ferdinando II de' Medici, written on the occasion of the carnival of 1643 and the entertainments organized in the Casino di San Marco. Molinari, "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa", 236; G. Poggi Cellesi, *Diario di Corte in forma di appunti*, ASF MS Misc. Medicea 302, 36r-36v. Rosa first indicated his involvement in the theatrical activity of the Medici court in a letter to Giulio Maffei of January 24 1641 (Borelli, letter 1), where he refers to some comedies being recited in Pisa for the prince (presumed to be Gian' Carlo de' Medici), suggestive of the possibility that his *conversazione* was already established at this date. Molinari, *ibid*, 234. Maylender had based his dating of Rosa's academic theatrical activity on the testimony of the biographers, placing their first activity between 1646 and 1647. Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 4: 262-65.

[252] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 451-452.

[253] Appendix III. I. "È della Rosa ognun di voi seguace,/ Ed ella ch'è cagion, che noi fiorite/ V'infiamma e move, e davvi il Brio vivace".

Rosa continued with his theatrical interests, primarily during Carnival season, after he returned to Rome in 1649. In his epistolary lamentations for his old Florentine academic friendships, it is their theatrical performances that seem to exert a particular hold on his affection – suggesting, further, the particular significance of this academic activity to his desired professional identity. He repeatedly expressed his sadness at not being able to take part in Ricciardi's own plays in Pisa, and to perform again as Patacca.[255] As late as 1668, Rosa was still writing nostalgically about the time spent performing among friends in Florence: during a bout of illness in May of that year, he complained about the poor quality of the comedies in Rome, pining for those happy times of years past and inquiring after the recitals being conducted by their mutual friends in Pisa and Florence.[256] The popularity of Ricciardi's comedies in Rome would also have kept the Florentine experience fresh in Rosa's mind.[257] For Rosa, the play truly was "the thing" – a place (as Hamlet had anticipated) wherein truths could be captured and, even more significantly, where real identities could be conceived, fashioned and broadcast.

---

[254] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 58. An apparently neglected poem entitled *Il Brindis di Pier Salvetti* ("A Toast by Pier Salvetti"), which concludes "Del Pier Salvietti all'improvv[.]",appears to link the academic dinners of the *Percossi* "proper" with the theatrical association, suggesting a less concrete division between the two. BNCF MS Magl. VII. 573 – VII. *Pier Salvetti, Poes. Varie*, 3r-9v. It is worth noting that there were a number of other academies in Italy that took the name "*Improvvisi*". Maylender lists three, including one in Fiorenzuola d'Arda (Lombardy) in the later part of the century, one active in Perugia founded in 1684 and devoted to "improvised" discourses and poetry, and another founded in Lodi and active from at least the 1590's, which was itself devoted to comedic performance and had as its motto "ESTEMPORE". Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 3: 179-181. Fumagalli argues that "in Grand Ducal Florence Rosa did not find conformity with his own interest in theatre, which, according to Baldinucci, Rosa then found a place for in his own academy." Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 62. But the fluidity of boundaries between the private academy and its courtly associations complicates such a clear cut division. The idea that the group was fragmented into two nominally distinct entities, according to the concept of "improvisation," is also debatable in view of the fact that the term was applicable for most of their activities.

[255] See Borelli, letters 55, 114, 121, 126, 135, 208, 209, 234, 268, and 375.

[256] Borelli, letters 355 and 114. For other complaints about the comedies in Rome, see letters 121, 161, 162, 163, 174, 221, 241, 243, 320, 338, 364, 365. Echoing his earlier reprimand of Bernini, Rosa complained to Ricciardi about the "overly intricate [*faldone*]" nature of Roman comedies, which "lacked taste in their recital". Borelli, letter 162. They were cold and uninspiring [*fredde*], (letter 174), of a "base and stingy [*vigliacca e pidocchiosa*]" constitution (letter 338), and occasionally patently stale – a thing particularly offensive to Rosa's predilection for novelty (letter 363). Also see letters 259 and 364.

[257] See Borelli, letters 252, 259, 263, and 301. Rosa yearned in particular for the opportunity to reprise his alter-ego Coviello.

The *Symposium* – A Fare of Friends, Food, Verse and Inspiration

Antonio Malatesti dedicated a poem to Rosa entitled "To Salvatore for a Dinner," intended more than likely for the occasion of one of the *Percossi*'s *simposie* or academic meals. In it he extols with humour the extravagant delights of Rosa's feasts:

> "You are, oh Salvadore, a great man
> in making suppers and meals for your friends,
> and I believe that in searching throughout all the companies of the world
> one would not find your equal;
> You would seem to make even acorns good
> while not spending money,
> but people willingly attach themselves to your house
> where there are chickens by the heap."[258]

The dinners Rosa hosted at his house are among the *Percossi*'s most significant borrowings from the Platonic academy.[259] Erudite and philosophical in nature, and aimed at the display of poetic talent, these *symposie* are also an important instance of the social birthing of Rosa's professional identity as inspired and free painter-philosopher.

The *symposium* (drinking party) and *convito* (dinner banquet) were, in the ancient Greek tradition of Plato and Xenophon, a form of meeting-cum-banquet during which virtuous men combined the pleasure of good food, wine, and the enjoyment of good conversation.[260] Sanctioned

---

[258] For the poem see Appendix IV. 1. "Voi sete o Salvadore un huomo grande/ in far cene agl'amici e desinari / e credo che a cercar tutte le bande/ del mondo non si trovi un vero pari / voi faresti parer buone le ghiande / mentre non fate spendere i danari / però la gente volentier s'attaca / a casa vostre ove son polli a massa". The poem is cited in Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 15; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 57, and Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravilgiosa Speditezza*, 64. Malatesti's comment that Rosa was able to make even acorns seem appealing "without spending money" may have been an ironic dig at Rosa for having miserly proclivities, although Baldinucci stressed the extravagant and generous munificence of Rosa in staging these academic dinners (and in his attitude toward spending money on his friends in general) – an idea that is also alluded to by Malatesti's comment that there were "chickens by the heap". See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 457, 497-8. Alternatively, Malatesti may have been referring to the *mascherate*, the fictive confections of meals that the *Percossi* took pleasure in concocting, and thus Rosa's ability to make "even acorns good" was not so much about frugality as inventiveness.

[259] Plato and his disciples were believed to have practiced conversation, the reading of poetry, banquets, and theatrical and musical performances in the garden of *Academos*. See Fumaroli, "The Republic of Letters", 146. Baldinucci's use of the term *simposie* (*Notizie*, 453) suggests the term may also have been used by Rosa and his friends. Rosa does not use the word in his letters or satires, but does refer affectionately to the "*cene*" he enjoyed with friends at their villas. See Borelli, letters 32 and 369.

[260] See for example Plutarch's *Quaestiones conviviales*, Macrobius's *Saturnalia convivia*, and Cicero's *De senectute*, XIII, where he writes of his preference for the *convivio* over *simposio*. Plato's *Banquet of the Seven Sages* is the source of the "*sermo*" as a discourse grounded in friendship. Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence," 37.

along with conversation as an elemental ritual within *academia*, and indulgence in food and wine (combined with the companionship these activities fostered) was endorsed as a conduit toward higher knowledge.[261] Friendship is essential to both the *symposium* and the *convito*, the latter of which is etymologically linked to the Italian word *convivialità* (conviviality or friendliness) and the Latin *convivium* (literally, to eat together).[262] A number of early-modern academies made the ritual of *simposia* a key feature of their academic practice.[263]

Baldinucci records that Rosa held elaborate dinners for the academy's members after each theatrical performance which he "insisted upon financing himself." These dinners consisted in an array of dishes, each more "bizarre" than the last:

> "in one meal you would have seen every dish appear in the form of pastries, even the salad; in another, all the dishes would be roasted things; in another, all soups; in another, all stews; in another, finally, all mincemeats [*polpette*]… it was marvelous to see the beautiful and bizarre inventions, which appeared every evening, and to taste the multitudes and varieties of flavours, which satisfied everyone."[264]

The *simposie*, then, are the culinary equivalent of the academy's other pursuits: like the poems, satires, and plays produced by the academy's members (often in conjunction with the meals themselves), the dinners are characterized by invention and (seeming) improvisation, at once witty

---

[261] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 206.

[262] *Ibid*, 205. In the literary tradition, the *convito* and *convivio* were eventually fused into a singular idea of "the table of knowledge."

[263] I have already mentioned the renown of the Bentveughels, the *Vignaiuoli*, the *Valle di Bregno*, and the Florentine *Svogliati* for their "convivial atmosphere" and "sumptuous banquets". The banquet also provided the setting for the origins of Vasari's *Vite*, and featured as an important theme in his biographies. See Paul Barolsky, *Why Madonna Smiles and Other Tales by Vasari* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1991), 112-115. Rosa's interest in the otherwise "irrational" Platonic or Bacchanalian components of inspiration is not necessarily incongruous with his vision of inspiration as a rational, and ultimately self-sufficient, experience. One need not look far for evidence of a conscious adoption of the ritual of *convito* on Rosa's part in the service of this more rational and decidedly moral-philosophical aim: one of his favorite ancient texts, the *Satires* of Juvenal, featured the academic dinner among friends as a setting for the illustration of his moral lessons. See Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist. A Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960). Juvenal also used the ritual more generally to demonstrate the value of friendship which was so central to the Epicurean philosophy that he espoused. The erudite potential of the *symposium* also explains Rosa's use of it as a strategy for making friends among the Medici courtiers upon his arrival in Florence.

[264] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453-54. "Era poi cosa bizzarrissima il vedere l'ordinazione di quelle mense de' simposi; perché in una avreste veduto comparire ogni vivanda in pasticci, fino l'insalata stessa: in un'altra tutti arrosti: in altra tutte minestre; in altra tutti stufati; in altre finalmente tutte le polpette: ed era maraviglioso il vedere le belle e bizzarro invenzioni, colle quali, senza variare vivanda, ogni sera era fatta apparire e gustare moltitudine e varietà di sapori, che tutti appagava."

and erudite. The practice of making artful, inventive dishes is part of a more general Florentine fondness for the expression of wit and joviality in the social setting, and it has an important precursor in a specifically Florentine academic context: the dinners hosted by the *Compagnia del Paiuolo*, founded by the artist Giovan Francesco Rustici in 1512, consisted primarily of "sculpted" dishes made to resemble other things.[265] Among the few regulations enforced by the *Percossi*, the *simposie* were always to be accompanied (according to the "essential law" of the academy) by a "beautiful oration". Francisco Maria Agli, for example, wrote a speech in praise of the *polpette*, a soft dish that was particularly suited to a man of his age who "found himself entirely without teeth".[266]

Conversation and Poetic Recital

The *Percossi* provided Rosa with an essential audience for his satires which he first began writing in Florence and recited to friends at his house and at the villas of the Maffei in Volterra. He also seems to have encouraged his friends to read them aloud: Baldinucci records, for example, that Francesco Berni recited Rosa's satire on Painting at one of the *Percossi*'s meetings.[267] There is little on which to construct an image of the exact nature of the *Percossi*'s recitals, although they likely followed the more typical formula of other Florentine academies: an original composition would be read aloud by the author, and then his fellow academics would respond with questions and comments.[268]

---

[265] Acton, *The Last Medici*, 34. On Rustici's dinners, see Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Maurizio Marini, "Vita di Giovan Francesco Rustici," 1128-1130. On the subject of *mascherate* or fictive culinary confections in the seventeenth century, see Jun di Schino, *I fasti del banchetto barocco* (Rome: Diomeda Centro studi e ricerche, 2005).
[266] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 454.
[267] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453. It is not clear whether or not Baldinucci refers specifically to Rosa's satire *La Pittura*, which Roworth has argued dates to 1650. Roworth points out that Baldinucci does not specify a date for the recital, and notes that it was not read by Rosa himself "as was his custom", suggesting "the possibility that Rosa might not have been present at the recitation, which could have taken place at any time, even after his move back to Rome." Roworth, "A Date for Salvator Rosa's Satire on Painting," 612-13.
[268] Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 8.

Baldinucci paints a vivid picture of Rosa's own readings, which he took great satisfaction in performing: being sure to include both close friends and more eminent men in his audience, he would begin with a small invitation or introduction, and then dive in, "accompanying the reading with the most wonderful jokes and the most ridiculous faces, in his Neapolitan manner, that one could imagine". Rosa would include pauses in anticipation of applause, at which he would jump up and exclaim: "Hear this, look, raise your eyes!" The biographer noted that Rosa was notorious for his insatiable appetite for praise, always seeking the greatest amount of laughter from his audience, to the point that he would try to elicit it with all kinds of lively gestures and expressions. Wildly flailing his limbs about the room, he could be seen "throwing his hat to the ground, rolling about on it like a donkey, and banging his head on the wall" for emphasis – behaviour that Baldinucci praised as a demonstration of Rosa's impressive expressive ability, but censured as evidence of his "excessive appetite for glory" and "exceeding love of his own work."[269]

At their meetings the *Percossi* took turns listening to each other's compositions "in verse and prose" – the number of their recitals so great, says Baldinucci, that they would "comprise a volume". Many of the compositions (which I discuss at length in the next chapter) appear to have been *elogie* in praise of fellow members, Rosa in particular. The academy's compositions often treated satirical and moralizing themes, sharing with other *seicento* academies a common goal in the pursuit of virtue.[270] This endeavour (and the nature of the conversations and recitals in which it was couched), however, was at once earnest and playful, formal and offhand, contrived and spontaneous. By Rosa's time, the scholarly and social aspects of academic life had become

[269] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 496-7. Croce notes Rosa's use of his distinctive Neapolitan language, as recounted by Baldinucci: "Siente chesso, vi'; auza l'uocchie!" Croce, "Saggi sulla letteratura italiana," 342.
[270] See Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 7, 23-4; Dempsey, "Some Observations on the Education of Artists," 563; Iain Fenlon, "Zarlino and the Accademia Venetiana," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 79. The virtuous aims of academicians also extended to the purpose of the academy, itself, conceived as "the engine of civic virtue" for its broader socio-political responsibility and efficacy.

inseparably entwined, and "[w]isdom, pleasure, and *virtù* … had become interchangeable."[271] Indeed, the pedantic tone of Rosa's satires – a tone that also crops up repeatedly in his letters – was tempered by a simultaneous love of jocular diversion. And although Rosa regarded his writing with all sincerity as an efficacious instrument of his position and identity – a very real opportunity to engage directly with the society he both craved and deplored – he was fully aware of the futility of that exercise. In reality, his situation was limited by restrictions beyond his control, and while his satires enjoyed a relatively wide circulation in manuscript form, they were not actually published until after his death.[272] In distinction to the primarily didactic mission of contemporary and later academies and schools of art, theatre, music, literature or science, the Florentine academies of the *Crusca*, *Intronati*, *Apatisti* or *Percossi* "made no pretense of instructing or edifying their fellow citizens" but instead "addressed only a select elite."[273] In his satire *La Poesia* Rosa mocked the academies of his own time (the *Crusca* in particular) in a manner that is more about affectionate ridicule than serious, incensed critique. He took a jab at the poetic pretensions of his academic contemporaries, who, as poets, were doomed to be ill-appreciated by a society that values money over words. As a consequence, however, he must have been aware that the *Percossi*'s ambitions might suffer the same fate. Rosa writes:

> All your inventions and your interludes
> are suitable for brothels or a pub
> and not the prizes and the praise you claim.
> The labours of your whetted intellects
> have only wit to scribble doggerel,
> to draw your little thoughtlets out with tongs

---

[271] Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 19, 25, 26; Dempsey, "Some Observations on the Education of Artists," 568; Quiviger, "The Presence of Artists in Literary Academies," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 107. The poetry written and recited in *seicento* academies was still regarded with a seriousness that may be hard for modern readers to imagine. Cochrane, *ibid*, 22. But the philosophical gravity awarded to these poems – and the more serious side of academic practice – was tempered by the more social and convivial purpose of the academy. Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 8. It is appropriate to see the *Percossi* likewise as a space that combined equal parts "pleasure" and "erudition". Baldinucci, for instance, is quick to point out that the *simposie* or elaborate banquets in which the *Percossi* indulged were not only intended for amusement but as the opportunity to display virtue. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453.
[272] Rosa's satires were first published in Rome, c. 1694. See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 12 note 12.
[273] Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 22.

> and cobble rhymes together with some wax
> and then misunderstand each word's accent,
> to have a quarry of bizarre conceits,
> to give antitheses for every word,
> to write and print all kinds of mad ideas.
> Don't Bran yourselves and don't be so upset
> by others' poems that your bark can't stir
> and, if you're Floured, jump in the frying pan.[274]

Fully cognizant that many of the members of the *Percossi* also belonged to the *Crusca* – Dati, Chimentelli, Bandinelli, and their illustrious patron Gian' Carlo de' Medici – Rosa likely intended his mockery largely in jest.[275] The *Crusca*, moreover, also had a sense of humor about their academic pursuit of moral virtue (illustrated most clearly in the academic *imprese* of their *pale*) and shared with the *Percossi* a sense of lightheartedness about their otherwise moralizing mission.[276] In the private *conversazione*, the ostensibly rhetorical and didactic aim of conversation and poetry was directed more at the members themselves, and only projected into society in an ideal rather than practical sense.

II.5. *Percossi*: What's in a Name?

Baldinucci is alone among the early sources in mentioning the academy's moniker,[277] and there are few if any textual (let alone visual) symbols from which to construct a clearer understanding of its meaning. It is particularly strange that Rosa never mentions the academy's name in his letters, an omission that gives cause for a certain degree of prudence in reading too much into its connotation. But the name is an intriguing one, and – if we trust Baldinucci's

---

[274] Rosa, *La Poesia*, vv. 354-399: "le vostre invenzioni e gli episodi/ son degne di taverne e lupanari/ e voi ne pretendete e premi e lodi!/ ... De' vostri studi i gloriosi impacci,/ l'occupazion de' vostri ingegni aguzzi/ facondia han sol da schiccherar versacci,/ stirar con le tenaglie i concettuzzi,/ rattacconar le rime con la cera,/ ad ogni accento far gl<i> equivocuzzi,/ aver di grilli in capo una miniera,/ far contraposto ad ogni paroluccia,/ e scrivere e stampare ogni chimera. ... Non t'incruscar tant'oltre e non t'afliggere/ de' carmi altrui ch'il tuo latrar non muove/ se Infarinato sei, vatti a far friggere." English translation by Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 82-3.

[275] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 83; and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 370, who considers Rosa to have had a more unswervingly sincere conviction in his moralizing efficacy.

[276] The *Crusca*, who had in their early days participated in the exchange of jocular "*cruscate*", had "essentially wanted a blend of *piacevolezza* and *erudizione* rather than the serious discussions, pedantic readings or compositions of the Accademia." Woodhouse, "Borghini and the Foundation of the Accademia della Crusca," in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 167.

[277] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 451.

account, as I have done in many matters pertaining to Rosa's Florentine experience – then it may be possible to construct an interpretation of the academy's name through a detailed examination of the word as it was more generally used by Rosa and his friends.

Rovai's poem for the "*Accademia degli Improvvisi*" (perhaps the most revealing extant document regarding Rosa's academy) suggests that the *Percossi* may have employed both nicknames and an *impresa* – traditional *seicento* academic paraphernalia. One of the manuscript transcriptions of the poem playfully makes reference to the names of various academicians, aligning the words of its verse with their surnames and signaling their special meaning by spelling them in capital letters, occasionally accompanied by a marginal note: "CAVALGA", for example, is both the "one who rides" (*cavalcare*, to ride or straddle) the wheel referred to in the poem's narrative, and "Andrea Cavalcanti".[278] These are not the especially witty or anagrammatic nicknames used in other, contemporary academies, but their inclusion suggests the likelihood that the *Percossi* participated in the same exercise.[279] Rovai's use of the name "IMPROVVISI", also written in capital letters, suggests that this word also had a symbolic or allegorical import that was perhaps codified in some form of academic motto.[280] Lippi, Rosa's good friend and likely fellow member

---

[278] BNCF MS ii ii 285, 1r-2v. Among the other identifiable names are ROSA (Salvator Rosa), ABATE (probably Antonio Abati), MALA and TESTA (with a note in the margin reading "Antonio Malatesta"), LIPPO (which must be Lorenzo Lippi), and SIGNOREGGIA (probably Gian'Carlo de' Medici).

[279] Rovai concluded his poem with his own anagrammatic nickname as a member of the *Apatisti*, "Rainero Fucasco" and in the title of the poem introduced himself as author with the epithet "*L'Instabile*". See Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 61. Rovai uses the same epithet again in a poem for Andrea Cavalcanti (BNCF MS Magl. VII. 872 – VII. *Varie Poesie diverse*. "Al Sig.[re] And[a] Cavalcanti" by Francesco Rovai, 199-204). The nickname "L'Instabile" may have come from one of his other Florentine academic memberships – Rovai also belonged to the *Alterati* and *Svogliati*. Lippi called Rovai "Franco Vicerosa" in the *Malmantile*. Struhal confirmed my own suspicions about the name "Vicerosa" as a playful reference to Salvator Rosa himself: "Lippi's choice of naming Rovai "Vicerosa" …clearly alludes to the poet's [Rovai's] admiring subordination of himself to his Neapolitan friend, perhaps to the extent of completely taking over the latter's ideas on poetry and painting. Furthermore, the word 'franco' may suggest that Rovai was openly and actively alluding to his admiration of Rosa, which is also indicated by his poems." Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 112.

[280] Similar, perhaps to the motto "ESTEMPORE" used by the *Accademia degli Improvvisi* in Lodi in the late sixteenth-century. See 127, note 254 above. It is hard to imagine that Rosa and his friends – who held memberships in many of the other Florentine academies preoccupied with epithets, *imprese*, and allegories, and shared a fascination with hyperbolic erudition and wit – would have neglected the practice. The members of the *Crusca*, for example, famously accompanied their nicknames with *imprese* – a system of allegorical symbolism allied to that more general, ancient association between inner and outer, soul and body – commissioning a series

of the *Percossi*, had himself painted *pale* with *imprese* for two of the members of the *Crusca*,[281] and included anagrammatic pseudonyms for his friends in his *Malmantile*, including among them Rosa himself (as "Salvo Rosata").[282] It is plausible that these names, too, were bandied around during the jocular atmosphere of the meetings at Rosa's house. Rosa's own interest in naming (particularly in the context of role-playing and theatrical performance), together with his frequent habit of self-identifying with historical and literary figures such as Timon the Misanthrope, Democritus, Diogenes, and even Christ ("Salvatore"), and his love of devising humorous monikers for his friends, suggests the strong probability that he encouraged the use of nicknames among his academic friends.[283] Like the "masks" of Coviello and Pascariello (which Rosa associated himself

---

of paintings in the form of shovels (an allusion to their linguistic academic purpose in sifting the "bran" (*crusca*) from the "shaft" of wheat in formulating the Tuscan language), to be displayed at the headquarters of the academy itself. On the function and origins of academic *imprese* see Ciardi, "'A Knot of Words and Things'," 37-39, 41; Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 5; Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 17. The widespread interest in such symbolic representations of identity should be seen as an extension of a more widespread fascination with allegory – especially moral allegory. See Gregori ed., *Storia delle arti in Toscana: Il* Seicento (Florence: Edifir, 2001), esp. Maffeis, "La Pittura di Stanza", 61-80.

[281] Baldassare Suarez ("*il Mantenuto*") and Francesco Ridolfi ("*il Rifiorito*"). D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 286-287.

[282] Struhal notes that Lippi "was inspired to use anagrammatic pseudonyms by the practice among the *Apatisti*". Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 110-111. On anagrammatic pseudonyms, see Gert Ueding ed., *Historisches Woerterbuch der Rhetorik*. 7 vols. (Tuebingen: M. Niemeyer, 1991), I, cols. 479-82.

[283] Rosa's identified himself with Timon of Athens (Borelli, letter 241 and the satire *La Guerra*); the crucified Christ (Borelli, letter 177 and a short poem, Appendix I.2; Francesco Baldovini also told Rosa his name guaranteed his salvation. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 470); the "laughing" Democritus (Borelli, letters 176, 330, 331, 332; also see Roworth's discussion of Rosa's more general self-identification with philosophers in *Pictor Succensor*, 273-293 and *passim).* On artists' naming and the "philosophy of nomenclature" in biography, see Barolsky, *Why Madonna Smiles*, 40-43. Rosa's letters are filled with affectionate and derisive nicknames: he called Giulio Maffei a "hairy beast" ("bestia pelosa") (Borelli, letter 38), "Signor Endymion" (letter 38), and mocked his large nose (letters 34, 37, 44, 57, 58, 70, 82, 97, an epithet he also extended to Marc'Antonio Maffei (letters 50, 54, 160); "Mr. Fashionable Gift-Giver" ("Signor Regalatore alla moda") (letter 44); "Ciullo" (an affectionate, Neapolitan "Giulio" (for example letters 72, 105); "Provveditore degli amici" (letter 67); and "Signor Amazzatore" (letter 160). The Maffei siblings are "Signori Vacchari", probably in reference to their farming (letter 60). Ricciardi is "Signor Viso di cotale" (letter 46), "Signor Horatio" and "Signor Horatiaccio" (for his Horace-like long-windedness) (letters 46 and 49); "Monsignor Minestra" (letters 67, 70); the "Messiah" (letter 67) - an epithet he also gave to Giulio (letters 53, 113, 161); "Signor Coccia" (letter 98); "Signor Metrodoro" (likening him, for presuming to comment on matters of painting, to the second century BCE painter Metrodoro of Athens) (letter 137); "My beautiful Signor Patrigno" (Stepfather) (letter 336); and "Signor Trespolo" after the protagonist of Ricciardi's comedies (letter 363). He referred to Lodovico Maffei as "Signor Capo Polcinella" (letter 153). He also nicknamed his son Augusto "Farfaricchio", a word derived from "farfaro", a grass or herb that grows low to the ground (*Vocabolario della Crusca*) (letter 252).

with even outside the theatrical setting[284]) the academic nickname was part of that more pervasive *seicento* interest in assuming "an imaginative name, a sort of fictitious identity which becomes almost the mask of he who wears it, far from reality in the 'non-reality' of the academic microsociety."[285] Both theatrical and academic names shared a combination of self-deprecation and self-assertiveness, and refer to a meaningful, personal characteristic of the bearer.[286] In this sense, Rosa's academy was an extension of the stage: as in acting, the "masking" effect of naming offered a concealment of one truth and advertisement of another; that is, adopting a name was a process of self-fictionalization, but that fiction could be shaped in the service of the self one desired to project. I argue here that the name of Rosa's academy served this very purpose.

Similar in form to many of the names taken up by contemporary academies, the word "*percossi*" derives from the remote past tense of the verb "*percuotere*" – to strike, hit, beat, or afflict. Hence, the *Percossi* are (in the simplest terms) "those who are stricken" or "the Struck". Scott interpreted the term as "the Smitten," without elaborating further on his translation.[287] The simultaneously injurious and affective implications of Scott's reading (do we take "the Smitten" to mean "the Smited" or "the Infatuated"?), however, is highly suggestive in view of the multivalent potential of academic names. I propose that the name of Rosa's academy intended to convey a variety of interrelated concepts that encapsulated both Rosa's desired identity and its social basis.

On the one hand, "*Percossi*" has a negative connotation. The verb *percuotere* and its cognates refer to being beaten, hit, or to the suffering of some form of affliction or punishment, physical or divine.[288] Baldinucci uses the term thusly in his biography of Rosa, describing the

---

[284] Rosa refers to himself as Patacca in a letter to Ricciardi of 1652. Borelli, letter 126. In another letter to Ricciardi of 1664 (letter 305), Rosa expresses his longing to see his friend: "in the words of Pulcinella: When, when?" In 1654 he referred to his "blundering" actions as "*pulicinellaggine*" (letter 177).

[285] Lazzeri, *Intellettuali e Consenso nella Toscana del Seicento: L'Accademia degli Apatisti* (Milan, 1983), 14.

[286] Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 113-14.

[287] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 43, 55.

[288] See the variety of negative connotations of the term in the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Grande Dizionario di Battaglia*. The *Vocabolario* defines "*percossa*" as a "battitura, o colpo, che si da, o si tocca, e, per

"beatings" (*percosse*) that Rosa received as a child in Naples as punishment for drawing all over the walls of a church cloister, or in describing the illness that "struck" (*percosso*) the Flemish artist Anton de Wael before his death in Rome.[289] On the other hand, the name has a more positive connotation: among the verb's various connotations are a set of optimistic and creative meanings, including a state of agitation, frenzy or liveliness, of being brightly illuminated by light, or of being struck by an intense feeling of piety, joy or marvel.[290] The more "active" connotation of the word *Percossi*, in contradistinction to the more "passive" names of the academies to which many of Rosa's friends belonged (the *Apatisti* (the Will-less) and the *Svogliati* (the Passionless), for example, which have an almost destitute ring to them) suggests a conscious attempt to cultivate a more lively, enthusiastic and efficacious self-image.

Seen from yet another perspective, the term "*Percossi*" shares with the names of other early-modern academies a play on semantic inversion (another instance of their love of intellectual, witty allegory), intending the ostensibly self-deriding tenor of the name to imply the very opposite. The "*Svogliati*," for example, were anything but "passionless" or "disinterested" but "most active and most tirelessly intent on studying philosophy, the military arts, poetry and politics," their meetings attended by "the best of Florentine society, Princes and Prelates."[291] In the case of the "*Percossi*," the act of "suffering" is inverted by being projected outward as an expression of self-agency: the "strick*en*" also become the "strik*ers*". By inverting the deprecatory meaning of the term, moreover, Rosa could express more effectively his rational and resolute brand of satiric castigation. As a group of inspired moral satirists, moved in their invective by their academic friend and host, the *Percossi* (and Rosa, above all) are at once "struck" by the moral decrepitude of society

---

lo più, senza ferita" ("A blow, or strike, that one gives or receives, and, usually, without injury") The verb "*percuotere*" is defined as "dar colpo, battere, bussare" ("to give a hit, to beat, to bang").

[289] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438, and 502.

[290] Battaglia, *Grande Dizionario*.

[291] Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 5: 289.

(which Rosa rails against in his satires[292]), suffering a mutual sense of affliction, and moved by this experience to exert their own, shared sense of moral responsibility to censure and "strike" out the vices of society, leaving their own mark on the world. The metaphor of the "blows of Fortune," frequently cited in Rosa's letters as a power that contributes to his moral-philosophical self-image (Fortune as the source of both his success and suffering), may also be implicated in the academy's name: as *Percossi*, Rosa and his fellow academics harnessed the existential power of the "blows" of fortune and unleashed it upon mankind.[293] It is possible that both the passive and assertive meanings of the term held interest for Rosa, and that he fully intended to play on the term's multivalency.[294] By using the term self-referentially in both senses Rosa consciously situated himself squarely within a realm of contradictory meaning succinctly emblematic of his more general position of conflict: as a "*Percosso*" Rosa was both the recipient and agent of affliction, both victim and victor. If this interpretation is justified, the name *Percossi* would have resonated in particular for Rosa in connection with his idea of inspiration as a striking force, both in its reception

---

[292] Rosa's hostility was directed to the moral ills of society that affected him personally and that impacted on his contemporaries more generally. On Rosa's satirical poetry and painting, and their collective expression of indignation and hostility regarding "contemporary events, society and politics", see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, esp. chapter 1. Rosa's Getty *Allegory of Fortune*, for example, "comments scornfully on the state of society which can so thoughtlessly allow [the] inequity" shown to painters (Rosa in particular) by corrupt papal patrons. Roworth, *ibid*, 198. Rosa's poem La *Corte di Roma* and his satire *La Babilonia* deal with similar themes, including "*fortuna*'s bestowing of favors upon the least worthy, particularly in regard to the corruption of court life and the basest aspects of power and wealth." Roworth, *ibid*, 200-1. His satire *La Guerra* constitutes an "invective against the evils of war and despotism." Roworth, *ibid*, 208. In *La Pittura*, which deals with the specific vices of contemporary painters, Rosa "raises a plea for reason, decorum, and careful use of learning in painting, and virtuous, honest conduct among its practitioners." Roworth, *ibid*, 119.

[293] The fear that Rosa frequently expressed toward the power of Fortune to dictate both his experience and identity made it a profound model to be emulated in exacting his own autonomous and inspired authority. On Rosa's fatalistic existential philosophy, see my discussion in the introduction. The academy's adoption of the word "*percossi*" may have been derived from a literary source, perhaps one that aligned the word with fate and fortune. Orazio Ricasoli Ruccellai, for example, recorded a maxim in his *Dialoghi di materie filosofiche* that suggests the more pervasive appeal of the "percosse" (blows) of fortune among Rosa's contemporaries: "Le grandezze sole son quelle, che stanno sotto le percosse della ventura." Ruccellai, "Dialoghi filosofici dell'*Imperfetto*", 105.

[294] The *Vocabolario della Crusca* suggests the word's semantic diversity, used to refer to everything from the blow of weaponry, the strike of an earthquake, the action of divine punishment, to the inner turbulence of love. The potential duality of the term's meaning for Rosa and his friends also resonates with other percussive or "striking" metaphors, such as the "darts" of ill-fortune which are mentioned twice in Ricciardi's canzone *Sotto rigida stella* or the "darts" of the moral satirist to which Rosa frequently alludes in his work.

and exertion: Rosa is "struck" by the impulses of his melancholic *furor*[295] and "strikes" out at the world outside. In a letter to Ricciardi of 1659, for example, Rosa claimed that his nature was "subject to enthusiasms, and excites itself at the scarcity of commitments".[296] And to Don Antonio Ruffo he asserted the utterly impulsive nature of his creativity, informing his patron that he had to be "transported by my own impulses of enthusiasm" before any work would be possible.[297]

The intentional semantic multivalency of the term is apparent from Rosa's own poetic use of the verb *percuotere* and the noun *percossa*. In his letters and satires he invests the word with an alternatively destructive or creative import, using it to refer to both the physical actions of men and the mysterious acts of divine providence: a fight between a servant and Giulio Maffei's brother Marc'Antonio, for example, resulted only in a "*semplice percossa*" – a minor blow; the "*percosse amorose*" (attacks of jealousy) that Ricciardi's suspicious protestations give Rosa are a mark of the intensity of his love and friendship; losing his brother Giuseppe and son Rosalvo to the plague is akin to being dealt a blow (*ha percosso*) by Heaven; in the satire *L'Invidia*, *percosse* are the strikings of the teeth of Envy upon the stone ("Il Sasso") that Rosa claims to have exhibited at the Pantheon; and in *La Poesia*, the *percossa* is the final "blow" of fate upon mortality.[298] Most revealing of all is the image of moral-satiric "beating" in Rosa's satire *La Pittura*, perhaps one and the same with the "satire on painting by Rosa" that Baldinucci said was read aloud at one of the academy's meetings by Francesco Berni.[299] Here, the allegorical figure of *Pittura* urges Rosa in his inspired moral mission to take up the whip (*sferza*) in order to strike (*percosso*) its harsh and bitter

---

[295] On *furor melancholicus* and *furor divines*, see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 74 (who sees Rosa's *furor* as a highly personal and passionate notion of satirical anger); Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," *Art Bulletin* 85: 1 (2003): 88; Poseq, "Caravaggio's Self-Portrait as the Beheaded Goliath," *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* 59 (1990): 180 note 33; Panofsky, *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 165-7.
[296] Borelli, letter 225: "alla mia natura qual sogiace a gli entusiasmi, e si riscalda alla strettezza de gli impegni".
[297] Borelli, letter 321. See Appendix I. 5.
[298] For the fight between Marc'Antonio and the servant, see Borelli, letter 63; for the "percosse amorose" of Ricciardi, see letter 46; for the loss of Giuseppe and Rosalvo in 1656, see letter 200; the passage in *L'Invidia* is vv. 544-549. The "*sasso*" was either an actual painting of a stone, as yet unidentified, or simply a metaphor. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 174. The passage in *La Poesia* is vv. 178-180.
[299] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453. See 131, note 267, above.

lashings (*flagelli*) against the damage done by the ignoble painters of his day.[300] The connotation that *Pittura* lends the term "*percossa*" suggests its probable significance for Rosa and his academic friends: a ferocious action that physically articulates the outward expression and assertion of Rosa's philosophical identity, characterized by an "inflamed" satiric indignation. Roworth interpreted the passages in *L'Invidia* and *La Pittura* as expressive of the concepts of inspiration, genius and righteousness integral to Rosa's self-conception.[301] Her observation that the character of *Pittura* touched Rosa's head with her vine-girt staff or thyrsus (a Bacchic symbol of poetic inspiration as well as satiric poetry) in order to "inspire his satiric spirit" suggests that, for Rosa, the exertion of his own genius – his chief preoccupation – would take place in a similar fashion.

Rovai's poem for the *Improvvisi*, permeated with percussive metaphors, conveys a similar image of passionate, fire-induced inspiration: he urges his fellow academics in their self-righteous toil for immortality to "Beat, beat, toil, strike, and persist", a line derived from an expression that also appears in Lippi's *Malmantile*.[302] "[M]ore passionate than the August sun,"[303] the *Improvvisi* are mutually enflamed and motivated by Rosa, and Rovai exhorts them to take up a scourge of Roses and "chase away idleness"[304] (an image uncannily similar to the "lashings" encouraged by Rosa's *Pittura*). Rovai implores his friends to "reprimand" Time with a harsh beating" and strike

---

[300] Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 79-96: "Mira con quanti ohbrobrij, e quanti eccessi/ Da gl'artefici proprij oggi s'oscura/ Il più chiaro mestier, che ai professi/ Parlo de l'arte tua, de la Pittura,/ Ch'é divenuta infame in mano à molti/ Con l'indegnita sua, con la natura./ E in vece di punir gl'audaci, e stolti / Professori di lei con dente acerbo,/ Tu verso il mondo i tuoi furor rivolti./ E tant'empio e'l pennel, tant'é superbo,/ Che sol tra i vezzi ai trastulla, e scherzai / E de gli sdegni tuoi tu fai riserbo?/ Sotto la destra tua provó la sferza / Musica e Poesia: vada del pari/ Con l'altre due sorelle anco la terza./ E se da' tuoi flagelli aspri et amari/ alcun percosso esclamerà, suo danno:/ da le voci d'un solo il resto impari."

[301] See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 60-61, 172-173. Roworth interprets the thyrsus as a symbol of satire.

[302] Appendix III.1. Rovai's line is: "Mena, rimena, dà, picchia, e martella …". In the *Malmantile*, Lippi writes: "Mena le man che, e' pare un berrettaio/ Ed a chius'occhi pur suona a raccolta/ E dágli e picchia, risuona e martella; / Ma forbice! l'è sempre quella bella. (vv. 1122-1125) A note in the *Vocabolario romagnolo-italiano* under the heading "*Dé*" (*Dare*) records that this expression and variations of it ("Dài e pécia e mena martel", "Dagli, picchia e mena," "Picchia, mena e martella," "Mena, mena", or "Picchia e mena") signify "an effort exerted in order to reach a goal". Antonio Mattioli, *Vocabolario romagnolo-italiano* (Imola: Galeati, 1879), 183.

[303] "Voi sete ardenti più ch'il sol d'Agosto …"

[304] "È della Rosa ognun di voi seguace,/ Ed ella ch'è cagion, che noi fiorite/ V'infiamma e move, e davvi il Brio vivace.// Ira le Rose o Signor voi non dormite,/ Ma d'un flag'el di Rose armando il Braccio/ Fugate l'ozio, e 'l cieco obblio fenite."

at him with a sword and "the short biting stab of a long pike", so that he and his ominous threat perish "either from the blows, or from laughter".[305] Although he does not use the term "*percossi*" or any of its cognates, the imagery of Rovai's poem is replete with terms that similarly connote the creative and assertive aims of Rosa and his academy.

The sense of the "momentary" implied by percussive and enflamed action also fits well with the ideal of "improvisation" that Rosa and his friends made a central feature of their poetic and theatrical activities, encapsulated in the name of the "*Improvvisi*" (and, not incidentally, characteristic of Rosa's style and manner of execution in painting and draughtsmanship.[306]) The fiery imagery of Rovai's poem also emphasizes the spontaneous nature of creativity, an ancient idea that aligns invention, novelty and genius with a form of combustive energy encapsulated in *furor*.[307] This "spontaneity" is aligned with the vision of inspiration and creativity as a self-sufficient product and action – it is not random, but pre-meditated and purposeful, and exerted with a deliberate intent. For its purifying as well as inspirational qualities, fire was an apt symbol of the sincere nature of Rosa's moral invective.[308] When Rosa mocked his friend Carlo Dati as "all pretension, all smoke," he implied that he was "all smoke and no fire"; that is, both his person and reputation lacked substance, being more about deception and an "appearance" of greatness than a revelation of truly great, inner essence[309] – hence Rosa's eagerness to describe himself as "all bile, all spirit, all fire".[310]

---

[305] "Correte à spron battato, e in un instante / Fate al Tempo che fugge una malia. … Con lunga Picca un pugnalin pungente/ Accoppia questi, et una spada porta / Che su l'ottuso filo sa piu d'un sente// Prende la Picca, e fier come marfisa / Piattona il Tempo, ond'egli affin si muore / Non so se da suoi Colpi, o dalle Risa."

[306] Mahoney notes the "improvisory" quality the pen technique of many of Rosa's drawings, and his early habit of "improvis[ing] landscape compositions" in oil without preparatory drawings. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 217, 267.

[307] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 18-29. The *Vocabolario della Crusca* defines "*novità*" as "a new, unusual thing that comes about unexpectedly".

[308] An analogy that is made clear in the inscription of his *Genius* etching.

[309] Rosa elsewhere used smoke as a symbol of evanescence and *memento mori*: in the *Umana Fragilitas* [Fig. 97] a *putto* "ignites a bunch of tow fastened to a distaff which … flares briefly only to die out immediately, an image that calls to mind the words of Isaiah 43: 17, 'they are extinct, they are quenched as tow,' and also the phrase used in the papal coronation ceremony … Rosa's use of fleeting smoke here as a sign of evanescence is also reminiscent of the smoking pipes, candles, and lamps frequently used in *vanitas* paintings… as in the smoking

The "fire" of inspiration, and of moral self-righteousness, is a recurring conceit in Rosa's textual and pictorial imagery: it is a central motif, for example, in his self-laudatory *"Genius"* etching [Fig. 99], with its inscription as "Candid, Free, Painter who inflames through indignation, yet is Just and Equable, Scorner of Wealth and Death";[311] it is present in the burning fuse of the *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* [Fig. 13], perhaps an allusion to the heroic, militant nature of the impassioned satirist (and here it is interesting to note the resonance between the term for a military striker or firing pin ("*percussore*") and Rosa's personal academic objective);[312] it appears in the moral indignation of *Peace*, who ignites the military paraphernalia at her feet [Fig. 20]; it is seen in the fiery torch of the chained and tortured *Prometheus* [Fig. 43], the instrument of his own inspired genius, generosity and freedom in desiring to give fire to mankind;[313] and it is evident in Rosa's rendition of Empedocles' death, where the philosopher tests his own philosophical self-confidence by jumping into the fiery abyss of Mount Etna (late 1660's, Hampshire, Lord Somers collection) [Fig. 127].[314] It also makes an appearance in his satires and poetry: in *La Poesia*, the fury Aletto (with whom Rosa directly associated himself on at least one occasion) is "inflamed" with an

---

tripod of the *Democritus* [Fig. 62]". Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus* and *L'Umana Fragilita*," *Art Bulletin* 50:1 (1968): 30.

[310] Borelli, letter 178: "… tutto bile, tutto spirito, tutto fuoco!" Rosa goes on to say that he will console himself with the thought that, while his detractors fires are made "of straw" and "mine are of asbestos [*pietra amianto*]."

[311] This is Roworth's interpretation of the Latin inscription on Rosa's etchings: "Ingenuus, Liber, Pictor Succensor, et Aequus,/ Spretor opum, Mortisque, hic meus est Genius./ Salvator Rosa". Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 93-94. Wallace translated it as "Sincere, free, fiery painter, and equable, / Despiser of riches, and death: this is my genius." Wallace, *Etchings*, 16. Roworth, however, has argued the phrase "pictor succensor" is better understood not simply as "fiery painter", but rather as "Painter-Satirist" or "'the Painter who is inspired by just indignation' above and beyond his creative passion", in keeping with Rosa's desire to be known as a moral satirist who "burns with indignation", "arouses, inflames with anger, and takes account of others' misconduct," and who "blazes with the anger and justified wrath" associated with the satirist, and Juvenal in particular who was one of Rosa's favourite philosophers. Roworth, *ibid*, 70-74, 81.

[312] Daprà suggested Rosa presented himself here as a "hero", "as he would want to have been seen by his contemporaries." Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 62.

[313] For the association of Prometheus with poetic and artistic creativity, inspiration and genius, see Pelles, "The Image of the Artist", 125; and Arthur D. Kahn, "'Every Art Possessed by Man Comes from Prometheus': The Greek Tragedians and Science and Technology," *Technology and Culture* 11: 2 (1970): 133-162.

[314] Roworth argues, conversely, that Rosa disapproved of Empedocles as symbol of "irrational, impassioned" inspiration. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 379-82. Athanasius Kircher also self-identified with Empedocles. See Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 56; Rowland, *The Ecstatic Journey: Athanasius Kircher in Baroque Rome* (Chicago: Dept. of Special Collections, University of Chicago Library, 2000), 58.

"insane furor";[315] and, in another poem, Rosa comments on the "divine" force of fire and its effect on the soul.[316] It also features in Rovai's poem for the *Improvvisi*, which describes the inspiration of the "Rose" as "inflammation".

The motif of fire featured as a prominent metaphor in the names of other academies like the Florentine *Infiammati* (the "Enflamed") and *Infuocati* (the "Scorching" or "Impassioned"), the Bolognese *Ardenti* (the "Passionate" or "Burning"), and the *Fuminati* (the "Lightening Struck") of Turin.[317] Roberto Ciardi argues that fire "unveils the inner substance" of the academy as an organization, it "distills [its] secret essence" and represents the power the academy "exert[s] in general and over individual members in particular." The ability of fire to refine the various humours "out of indistinct matter" made it a particularly apt symbol of the work conducted in the academy itself, which consisted in the recognition and unification of both individual and collective purpose.[318] In this sense, percussive and fiery action represents the collaborative, interdependent and reciprocal nature of *academia*: the fire of inspiration that Rosa's friendship imparts to the academy's members is like the sudden strike ("*percossa*") of one rock against another.[319] The "passion" associated with this mix of metaphors also suggests a spirit of community and friendliness – the *Percossi* as "smitten". Indeed, Baldinucci implied that a mutual affection for and beguilement with Rosa was a motivation for the formation of the academy itself.[320]

[315] Rosa refers to himself as Aletto in letter 144; *La Poesia*, vv. 884-8: "sia del vostro sudor virtù l'oggetto, / ché mentre queste atrocità cantate / d'un insano furor v'infiamma Aletto,/ ché se gli allori e l'edere v'han date / è perché avete in testa un gran rottorio / e i fulmini dal cielo in voi chiamate."
[316] Rosa, "Amplificazione del Testo di Giobbe": "E siccome nel foco/ L'Oro più si raffina,/ Così l'Alma costante appoco appoco/ Si rende più celeste e più divina: .../ Onde poi s'incammina/ Con più fervor nel bel sentier del Cielo;/ Dove, senza alcun Velo,/ Da malvagio Livor non mai depressa,/ S'à da mirar la Veritade istessa./ E questo sarà il frutto, ...". Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, I: 146-150.
[317] Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 3: 265. On the *Infuocati*, founded in 1665, see 92, note 103 above.
[318] Ciardi, "'A Knot of Words and Things'," 53.
[319] The idea of fiery ignition as a "striking" action is implicit in Ripa's allegory of the *Four Parts of Night*, where the personification of the first part strikes (*percosso*) a stone, setting off sparks. Ripa, *Iconologia*, 361.
[320] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 449-451. Baldinucci notes that the great literati of Florence became "enamoured" (*innamoratisi*) with Rosa's landscape paintings and the "spirited and lively" nature of his conversation and reasonings. His use of the term "enamoured" is in keeping with the idea of the "*non so che*" in art theory – the Petrarchan notion that art conveys some kind of unidentifiable but powerful ("moving", "enrapturing") force on

The names of academies were intended to describe the shared interests of members, and the use of the implicitly-plural adjectival participle ("*percossi*") imparted a sense of community, cooperation and solidarity. The academic moniker defined not only the identities and interests of individual members, but characterized those identities as fundamentally relational.[321] Names of academies like the "Inflamed," the "Stunned" or the "Thirsty," for example, indicated "the mutual trust and commitment binding individuals into a single institution" and reflected the qualities that united them and distinguished them from other groups. All members partook of the particular identity that was codified in their common name, and, like true friends, shared all good things in common. The name *Percossi* was likely regarded by the other members of the academy as an equally resonant expression of their own practices or professional identities. The broad, multivalent potential of the term made it appropriate for a community of diverse professionals – scientists, poets, musicians, and artists alike – all of whom deemed inspired genius a critical component of their own endeavours. The "percussive" implications of the term would have resonated particularly well with the musicians and poets – the percussive nature of the form and content of satirical poetry in particular seems well-suited to the name.[322] But the term may also have been meaningful for the scientists. In 1644, Torricelli gave a lecture on the Galilean principles of impact entitled "*Della Percossa*", the subject of one of twelve speeches delivered to the *Crusca*.[323] In his lecture he described mechanical forces like the "*percossa*" as "miraculous" for

---

the viewer, approximating the experience of love. Sohm, *Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 191-3.

[321] Ciardi, "'A Knot of Words and Things'," 42-3. There were a few exceptions to the plural form, such as the *Accademia della Crusca*, although here "the strict bonds between individuals and the sodality was underlined by the constant use of the 'isotope' governing choice of nicknames and *imprese*," as was also the case with the *Accademia Venetiana*, the *Olimpici* of Vicenza, and the *Sireni* of Naples. Various academies made the affective bond of friendship a feature of their academic *imprese* or names, such as the *Intenti* of Pavia, the *Partenia* of Milan, the *Assetati* of Naples, the *Unanimi* of Salò, the *Uniti* of Siena, or the *Concordi* of Bologna.

[322] I am grateful to Philip Sohm for suggesting this possible resonance.

[323] Torricelli was himself made a member in 1642; his lectures were delivered from about 1640 onward. For Torricelli's lecture see Torricelli, *Opere*, ed. Gino Lauria and Giuseppe Vassura. Vol. II, Lezioni Accademiche Meccanica – Scritti Vari. Lezione Seconda, "Della Percossa" (Faenza: Stabilimento Tipo-Litografico G. Montanari, 1919), 5-15; BNCF MS Gal. 149, *Discepoli di Galileo Tomo XXXIX, Torricelli Evangelista, Vol. 19,*

having an unknown source, tempting an analogy between the "*percossa*" and the force of creative inspiration. He argued that a group of "*percosse*" produced a greater quantity of force than an individual one – a notion that expressed the cooperative nature of the *Percossi*'s activities. And he concluded, like Galileo, that the energy of the *percossa* is "infinite", an idea that would have appealed to Rosa's ambition for everlasting fame.[324] The name chosen by Rosa and his friends to describe their impassioned objective, then, provided a conveniently open metaphor for both their mission and the social process that facilitated it.

II.6. Friendship in the Academy and Flattery at Court: An Allegorical Discourse in Two Paintings by Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi

Two enigmatic allegorical paintings by Rosa and his friend Lorenzo Lippi present an intriguing, visual acknowledgment of the social nature of Rosa's academic objective. Rosa's painting, known from the nineteenth century onward as "*La Menzogna*" or "The Lie" [Fig. 34], and Lippi's canvas, considered by modern scholars to be an *Allegory of Simulation* (or of *Imitation*) (early 1640's, Angers, Musèe des Beaux-Arts) [Fig. 136], signal the confluence of a specific moral-didactic ideal between Rosa and his friend, with whom he shared a particularly close intellectual affinity.[325] As previous scholars have suggested, the two paintings likely articulate moral lessons

---

Fisica sperimentale, E. Torricelli, 'Della percossa, Lezzioni Tre, Fatte nell'Accademia della Crusca', 54-78v. Torricelli also delivered two other lectures on the "Percossa". Torricelli, *Opere*, 15-32. He concluded his lecture with a pun on his own wielding of percussive action in speaking: he will end the discussion "seeing as how I have beaten [*percosso*] however much patience you have, and perhaps broken it off entirely." ("conoscendo d'haver io percosso homai tanto pazienza vostra che forse l'havrò rotta.") Torricelli, *Opere*, 14.

[324] The notion of the strike (*percossa*) as a force that exerted infinite energy provided an apt (even if only coincidental) metaphor for the boundless vigor and productive spirit and genius of the academy and its members.

[325] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 458. Lippi shared Rosa's love of painting, poetry, moral satire, witchcraft, theatrical performance and – as Struhal notes – his opposition toward courtly affectation, "hostility to political authority" and "distaste for warfare." Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 280. The title "La Menzogna" was first given to the painting in 1828, by Francesco Inghirami in his description of the Medici inventory of the picture gallery of the Palazzo Pitti. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 172, cat. 16. Langdon traces the name to an earlier date, 1799, "as it appeared in an inventory of paintings taken by the French from the Palazzo Pitti during their occupation of Tuscany." Langdon, in *Salvator Rosa*, Arts Council Exhibition, London, 1972, no. 19. Tomory makes a convincing, but not universally accepted, argument for Rosa's own authorship of the work's title as *La Menzogna*. Tomory, "Salvator Rosa: 'La Menzogna'," *Paragone* 31: 367 (1980): 60-61. D'Afflitto suggested that Lippi intended his painting as a pendant, perhaps with his *Allegory of Human Folly* (or *Allegory of Fortune*). D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 236. I do not suggest that Lippi's and Rosa's are pendants, but

admonishing falsity of court and a commentary on the subject of identity.[326] They present in pictorial terms the moral call-to-arms in the practice of self-fashioning that permeates the philosophical discourse in which Rosa and his friends were so absorbed. What has not been explored, however, is the implication of this subject in regard to both the personal relationship of these artists and the broader social situation with which it engages. Rosa's and Lippi's paintings express a shared opinion concerning the polarities of duplicity and sincerity that characterize the two social realms of court and academy.[327] Their images profess not only a shared interest in academic, moralizing allegory and an admonition of deception – that exasperating yet ever-present necessity of *seicento* courtly experience – but an advocation of academic friendship in particular as its alternative and antidote. More than this, they acknowledge the requisitely paradoxical situation of confluence and conflict between those two realms.

Rosa's *La Menzogna*, dated on the basis of style and provenance to c. 1645-8, is described only cursorily by Baldinucci: "a philosopher, in three-quarter view, from the life, who is in the act of showing a mask to another person".[328] The Medici inventories contribute little to solving the mystery of the subject.[329] It has been suggested that the painting was purchased by Rosa's most

---

rather two paintings in direct dialogue with each other in the context of the Florentine taste for constructing and comparing "cose morali".

[326] The paintings are described by Massimo Lollini as an ontological or existential project. See Lollini, "Vico, Salvator Rosa e le maschere del barocco," *Forum Italicum* 29: 2 (1995): 245-65. For Rosa's invective against the court, see my discussion in chapter five. Among the more amusing contemporary critiques of the court are: a poem by Malatesti which compares the court and its courtiers to hell and its damned inhabitants (BNCF MS Magl. VII 356. *Poesie di diversi non ancora stampate raccolte da piu manoscritti, 1650, Parte Prima*, 196v); a poem by Marco Lamberti which compares the court to the devil (BNCF MS Magl. VII. 364: Poesie diverse (anonimo), 92r); and a poem by Volunnio Bandinelli, which compares the court to an "arsenal, a room of cankers, troubles and misery; where one lives perpetually divided". BNCF MS Magl. VII 872, 449, *Varie Poesie diverse*, 449. Valerio Inghirami wrote an amusing sonnet on the subject of advising a friend about life at court, comparing it to a lottery game. BNCF MS Magl. CL. VII no. 871, 'Poesie diverse', 79v; see Appendix VII. 13. Such descriptions stand out in sharp relief against the ideal characterizations of the court as a place of friendship offered by Baldassare Castiglione and Cesare Ripa. Calitti ed, *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 206. On the early-modern discourse on the court as a site of adulation, artefice and false friendship, see Calitti ed., *ibid*, 187-9.

[327] Fumagalli has also noted the painting's likely connection to the literary and philosophical interests of the *Percossi*. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 53.

[328] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 449. "vedesi un filosofo, più che mezza figura quanto il naturale, che mostra ad altra persona una maschera."

[329] Fumagalli, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 172, cat. 16.

important Medici patron, Cardinal Gian' Carlo, perhaps as a pendant to the *Temptation of St. Anthony* (mid-1640's, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 30], although the records reveal nothing of its earliest provenance.[330] In the canvas, Rosa depicts two male figures set against a plain, shallow background. The protagonist, a young man with a light beard and neat, curly hair, dressed in the simple white tunic of the ancient philosopher, dominates the composition.[331] Seated beside a parapet, he rests one elbow on its edge, holding a mask aloft in his right hand and gesturing toward it with his left. His companion, a younger acolyte wearing a cap, stands behind him in shadow and looks over his teacher's shoulder in the direction of his instructor and the mask in his hand.

The patron and date of Lippi's *Allegory* are also unknown, although stylistic cues suggest a date to the early 1640's.[332] In the painting a young woman dressed in blue and purple shot silk with a light-colored turban raises a mask in her right hand and holds a burst pomegranate in her left, her arm resting on a thin ledge close to the picture plane. Set against a black background, the three-

---

[330] The painting does not appear in Gian' Carlo's inventory. Baldinucci describes both paintings as on display in the rooms of Ferdinand de' Medici, and his choice of wording suggests that the two paintings may have been intended as pendants. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 449. It is tempting to see in both paintings a shared concern with a general moral theme of resistance and forbearance: in a manner akin to St. Anthony, the courtier is tested by the temptation to betray his true self. St. Anthony's challenge was to maintain his belief in solitary isolation as the most sincere and efficacious form of devotion. Perhaps Rosa's *La Menzogna* reveals a similar concern in the form of an admonishment of false society and an endorsement of a selective choice of friends. Roworth suggested, similarly, that the *Temptation* "could represent a Christian parallel to the philosopher's resistance to the passions and worldly pleasure". Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 252. Salerno thought that Rosa's *Portrait of a Poet* (Ringling Museum, Sarasota) [Fig. 35] might be a pendant to the *La Menzogna*, though scholars are not in agreement. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 53; Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 42, 142. Tomory proposed the *La Menzogna* might be an allegory of Satire (the mask being attribute of satiric poetry, and the gesture of pointing ("monstrari digito" or finger of fame) perhaps an allusion to Horace himself), an idea devised with the help of Antonio Abati. Rosa's letters suggest that Abati himself may also be alluded to in the *Temptation*. Fumagalli, *ibid*, 53; Tomory, "Salvator Rosa: 'La Menzogna'," 62.

[331] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 252-253; Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 94-95, who noted the "unkempt" appearance of the figure typical of philosophers, students and saints, and proposed it "might represent a comic or tragic poet of antiquity". Roworth notes that "Baldinucci's description of the picture as a philosopher should be taken literally."

[332] Jon R. Snyder suggests Lippi's painting may have been made for his Florentine patron Agnolo Galli as one of a series of allegorical images. Snyder, "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy," *Rinascimento* 43 (2003): 276. The canvas has been dated on the basis of a stylistic and iconographic affinity with other allegorical works, like the *Allegory of Music*, to the early 1640's. D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 244. D'Afflitto notes that a date to c. 1642 is tempting, considering that a lesson on "Simulazione" was given by Filippo Galilei that year at the *Svogliati*; although Rosa is not listed among the attendees, Rovai and Chimentelli were present. BNCF MS Magl. IX, 60, Atti dell'Accademia degli Svogliati, lezione di Filippo Galilei, January 2 1642. Fiorella Sricchia dated Lippi's painting to between 1640 and 1642 based on the "iconographic rigor" and caravaggesque qualities of the canvas, while Durey Lavergne dates it to around 1650. Sricchia, "Lorenzo Lippi nello svolgimento della pittura fiorentina della prima metà del Seicento," *Proporzioni* IV (1963): 260, fig. 91.

quarter view of her body fills the surface of the painting. A lack of chronological certainty about the dates of the two paintings makes it difficult to assess the influence of one on the other, but both images announce these artists' shared interest in moral allegory and mutual engagement in the philosophical discourse that circulated among their courtly and academic friends.

The mask featured in both paintings has been interpreted as a symbol of falsity and deception. A commonplace metaphor of self-performance at court, the mask appeared in conduct manuals like Antoine de Courtin's *Nouveau traité de la civilité qui se pratique en France* (1671) which required the courtier to "learn the art of unmasking others, of interpreting what one sees."[333] Rosa's own comment to Ricciardi on the necessity of masking at court,[334] together with various other expressions of disdain from his letters and satires toward the specious "masking" activities of the court, have been considered as evidence for reading the *La Menzogna* as a commentary on deception.[335] In Lippi's *Allegory*, the mask is accompanied by a pomegranate, another symbol closely associated by early-modern iconographic texts with fraud: it features, for example, as an attribute of "*Simulatione*" in Ripa's *Iconologia*.[336] The pomegranate was considered deceptive for concealing its many seeds, an idea that appears in a poem by Antonio Malatesti on the subject of the court.[337] D'Afflitto considers that both the mask and pomegranate in Lippi's painting signal a

---

[333] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 22. Michele Rak has also interpreted the mask in Rosa's and Lippi's paintings in terms of the duplicitous nature of *seicento* court culture. He connects the *La Menzogna* to the Giambattista Basile's moral eclogue "against the world that always goes about in masks, and in which one can never see a person's true face". Basile, 'Uomini con la maschera', *Cunto, La coppella*, v. 568 ff; see Rak, *La maschera della fortuna. Letture del Basile 'toscano'*, Naples: Liguori Editore, 1975; and *idem*, "Cade il mondo," 92-94.
[334] Borelli, letter 85. Cited above, chapter one, 36.
[335] For a survey of the scholarly debate thus far, see Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 172, cat. 16. Scott sees a connection to Rosa's "epode" entitled *The Court*, a "poetically undistinguished diatribe" against the court set to music by Marcantonio Cesti, and proposes the painting as a sign of Rosa's desire to break free from Gian' Carlo's control. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 42, notes 14 and 15. For *La Corte di Roma,* see Limentani, "Salvator Rosa – Nuovi Studi e Ricerche", *Italian Studies* 8 (1953): 29-34, and my discussion in chapter five. Rosa frequently refers to the mask or "masking" as an analogy for the deceptions of his contemporaries and even his friends. See Borelli, letters 49, 50, 178, 198, 281, 337. In his satire *La Guerra* (vv. 481-3), Rosa again contrast the mask explicitly with the sincerity of friendship. Also see *La Guerra* vv. 145, 595, 785; *La Musica* v. 129; and *Tirreno* v. 107.
[336] Ripa, *Iconologia*, 407.
[337] Appendix IV. 2.

reference to the idea of "simulation",[338] although other scholars have questioned the exact nature of the "deception" to which Lippi's painting refers: is it "simulation," the "pretence of what is not" or the less dangerous (and even commendable) "dissimulation," the "concealment of what is"?[339] Victoria von Flemming has proposed the latter is "more consistent with the iconological texts of the period"[340] – that is, the figure engages in an act of concealment rather than a display of falseness. But is Lippi's young woman in the act of raising or removing her mask? The confusion elicited by Lippi's allegory results from its simultaneous adherence to and deviation from Ripa's iconographic code. Rather than reproducing Ripa's image of "Simulation", Lippi appears to be inventing his own, intricate visual metaphor – one that cites from Ripa's easily-recognizable vocabulary but interprets it in a new way.[341] Both Lippi's and Rosa's paintings participate in the more pervasive interest in constructing erudite, multivalent allegorical enigmas (both pictorial and literary) intended to challenge and entice the viewer.

One of these deviations consists in Lippi's use of the pomegranate. This fruit was not only a symbol of deception, but also, paradoxically, an emblem of love, friendship, and sincerity. In Ripa's *Iconologia* and Valeriano's *Hieroglyphica* the pomegranate features prominently in the conceptually-related allegories of Friendship, Concord, Conversation, and Love.[342] In Francis Bacon's essay *Of Friendship* (1625) the pomegranate represents "aid", one of three "fruits of

---

[338] D'Afflitto, "Precisazioni sulla fase giovanile di Lorenzo Lippi," *Paragone* 353 (1979): 76, note 57; D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 244. Fumagalli likewise interprets the pomegranate as a symbol of "false appearances". Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 172, cat. 16. Anne-Marie Lecoq suggested the pomegranate, together with the female allegorical figure, might refer to the duplicity of women. Lecoq, "Une peinture 'incorrecte' de Lorenzo Lippi," *Revue de l'Art* 130 (2000): 9-16.

[339] Accetto, *Della dissimulazione onesta* [1641], ed. 1997, chapter 8. Dissimulation was a requisite ritual in court culture and was considered less dangerous and corrupt than simulation, which required lying outright rather than merely "concealing". Philibert de Vienne recommended dissimulation in his treatise on the court: "The gentleman courtier is not subject to himself. If he must laugh, he laughs, if he must be sad, he weeps… In short, he is ready to do anything to please others, even if his feeling is totally otherwise." De Vienne, *Le Philosophe de court* [1547], 95-106, cited in Davis, *The Gift*, 73.

[340] Von Flemming, "Dissimulazione: Lorenzo Lippi, Salvator Rosa und die Krise der Repräsentation", 77.

[341] Snyder has also argued that Lippi's painting is a unique allegory, based on elements of Ripa's readily-recognizable iconology. Snyder, "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy," 265.

[342] Ripa, *Iconologia*, 10-11 ("Amicitia"), 65-66 ("Concordia"), 494 ("Conversazione"); Valeriano, *Les Hieroglyphiques de Ian-Pierre Valerian* [1615], ed. G. P. V. Bolzani, trans. by I. de Montlyard (New York and London: Garland, 1976), chapter XXXII, 727 ("Amitie" and "Amore").

friendship", since it is "full of many kernels" and bears "a part in all actions and occasions."[343] He follows this analogy with a reference to the trope of similitude between friends and the consequent multiplicity within the self that results from that unity.[344] (Hence, the pomegranate is a symbolic correlate to the "union of parts" that takes place in the social process of self-fashioning.) The pomegranate was also popular among religious orders as a symbol of generosity or charity, often shown split open – like Lippi's example – as if to offer its seeds.[345] Rosa used the pomegranate as a symbol in his *"Genius"* etching [Fig. 99]. Wallace interpreted the pomegranate tree in the background of the image as an allusion to mortality (via its connection to the myth of Persephone), an association that aligns it with other symbols in the print and Rosa's declaration in his inscription to "despise" both riches and death.[346] However, like the cypress trees that accompany the pomegranate tree in the background, which Wallace interprets as a funereal symbol[347] but which I read as equally indicative of immortality, the pomegranate too can be regarded as referring not only to the hindrance itself (deception or death) but also the strategy for its defeat (friendship).

Jon R. Snyder considers the "parallel [*seicento*] discourses on dissimulation and sincerity" to be the key to understanding Rosa's and Lippi's allegories, a reading that confirmed my own

---

[343] Bacon, "Of Friendship" [1625], from the edition of the *Essays* by Gordon S. Haight, cited in Philip Blosser and Marshall C. Bradley eds., *Friendship. Philosophic Reflections on a Perennial Concern* (Lanham, New York and Oxford: University Press of America, Inc., 1997), 170. The other two "fruits of friendship" are "peace in the affections" and "support of judgment".

[344] Bacon, "Of Friendship", 170-171: "the best way to represent to life the manifold use of friendship is to cast and see how many things there are which a man cannot do himself; and then it will appear that it was a sparing speech of the ancients to say, *that a friend is another himself,* for that a friend is far more than himself." Bacon's analogy is based on the medieval moral-theological theory of "unity in multiplicity", or the transmutation of the individual into the "multiple" space-time continuum of God and eternity. See J. E. Cirlot, *A Dictionary of Symbols*, trans. Jack Sage (New York: Philosophical Library, 1962), 249.

[345] *Penguin Dictionary of Symbols* (London: Penguin, 1996), 766; and Rak, "Cade il mondo," 94.

[346] Wallace, *Etchings*, 85.

[347] Both Wallace and Roworth have interpreted the crown of cypress leaves worn by the figure in Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi [Fig.64] as a funereal or *memento mori* symbol. Wallace, *Etchings*, 85; Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship", 103 and *passim.* In my discussion of the painting in chapter four, I suggest, alternatively, that the cypress wreath – also symbolic of immortality and longevity – is intended to refer at the same time to the mutual desire of the two friends for the interminable preservation of their bond. See 272, below. Wallace himself noted Ripa's and Valeriano's strange omission of the pomegranate as a symbol of death or mortality, discussing it at length "as a symbol of other things, especially *Concordia*." That Rosa intended the pomegranate to refer to friendship or concord seems even more likely in view of the fact that his print is filled with direct quotations from Ripa's other allegories, as Wallace has shown.

initial impulses.[348] He sees Lippi's allegory as representing not only a commentary on but the *choice* between truth and deceit, an interpretation that I think can also be applied to Rosa's painting.[349] It is noteworthy that Lippi has chosen not to place the mask directly over his sitter's face (either in an act of pretence or concealment). She also appears to hold both the mask and the pomegranate as if to "weigh" their relative merits, and the pomegranate has clearly tipped the scales. (Like Justice, Lippi's figure – with her mask "removed" – is not to be deceived.) Held close to the viewer, the pomegranate seems to be offered to the viewer as the object of choice.

Scott suggested the intriguing possibility that the pomegranate tree in Rosa's "*Genius*" print referred to "Academia," the Ripan personification of which holds a pair of pomegranates.[350] This is a further layer of meaning that may offer a clue to the connection between Lippi's and Rosa's paintings. More than *paragoni* of sincere friendship and deceptive dissimulation, their allegories may intend to contrast the academy and the court as the specific contexts of those rituals, and to assert academic sociality as the liberating remedy to courtly captivity. This is most apparent in Rosa's *La Menzogna*, which contrasts the sincere academic realm of the philosopher with the duplicitous space of the court. Similar to Lippi's painting, Rosa's image contrasts the deceptive mask with a symbol of sincerity and friendship – in this case, a multivalent pointing gesture.

---

[348] Snyder, "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy," 265-286. Snyder reads the pomegranate in Lippi's painting as a positive symbol – split open and revealing its seeds – rather than the "concealing" and deceptive object that Ripa describes in his description of the allegory of *Simulazione*. Snyder, *ibid*, 278-9. But he neglects the examples of Ripa's allegories of *Concordia*, *Amicizia* and *Amore*, all of which feature the pomegranate as a positive symbol. Snyder confirmed my own theory that the pomegranate in Lippi's painting might be understood as a reference to friendship: "the split pomegranate [is] a symbol of sincerity and openness – the bright red seeds …represented an open heart devoid of secrets and full of trust. ... [it] figured the act of sincere confession between friends, or the intimate revelation of truth of the heart". In combination with the mask, the pomegranate proclaims "in this intimate setting, I have unmasked myself – or not yet masked myself – and offer you the sincere private truths of the heart, the fruit of a disciplined inner life, the gift of the split pomegranate. However, the mask remains ready at hand, to be put on (again) at a moment's notice."

[349] Snyder, "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy," 284-5. Returning again to Rosa's *"Genius"* etching, Snyder has pointed out the central role of "Sincerity" in the image, indicative of its importance to Rosa's self-conception as an artist and satirist. Rosa's inscription identifies him as a "Sincere" painter, and, in the image his "Genius" (or "spirit") is accompanied by the allegorical figure of Sincerity. Thus Rosa extols sincerity as a key feature of his identity and inspiration. As his letters make clear, Rosa considered sincerity to achieve its apogee in the practice of true friendship. See my discussion of epistolary sincerity in chapter three.

[350] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 161. Ripa, *Iconologia*, 4.

Snyder has interpreted this gesture as signaling the figure's heart,[351] but it appears to be more ambiguous than this: Rosa's philosopher also seems to point (as Baldinucci intuited) toward the mask and, perhaps, to the world beyond the picture frame which – if the painting hung from its earliest days in Gian' Carlo's Casino or the Palazzo Pitti – would be the realm of the court itself.[352] Like the mask and pomegranate in Lippi's painting, the mask and gesture in Rosa's image indicate the distinction between "surface and depth, outside and inside, appearance and essence".[353] Rosa's mask, moreover, is made all the more deceptive in its highly naturalistic, almost flesh-like appearance.

In drawing a distinction between the sincere academic space of the philosopher and his acolyte from the deceptive realm of the court, Rosa's canvas shares an iconographic (and compositional) affinity with a group of paintings that similarly treat the social and performative basis of self-knowledge. These images treat self-knowledge as the concern of moral philosophy, to be achieved in the social and didactic context of the student-master bond – the relationship, no less, in which Rosa's two figures appear to be engaged.[354] In the case of Rosa's painting, the superior

[351] Snyder, "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy," 283ff.
[352] Fumagalli is unconvinced by Snyder's argument, noting that it disregards the preceding interpretations of the image that read the gesture as pointing to the mask or outward to the world beyond the realm of the painting. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 172, cat. 16. Ripa's inclusion of the same gesture (for example in his allegory of *Amore verso Iddio* (Love of God)), however, may be cited in support of Snyder's interpretation of the gesture as indicative of affection. Furthermore, Snyder shares Fumagalli's conviction that the image should be read in spatial terms, the viewer being asked to choose between "public" and "private" life – to make "the obligatory choice between the mask, which is indispensible in public life, and true sentiments, cultivated in the private sphere."
[353] Snyder, "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy," 278.
[354] In Rosa's painting, the central figure holding the mask does not look directly at his companion but slightly downward, to a space beyond the painting. The direction of his gaze, combined with the position of his associate on the edge of the painting, suggests that he is directing his discussion to a larger audience. In this way Rosa's painting recalls other contemporary images which treat the same sort of moralizing, didactic subject matter in the context of the philosopher guiding his acolytes in the subject of self-knowledge, such as Pier Francesco Mola's *Homer* (Puskin Museum, Moscow) and *Socrates Teaching his Students Self-Knowledge* (Museo Civico di Belle Arti Villa Ciani, Lugano). See Manuela Kahn-Rossi ed., *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*. Exhibition catalogue (Milan: Electa, 1989), 195, cats. I. 38 and I. 39. Roworth has argued that the pedantic nature of Rosa's painting links it to the philosophical lesson of "indifference to Fortune" (as in Anton Francesco Doni's *La Moral Filosofia* of 1606) in which the pupil is instructed to pattern himself after the actor, an idea that is "dramatically emphasised by the peculiarly expressionless mask." She suggests the further possibility that the two figures represented "could conceivably be meant to represent Epictetus and his pupil Arrian". Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 254-255.

place of friendship and self-discovery is the academic realm of the philosopher – and it is even tempting to imagine that he made the painting as an ode to the *Percossi* itself.

By referring to friendship in particular as the most prized manifestation of academic sincerity, Rosa's and Lippi's allegories may comment on a specific subject of philosophical discourse with which they would have been well familiar: "How to Distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend." Plutarch's *Moral Essay* was probably the most well-known of a number of treatments of the subject that gained renewed popularity in the early-modern period.[355] Tasso mentions it in a letter to Marcello Donati of 1585, concerning changes he wanted to make to the manuscript of his *Il Malpiglio* (a dialogue on the subject of the court); here Tasso expresses his anxiety to present the courtier as a dissimulator or one who merely "hides himself," rather than a simulator who is morally deplorable by comparison.[356] In his essay, Plutarch is primarily concerned with the "interrelationship and inter-reaction between two people for practical moral benefit",[357] ostensibly the same prerogative of Lippi's and Rosa's paintings. He discusses the importance of similitude in friendship: unlike the flatterer, who "pretends" to share the temperament or interests of another person, the true friend is by his very nature a second self. The friend cannot help but reveal his similarity, since it is natural and therefore consistent, whereas the flatterer, who "moulds and adjusts himself by reference to someone else," is likely to slip up in his performance and reveal the inconstancy of his persona.[358] Masking, or rather "unmasking" (the action of the figure in Lippi's painting?) also appears in Plutarch's essay: "since he [the flatterer] puts so easily upon us under the disguise and appearance of a friend," he writes, "it will be our business … to unmask the hypocrite

[355] The subject received renewed attention in early-modern court circles and in the writings of conduct-theorists like Baldassare Castiglione, Michel de Montaigne, Torquato Tasso, and Stefano Guazzo. See Castiglione, *Il Libro del Cortegiano*, I, 27, cited in Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 240; Montaigne, *On Friendship*, trans. M. A. Screech (New York: Penguin Books, 1991); Tasso, *Lettere*, ed. C. Guasti (Florence: Le Monnier, 1853), 319, no. 331; and Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, 57.
[356] Tasso, *Lettere*, 319, no. 331.
[357] Ian Kidd, in Plutarch, *Essays* [*Moralia*], trans. Robin Waterfield, intro. and annotated by Ian Kidd (London: Penguin Books, 1992), 25.
[358] Plutarch, "How to Distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend", in *Essays* [*Moralia*], 66-68.

and show him in other men's shapes and colours, as Plato says, since he has none properly his own."[359] Rosa frequently turned to Plutarch's *Lives* as a source for his paintings and satires, and his collection of maxims shows his familiarity with the *Moral Essays*: one of his aphorisms on the subject of friendship seems to have been taken from Plutarch's essay on friendship and flattery.[360]

The notion of friendship as a key to surviving at court is elucidated in courtesy manuals such as Nicolas Faret's highly influential *L'honnête homme ou l'art de plaire à la cour* (Paris, 1630). Here Faret "remarks that the courtier's need to please others, and his ability to assume a variety of social masks, can be intolerably painful unless he is able to take refuge in the society of true *honnétes gens*, from which the pressures of *complaisance* are banished. It is only in this company that the courtier will feel in harmony with the reflection of himself he sees in the eyes of others."[361] The art of masking as a form of self-protection was a subject of particular importance to Faret throughout his treatise. For him, the "[c]ontrol of one's gestures, facial expressions, and body movements give the courtier control over his public image, freeing him from being 'a slave to his inclinations'." But if this self-masking was taken too far, it could eradicate one's personal identity.[362] Faret's courtier was thus required to participate in this "necessary process of dissimulation", and "then seek relief in the company of *honnêtes gens*." Faret's comments easily transpose themselves onto Rosa's *La Menzogna* and Lippi's *Allegory*, both of which covey the

---

[359] Plutarch, "How to Distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend", chapter 5.

[360] Plutarch writes "And it is because goodwill and service are inseparable from friendship (hence the saying that a friend is more essential than fire and water." Plutarch, "How to Distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend", 66. Rosa's maxim reads: "L'uomo ha piú bisogno di un bono amico che dell'acqua, del fuoco e del sole." Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica*, 17, no. 134. Rosa's list of maxims also include a number of other pithy sayings on the subject of flattery and friendship, including Sir Walter Raleigh's (1552-1618) dictum that "Just as the wolf is similar to the dog, so the flatterer is similar to the friend". Rosa, *ibid*, p. 5, no. 24. Other similar maxims include: "Gli adulatori son peggio dei corvi; quelli corrompono l'animo dei vivi e questi solamente il corpo dei morti" (*ibid*, 9, no. 61); "L'adulatore è come il polpo, che secondo il tempo cresce o scema, e secondo il luoco cangia colore: siché i pesciolini, non discernendo il polpo dallo scoglio, fidatamente si appressano e restan colti" (*ibid*, 58, no. 490); and "L'adulatore è simile al camaleonte, il quale ogni altro colore rapresenta fori che il bianco tiene fra i colori il primo luom" (*ibid*, 35, no. 291). The theme of the "mask" of feigned friendship also features in a poem attributed to Rosa, which begins "Solo chi a robba a dagli Amici assai…" and refers to the "maschera d'amico" worn by Judas. BiASA MS 77 (96353).

[361] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 21.

[362] *Ibid*, 23; citing Faret, *L'honnête homme*, 70, 72.

same anxiety over the court ritual of masking while at the same time offering sincerity and friendship as its cure.

The conception of flattery as utterly opposed to friendship or sincerity, however, is complicated by the fact that a certain brand of flattery was considered both virtuous and commendable. Guazzo, for example, made it an essential virtue in the acquisition of honor, the practice of conversation, and as a veritable "principle" of friendship itself.[363] The skill of the courtier, then, lay in his ability to recognize and perform the *right kind* of adulation or dissimulation[364] – the kind of masking that even Rosa admitted to Ricciardi was required in order to "get ahead." Rosa's and Lippi's acknowledgement of the courtly requirement of dissimulation reflects an extensive contemporary discourse on the subject, in which self-concealment was alternatively regarded as a commendable skill or unavoidable obligation – part of what John Lyons has described as a new "mediated" form of epistemology, reflected in the rise of an instrument-based natural science and a moralistic type of writing "in which the active and conscious construction of false appearances was sometimes motivated by the systematic search for truth".[365] Rosa's and Lippi's paintings convey the tenuous nature of the discourse on dissimulative self-fashioning, represented on the one hand by theorists like Pierre Nicole (1625-1695), who promoted self-concealment and performance as necessary for self-knowledge, and on the other by writers like

[363] In the *Civile Conversazione* Guazzo has one of his interlocutors (the "Cavaliere") extol the skill of flattery as essential virtue in the acquisition of honor, the practice of conversation, and as a veritable "principle" of friendship itself. Guazzo, *La Civil Conversazione*, 55. Only a certain kind of adulation was granted as virtuous – that which was intended as a sign of courtesy and civility, rather than offense. Guazzo, *ibid*, 60. Guazzo ultimately equates the virtuous form of adulation with friendship itself, noting that "the wounds inflicted by a friend are sweeter than the kisses of an enemy, that is from an adulator." Guazzo, *ibid*, p. 61. The same idea is presented by Castiglione in the *Libro del Cortegiano*, where *affettazione* (closely allied with simulation, pretence and ostentation) is contrasted with *sprezzatura* or *grazia*. The latter are the most valuable skills the courtier must acquire, because they are sincere and virtuous. Castiglione, *Il Libro del Cortegiano*, I, 27.

[364] As Quondam has pointed out, the early-modern concept of dissimulation is hard to understand in modern terms. The issue is largely semantic: while we might view the lack of authenticity implied in "dissimulation" as negative, the term had a positive connotation the early-modern age as one of the virtues of the *gentiluomo*. Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, XX. Torquato Accetto, for example, touted it in his *Della dissimulazione onesta* (1641) as "an art, a virtuous ability, essential in the good company of beautiful society". Calitti ed., *ibid*, XXI.

[365] Lyons, "Self-Knowledge and the Advantages of Concealment: Pierre Nicole's 'On Self-Knowledge'," in *Culture and Authority in the Baroque*, ed. Massimo Ciavolella and Patrick Coleman (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 193-4.

Jean de La Bruyère (1645-1696), who "deplored the hypocrisy of the court and city life and expresse[d] a persistent nostalgia for a more sincere age and for the directness of provincial life."[366]

The two paintings each present complex moral commentaries on the subject of artefice, challenging the courtier to distinguish and choose between its wicked and virtuous manifestations and to find assistance in his endeavour in the sincere realm of academic friendship. The iconography of both images suggests that the anxiety they express over the illusory nature of behavior and self-construction as courtiers was equally an issue of concern for their makers' alternative (but related) identities as painters and actors. The aesthetic or arteficial nature of performative self-construction and self-display easily aligns the courtier (as illusionist) with the painter and the actor.[367] Indeed, the symbols of the mask and shot-silk dress that adorn the allegorical figure in Lippi's painting are shared by Ripa's *Simulatione* and *Pittura*,[368] and the mask in both Lippi's and Rosa's paintings is also a symbol of theatre. Scholars have noted this aspect in the two allegories: Volpi argues that the figure in Rosa's *La Menzogna* is best understood as both an "actor" and an "ancient poet", while Eva Struhal has interpreted Lippi's painting as an *Allegory of Imitation*, expressive of the artist's skill of pictorial artefice.[369] In this regard, Rosa's *La Menzogna* belongs to a set of explicitly performative self-images of his Florentine period, including *Self-portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15], the *Self-portrait as a Soldier* [Fig. 13], and the *Self-portrait as*

---

[366] In his popular *De La connaissance de soi-même* (1671), Nicole argued that self-knowledge comes about socially and through a necessary practice of masking; we can only know our true selves with the use of other people. Lyons, "Self-Knowledge and the Advantages of Concealment," 195-7.

[367] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della* Conversazione, 197. The term "artificio" was applied to forms of comportment and behavior as well as the visual arts. Passeri uses the term "artefice" in his biography of Rosa to describe the artist's skilful mastery of the art of painting as well as the ability to create and perform a "self": the composition of Rosa's lost *Bacchanal* was achieved with "grand'artificio" while Bernini's ability to present a calm, collected demeanor in the face of ridicule is deemed "una disinvoltura artificiosa". Passeri, *Vite*, 422, 425.

[368] Ripa, *Iconologia*, 357, 407.

[369] Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 34. Volpi links the pose of Rosa's figure to an image of the poet Menander in a marble relief (Museo Gregoriano Profano, Rome) that shows him holding a mask in the company of the figure of Comedy. Michele Rak also interprets Rosa's figure as an actor, "donning the loose white shirt of Pulcinella and the Zanni". Rak, "Cade il mondo," 94. Struhal argues that Lippi deliberately contrasts the "caricature"-like and lifeless qualities of the mask in his painting with the more naturalistic qualities in the face of the female figure. "Lippi's young woman competes against the mask, and indeed the two represent opposing modes of imitation: the lifeless mode, which relies on stereotypical elements of representation, such as artificially red cheeks, is outdone by Lippi's "simple imitation of nature." Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements".

a Philosopher [Fig. 10]. Rosa and Lippi were likely aware of the irony entailed in creating a painted (and therefore illusory) critique of the artefice that characterized human behavior. Indeed, the visual mode of allegory was itself recognized as a highly arteficial form of illusion, explicitly aligned with the courtier's own dissimulative practice in a treatise on poetry of 1598.[370] Rosa's accusation of Bernini's theatrical practice in Rome was an early indication of his conflicted position on the subject. The forms of artefice theorized and practiced by the painter, actor, and courtier were equally fraught with conflict and challenge, and shared the pursuit of a similar ideal. It is not too great a leap to suggest that Rosa and Lippi intended to make an analogy between the ideal of imitation pursued by the courtier and that of the painter or actor. Like the courtier, who was encouraged to choose the path of sincere and truthful friendship or productive dissimulation over false flattery, the painter and actor had the corresponding challenge of both approximating and surpassing truth.[371]

An interpretation of Rosa's figure as an actor complicates the otherwise apparent message of the painting as a condemnation of masking or performance. It contradicts in particular his own adoption and endorsement of an otherwise unequivocally masked brand of self-construction and self-assertion at an early, crucial stage in his career. Seen in this way, the mask in the *La Menzogna*

---

[370] In a treatise on *The Art of English Poesie* (1589), attributed to George Puttenham, the author named the figure of *Allegoria* "The Courtier", calling it as "the figure of fair, *beau*, or false semblant." Whigham, "Interpretation at Court," 629, from Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 299.

[371] On the link between "sprezzatura" (the artful skill "that does not seem to be of art") and "disprezzare", see Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 240; Castiglione, *Il Libro del Cortegiano*, I, 26. The courtier's "artefice" is akin to seeming effortlessness of both the improvisory actor, who seeks a successful fiction of verisimilitude, and the painter who is anxious to surpass nature while concealing his method of production. On the fictive nature of theatre, see Pamela D. Stewart, "Disguise and the Masks: from the *commedia erudita* to the *commedia dell'arte,*" in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. Pietropaolo, 200-201. Religious critics of theatre like Carlo Borromeo likened theatre to painting: "The effect made by theatre was seen as comparable to that of painting and sculpture, but much the greater in that theatre presented live and moving pictures, was a public activity, and its subject-matter less easily stipulated or controlled." Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 236. Cecchini commented on the issue of verisimilitude in theatrical performance – the actor as well as the performance must imitate well and create a "sustained illusion," with the result of pleasing the audience, in terms of gesture, language and appearance. Henke, *Performance and Literature*, 202-4. Rosa's desire to be considered an artist capable of surpassing nature is apparent in the poetry of his academic friends. See my discussion in chapter three.

becomes a more complex symbol of both deception and self-discovery – an emblem that represented both the potential loss of self at court through dissimulation but also the possibility of self-creation.[372] Both Roworth and Tomory have indicated the significance of the mask as a symbol of satire, and its use by the Cynics as a symbol of their own "performative" brand of philosophy.[373] The gesture of the Rosa's philosopher, which seems to issue a warning of the dangers of the mask as an instrument of self-deception, consequently highlights the potential confluence between the mask and the self and the alternative benefits and detriments that may result from masked self-performance. If we interpret Rosa's self-referential protagonist as a philosopher, then he is surely in the midst of recommending the removal of the mask in order to reveal the true self beneath. But if we also regard him as an actor, then he is perhaps advising the wearing of an *appropriate* mask – one that conveyed a desired identity. (Rosa's own comments on the subject of masking suggest his distaste for its duplicity on the one hand and his appreciation for its usefulness on the other.[374]) The mask, then, is about truth as much as deception: it is a shield from behind which Rosa (and any other courtier wishing to maintain his own rebellious integrity) could continue to perform an antagonistic self in a realm intolerant of dissent. Rosa was cognizant of the resonance between the

---

[372] In its theatrical context, the mask is meant to both represent and communicate one identity while concealing another. In Rosa's case, the identity of his mask conflates a conspicuous element of his personal, hidden identity, and in a sense collapses the dual role of the mask into one. On this dual function of the mask, see chapter one, p. 64.

[373] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 253. The Cynics "instructed [man] to compare himself to an actor who can perform Tragedy or Comedy equally when the call arises and can hide his true feelings and wounds beneath his mask." In the *Il Tirreno*, Rosa aligned the mask with the satirist who "adopts the mask of the satyr," and made a clear connection between satire, Cynicism and painting ("E con Cinico ardir pinsi le Tele"). Roworth, *ibid*, 255.

[374] The subjects of masking, disguise and deception recur often in Rosa's letters to Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei. Rosa's use of the term "*maschera*" usually stands for "disguise" or "fraud". It is applied in a literal sense, in reference to a person's attributes or physical appearance (letter 48), although it is also used in the context of the actions of friends: Ricciardi's seemingly benign comments to Rosa are childish and hateful statements "*in maschera*". Borelli, letter 49; also see letter 50. Ricciardi's un-kept promise to spend time with Rosa at Strozzavolpe makes him a "*menzognero* [deceitful person], both in language and in heart" (letter 239), forcing Rosa to conclude that "in many things we are not what we intend to be" (letter 245). Rosa acknowledged that, on certain occasions, deception and even masking was a necessity: when he received slander over his satires, he decided to wear a "stoic mask" [*maschera stoicchezza*] of "disdain and suffering" in order "to laugh at such lies". (letters 177 and 178) Expressing his concern over a sex-scandal in Rome involving Ugo Maffei, Rosa appears to advise dissimulation: "this is a case rather to hide it, and to keep quiet about it, [instead of] to discuss it." (letter 102) For other instances, see Borelli, letters 48, 54, 104, 107, 115, 117, 198, 281, 337 and 374.

court and the comedic stage, its plots permeated by themes of deception and mistaken-identity.[375] As Fumagalli has observed, Rosa's painting likely has a close connection to his academic theatrical activity, "in which friendship, literature, theatre and painting were indissolubly united".[376] The actor-philosopher in Rosa's *La Menzogna* is another manifestation of a personal identity sanctioned, facilitated and perpetuated from within the social context of the *Percossi*. Together with Lippi's painting, Rosa's canvas suggests that painting may be added to the list of academic activities (poetry, comedic performance, and *simposie*) directed toward constructing and sustaining Rosa's desired identity.

Just as the venue of theatrical performance had offered Rosa an opportunity to craft a true self, the masking to be practiced at court offered the chance to project an otherwise unacceptable or antagonistic persona – it offered a dissimulative veil that both concealed and asserted a carefully calculated performance. This was to be achieved, moreover, with the support of the sincere realm of academic friends, among whom the courtier is alternatively free to remove his mask, deliberate on the dilemma it presents (as do the two figures in Rosa's painting), and cultivate a true self without any requisite manipulation. In this context it is significant that Rosa's comment to Ricciardi concerning the "necessity" of masking at court made friendship into the courtier's saving grace: "though I do not know how to use all these things to my advantage", he writes, "it is not the case, however, that I do not think it worth advising friends [in this matter]."[377] Confessing his own requisite commitment to courtly dissimulation, Rosa sanctions its practice within the realm of friendship. An exchange of advice on the subject between friends (like the conversation taking place in the *La Menzogna*) is the only way to manage participation in courtly deception, and the

[375] Richards and Richards, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, 2.
[376] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 172, cat. 16.
[377] Borelli, letter 85: "Lo vado istruendo circa il modo d'adoperar la maschera, cioè gli atti d'humiltà, e della adulatione, cose necessarissime a questa Corte per chi vuol avanzarsi o almeno per non restar dietro agli altri poiché, tutto che queste cose non le sappia adoperar per i miei vantaggi, non resta però che non vagli nel consigliarne gli amici."

segregation of true friendship from flattery makes excusable one's regrettable involvement in the latter.

Ultimately, the message of "truth to oneself" that was represented in Rosa's and Lippi's paintings was an ideal, the attainment of which entailed a complex mixture of self-denial and self-assertion. These paintings underscore the necessity of court participation for professional success in the *seicento*, and point to academic self-knowledge as the source of relief for the courtier who questioned or rebuked the nature of his practice. It was, as Lippi's painting suggests, a fine balance. The intentionally vague and enigmatic nature of Rosa's and Lippi's allegories conveys both the uncertainty and the challenge presented by this way of life. Their message finds a particularly salient reflection in Francesco Berni's *Dell'Accademia* (Modena, 1658). A fellow member of the *Percossi*, Berni advocated the academy as a place of friendship and respite from the duplicities of the court. He offers a twofold vision of the *teatrum mundi* as "the world as a theatre of misery" and "the world as a theatre of happiness": in the first realm, the world takes the form of a theatrical stage, its occupants – especially men, the "actors" – destined for wretchedness [*infelicità*]; in the second, the academy is the sole realm of earthly happiness: "Friendship in the Academies of men renders beneficial concord [among them] ... in the Academy, the happiness of the Actor [*Istrione*] is located no longer in the mask but in the heart. This is due to the fact that he plays his roles from his soul [*anima*]."[378]

II.7. Concluding Thoughts

[378] "Vi introdusse infine l'Istrione l'huomo … La felicita di un comico è una maschera, e l'essere mascherato è un non esere, perché non è che un parere." … "L'amicitia nelle Accademie gli huomini rende concordi nel bene … Passa nell'Accademia la felicita dell'Istrione dall maschera al cuore. Mercè che le sue parti egli rappresenta con l'anima. Fin anco quelle, che recita con l'esterno, sono i più fini parti, che gli possa produr l'intelletto." Berni, *Dell'Accademia*, 205, in Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 34.

After he returned to Rome in 1649, Rosa attempted to re-launch the identity he had consolidated among his Florentine academic friends, only to encounter fresh obstacles.[379] At the Roman *Accademia degli Umoristi* in the early 1650's, for example, he was plagued by condescension, ridicule and accusations of plagiarism,[380] and his membership in the *Accademia di San Luca* was jeopardized by his attempt to sustain (what its academicians perceived to be) an egotistical and hostile persona amid their ranks.[381] Rosa's letters to Ricciardi of this period make clear his longing for the supportive atmosphere of friendship he had found among his Florentine academic friends.[382] In 1651 Rosa showcased his new, philosophical identity in his first major painting, the large *Democritus in Meditation* (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst) [Fig. 62] which he displayed at the annual exhibition of S. Giuseppe at the Pantheon. As Volpi has argued, the *Democritus* encapsulates Rosa's eagerness to express, in a new kind of "philosophical painting", the intellectual persona he had acquired among academic and court circles in Florence. But he was unable to secure a buyer who was willing to pay the high price of two-hundred-and-fifty *scudi* he was asking for it, a dilemma Rosa attributed to the public's inability to appreciate his novelty.[383] In Rome, Rosa discovered just how vital his Florentine academic friendships had been in assisting him in his quest for personal and professional liberty and recognition.

By founding his own *conversazione* Rosa boldly proclaimed his desire not only to participate in the culture of *academia*, modeling aspects of his gatherings on extant academic communities, but also to create his own, unique version of that experience. Ostensibly informal in

---

[379] Roworth also noted the importance of Rosa's Florentine experience in bolstering his ambitions after returning to Rome, but did not elaborate on its significance. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 354.

[380] See note 97 above.

[381] On Rosa's clash with the members of the Accademia di San Luca, see 91, above.

[382] Rosa first informs Ricciardi of the accusations of the *Umoristi* in January of 1650, although his lamentations over successive, similar detractions continue over the course of the next decade. See Borelli, letters 46, 47, 50, 51, 54, 69, 70, 95, 103, 146, 147, 153, 161, 171, 174, 175-9, 181, 182, 192, 198, 208, 211, 214, 216, 217, 231, 239, 266, 281, 292, 292 and 310. In 1654 Camillo Rubiera came to Rosa's defense, and the artist affectionately thanks Rubiera and his distant Florentine friends for their support. See Borelli, letters 177 and 178.

[383] Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini," 79-80; see Borelli, letter 101.

nature, Rosa's academy was highly calculated in its organization and practice, founded and directed by Rosa in response to a personal need for a self-centered space.[384] The egalitarian nature of academic solidarity permitted the otherwise insubordinate courtier to capitalize on the success conferred by participation in court society, while simultaneously challenging its control. In this sense, Rosa's freedom was found, quite literally, in friendship. Further study of the role played by friendship in the *seicento* academic experience and the emergence of professional freedoms for the artist and his colleagues will offer insights into the complex nature of this important development, long relegated to an individualist paradigm.

---

[384] Here it should also be noted that Rosa exerted an equally significant degree of influence on his friends. In addition to the general impact of his unique brand of landscape painting and his predilection for certain philosophical and satirical subjects, a more specific instance can be detected in Lippi's mock-epic *Malmantile Racquistato*, which seems to have been completed only at the urging of Rosa and his other Florentine friends. The poem's spirit was inspired in large part by Rosa's own moral-satirical interests. Rosa apparently gave Lippi a copy of the Neapolitan author Giovan Battista Basile's *Lo Cunto de li cunti* ("The Tale of Tales") (published 1634-36) which in turn became an important source of literary inspiration for Lippi's own work. Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 23. On Rosa's influence on Lippi, also see Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 18-19, 48; and Alterocca, *ibid*, 47, 94, 99, 100.

Chapter III
Words and Gestures: Writing and Speaking as the Rituals of Friendship

The practices of writing and speaking that define the *Percossi*'s activities are a continual theme in Rosa's pictorial and textual production. This chapter explores the letters, poems and conversations of Rosa and his friends as documents of the social nature of his identity and signs of the broader, language-based nature of early-modern self-fashioning.[1] In Guazzo's influential *Civile Conversazione*, for example, the practices of writing and speaking are inexorably bound to the experience of living.[2] I approach Rosa's letters as records of a social individuality, founded in the sincere and democratic discourse of friendship. The poetry of his friends contributed significantly to the construction and perpetuation of his desired professional identity. And speaking and silence, prevalent subjects in Rosa's art and writing, highlight both the social contingency and the performative, rhetorical nature of his ambition and its attendant persona.[3]

III.1. Rosa's Letters as Social Documents

Almost four-hundred in number, the majority of Rosa's extant letters were written to his closest friends. Very few letters to patrons have survived. This significant point has been overlooked by scholars quick to cull Rosa's correspondence for facts and figures about his life and

---

[1] This is a theory propounded by Lacanian and post-structuralist theorists that finds a fundamental basis in Renaissance theory This notion is central to Jacques Lacan's theory of the linguistic construction of identity, taken up by Stephen Greenblatt in his argument for self-fashioning as a language-based process. Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, 4-5, 9, 244-5; Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity*, 1. Psychoanalysts and historians of material culture have taken issue with some of Greenblatt's restrictions. For the argument against his dismissal of psychoanalysis as a "belated" methodology in Renaissance scholarship, see Elizabeth J. Bellamy, "Desires and Disavowals: Speculations on the Aftermath of Stephen Greenblatt's *Psychoanalysis and Renaissance Culture*," *Clio* 34 (2005): 297-315; and Juliana Schiesari, *The Gendering of Melancholia. Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992), 23ff. For the debate between "materialist" and "linguistic" approaches, see Patrick J. Keane, *Coleridge's Submerged Politics* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1994), 184-185; and Martin, "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence," 1309-1342. On the critique of New History, see the useful bibliography in Chung-Hsiung Lai, "Limits and Beyond: Greenblatt, New Historicism and a Feminist Genealogy", *Intergrams* 7.1-7.2 (2006): 1-29.

[2] Quondam ed., *Le 'carte messaggiere'. Retorica e modelli di comunicazione espistolare: per un indice dei libri di lettere del Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1981), 73.

[3] Early-modern masculine identity, in particular, is contingent upon conversation: the *honnête homme* ("gentleman of virtue") only achieved his identity "in the company of other men". Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity*, 9.

career while disregarding the essential context of the letters' composition. The content of Rosa's letters should be considered a record not only of individual identities but of the relationship that defines them. In Rosa's case, the letters reveal the essential contribution of friendship to his identity. Time and again, Rosa concludes his letters by accompanying his signature with the phrase "*Amico Vero*",[4] an epithet that becomes as much a part of his identity as his name. The content of Rosa's letters to friends demonstrates his faith in the value of friendship, and his self-identification as "*amico vero*" is a marker of his recognition of the fundamental sociality of his identity.[5]

The conventions (and idiosyncrasies) that characterize Rosa's letters derive from the tradition and development of the personal letter. The intimate connection between friendship and the *ars epistolaria* in the early-modern period stems primarily from Cicero's definition of the "personal" letter and his influence on epistolary treatises from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries.[6] The early-modern letter differs from its ancient counterpart for its fundamental status as a "private" document, a form of writing that operates within (and is emblematic of) a more intimate social sphere.[7] There are important ancient precedents, however, for this conception. Long before Erasmus defined a new type of personal or familiar letter, conceived as "a conversation between absent friends" and defined by an emphasis on equality and friendship over social rank,[8] the first-century ACE philosopher Demetrius argued in his treatise *On Style* that friendship was the foundation of letter-writing itself: the most beautiful style of letter-writing, he said, resulted from

[4] Rosa also uses the more weighty "*devotissimo amico vero*"; see the letters as cited in Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*.
[5] Limentani noted the impression of "fraternal friendship" that emerges from Rosa's letters to Ricciardi in his use of the recurrent phrases "amico unico" and "amico vero". Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 32-3.
[6] Luigi Matt, *Teoria e prassi dell'epistolografia Italiana tra Cinquecento e primo Seicento. Ricerche linguistiche e retoriche, con particolare riguardo alle lettere di Giambattista Marino* (Rome: Bonacci, 2005), 16. Considered an authority on both oral and written discourse, Cicero is credited with devising the "personal" letter. In the *Epistulae ad Familiares* (2.4. 1-2; 4. 13 1; 6. 10. 4), Cicero discusses two primary types of letters: the *genus familiare et iocosum* (the familiar and friendly or pleasing type) and the *genus severum et grave* (the serious type). Bray and Strosetzki, *Art de la lettre, Art de la conversation*, 12.
[7] Sebaste, *Lettere & Filosofia, Poetica dell'Epistolarità* (Florence: Alinea Editrice, 1998), 31.
[8] Couchman, Jane and Ann Crabb, *Women's Letters Across Europe, 1400-1700: Form and Persuasion* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005), 8; Erasmus, *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* [1522]. Erasmus describes the letter in a revolutionary way: it is an "intensely personal, situation-oriented product" which should be expressive of the writer and of the relationship shared between the writer and recipient.

the "signs of friendship" it contains, and the letter should show a certain "affectivity and friendliness (*amicalità*)".[9] Seneca also seems to have anticipated the sentiments of his seventeenth-century enthusiasts, such as Justus Lipsius, with his stipulation that letters "should be simple and informal".[10] In the early-modern age, the letter was no longer solely the domain of philological study but "the site for the study of friendship and human relations."[11] Not only the act of writing a letter, but the frequency of its production and receipt was proof of the degree and quality of friendship itself. As Peter Paul Rubens wrote to his close friend Pierre Dupuy in October of 1630, concerning the recent death of the Marquis Spinola: "In him I have lost one of the greatest friends and patrons I had in the world, as I can prove by a hundred letters from him."[12] In the *seicento* the letter became the social genre of writing *par excellence*,[13] as evidenced by the rapid increase in the popularity of epistolary manuals.[14] This interest is tied to the desire among scholars to become heirs to the great network of ancient and medieval thinkers – the "republic of letters" – for whom the letter (among other forms of writing and discourse) played a crucial role in cultivating, reinforcing, and maintaining the sociability, dialogue and solidarity between learned friends.[15] Like many scholars of the seventeenth century who self-consciously emulated their forebears in this regard,[16] Rosa sought to participate in this broader, pan-historical community, cultivating his own intimate social group of academic friends with a self-serving objective.

---

[9] Sebaste, *Lettere & Filosofia*, 31-32.
[10] Bolgar, "The Teaching of Letter-writing in the sixteenth century", *History of Education* 12: 4 (1983): 245. Both Erasmus and Lipsius emphasized the quality of spontaneity in letter-writing. Hoff et al eds., *La Lettre Dans Tous ses Etats* (Strasbourg: Clément & Gyss, 2000), 8.
[11] Sebaste, *Lettere & Filosofia*, 9.
[12] Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 369, letter 217.
[13] Morabito, *Lettere e letteratura*. *Studi sull'epistolografia volgare in Italia* (Turin: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2001), 123.
[14] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 28.
[15] See Fumaroli, "The Republic of Letters," *Diogenes* 143 (1988): 129-52.
[16] Cassiano dal Pozzo, for example, the collector and secretary to Cardinal Francesco Barberini who counted among his friends many of the foremost intellectuals of the period, occupied "the center of an epistolary network among European intellectuals". Jonathan Unglaub, "Poussin's 'Esther before Ahasuerus': Beauty, Majesty, Bondage," *Art Bulletin* 85:1 (2003): 118. On Cassiano's correspondence and relationships, see Giovanni Lumbroso, "Notizie sulla vita di Cassiano dal Pozzo ... con alcuni suoi ricordi e una centura di lettere," *Miscellanea di Storia Italiana* 15 (1876): 129-388; Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 98-114; and Anna Nicolò, *Il*

The Letter as the Self and the Friend

In his biography of Rosa, Baldinucci noted that after the artist had returned to Rome he was so sorely missed by his friends that they sent him letters filled with "demonstrations of affection, and of great esteem" in order to keep their mutual memory alive.[17] Letters were a valuable tool in the preservation and maintenance of distant bonds.[18] They enabled not only a single pair of friends to maintain their relationship, but an entire community. Rosa's own letters show his faith in letters as the life-blood of friendship. Urging Giulio Maffei to write to Ricciardi in 1651, Rosa implored: "Keep alive the friendship with our Signor Ricciardi and all those who profess true friendship to you."[19] The ability of the letter to reproduce individual identities and experiences was an early-modern commonplace. In a very real way, the letter was conceived as a literal "embodiment" of or surrogate for the writer, and the ancient idea of "writing the self" was a trope that Rosa and his contemporaries were often eager to invoke.[20] This notion is tied to the conception of the personal letter as a proxy for lived "conversation" or "dialogue", an idea popularized in antiquity as the *sermo absentium* and revived by Erasmus who also considered each letter to be as unique as its writer. Tasso echoed the sentiment when he wrote to Angelo Grillo in 1591, "I am more sure of writing than of living".[21]

Carteggio di Cassiano dal Pozzo. Quaderni del Rinascimento, II (Florence: L. S. Olschki, 1991). The early-modern trade in letters (and the sharing of ideas they record) represented the conscious endeavour of its participants to participate in "elite culture". Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 113.

[17] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 463.

[18] John Milton, for example, wrote to Carlo Dati almost a decade after returning home to England, reflecting on his idyllic Florentine experience and remembering the many friendships he had made. Milton asked not only to be remembered by Dati himself, but also by the rest of his companions. Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 5; see Milton, *Epistolae Familiares* 10, in Patterson ed., *The Works of John Milton*, 12: 44-52.

[19] Borelli, letter 99. Also see letters 102 and 107.

[20] On the topos of "writing the self" see Marshall Grossman, *The Story of All Things. Writing the Self in English Narrative Poetry* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998); Maritere Lopez, "Writing a letter, writing the self: Courtesans of the Italian Renaissance and their epistolary writings (Camilla Pisana, Tullia d'Aragona, Veronica Franco)" (PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 2003); and Roy Porter ed., *Rewriting the Self. Histories from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: Routledge, 1997). Baldinucci alluded to the trope of epistolary or conversant surrogacy: after Rosa left Florence in 1649, he made a concerted effort to keep his memory alive among his Tuscan friends by writing affectionate letters. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 463.

[21] "Di scrivere sono assai più sicuro che di vivere." Morabito, *Lettere e letteratura*, 11; G. Resta, "Le Lettere del Tasso: Scrivere per esistere", in Doglio, *L'Arte delle Lettere*, 160. Tasso's expression conveys his more

Rosa's own letters occasionally cling to certain older epistolary conventions, but they also reflect the growing interest in conveying a more personal, unique quality in form and content. His faith in the letter as an embodiment of self and presence is suggested in one of his earliest missives to Giulio Maffei in 1646: "Signor Cavaliere has left and he carries part of me myself in the confines of this paper to honour my Signor Giulio".[22] Rosa's letters to Ricciardi also show his belief in the letter's ability to embody selves and reproduce physical experience: in 1664 he writes, "In seeing your character [*vostro carattere*] at the heading of the letter, I felt myself entirely recover, and a perceptible improvement in my sight and all my feelings."[23] (He intends the term "*carattere*" as "script", but may have entertained the alternative, closely connected, idea of personal "spirit" or identity.) In another letter to Ricciardi, Rosa equates the pen with the lips.[24] His frequent complaints to friends over the lateness of their replies reveal his conception of the letter as a simulation of real conversation: the more punctual the letters, the more the exchange approximates the bodily "presence" of its interlocutors.[25] The length of the letter and the use of hyperbole – as signs of greater affection or sincerity of sentiment – were also exploited in the hopes of replicating live experience.[26] Rosa's exaggerated expressions of desire, longing and embracing

---

pervasive autobiographical preoccupation, and likens the process of writing to the inscription of a "self" onto the world and into posterity. G. Resta, "Le Lettere del Tasso: Scrivere per esistere", in Doglio, *L'Arte delle Lettere*, 145, 160; Hoff et al eds., *La Lettre Dans Tous ses Etats*, 34. For Erasmus, see Morabito, *ibid*, 9; Sebaste, *Lettere & Filosofia*, 8. In the first century ACE, Demetrius of Phaleron described the letter as a "dialogue of ancient persons". Bernard Beugnot, "Les voix de l'autre: typologie et historiographie épistolaires," in Bray and Strosetzki, *Art de la lettre, Art de la conversation*, 47.

[22] Borelli, letter 12: "Partì il Signor Cavaliere e porta parte di me medesimo nel ristretto di questa carta per riverire il mio Signor Giulio al quale conserverò sempre viva la serie delle mie obligationi."

[23] Borelli, letter 305: "In vedere il vostro carattere nella soprascritta della lettera, mi sentii tutto riavere, et un sensibile rinforzo nella vista e per tutte le viscere." Also see letter 377.

[24] Borelli, letter 288: "Quel che sempre mi troverete in bocca e nella punta della penna, e che di continuo vi replicherò, è che non ho senso più vivo, né memoria più tenace che il vedere e l'amar voi."

[25] In a letter to Giulio of 1652, Rosa berates his friend for not being as "punctual with the pen as I am with the heart". Borelli, letter 125; also see letters 31, 32, 37 and 45.

[26] In a letter to Giulio in July of 1650 Rosa suggests that he would prefer his friend write more at length (likely in view of his previous inability to respond at all). Borelli, letter 61; also see letters 74, 145. Elsewhere Rosa suggested that the quantity or length of letters is not necessarily an indication of their quality. Borelli, letter 52. Rosa's expressions of longing often appear to be motivated by a hope to reproduce proximity: in 1669 Rosa laments to Ricciardi that they have not seen each other in seven years. Borelli, letter 369; also see letters 375 and 378.

were usually directed at Ricciardi: "I do not love anyone but you, I embrace you from my heart"; "I have no other happiness than the thought of your love"; "I … do not love another creature than you"; and so forth.[27] Such statements should be situated in the context of early-modern definitions of masculinity and male affection, and are derived from chivalric discourse and the rhetoric of loyalty.[28] In Ricciardi's case, they also served to placate his jealousies and suspicions: "For the love of Christ," Rosa writes in 1667, "I beg of you to believe that I have no other desire than to think of living and dying with you, and that my heart does not know to love any other than yours; that my pen does not deign to write to anyone else in this world, only to you, and yet you mistrust me."[29] In spite of his reliance upon hyperbole, and his apparent faith in its usefulness for conveying genuine feeling, Rosa was also aware of its potential triteness.[30]

As an embodiment of the sender, the letter is closely allied with the gift and the ideas of presence and absence which are intrinsic to the practice of gift-giving.[31] Tasso defined the letter as

---

[27] Borelli, letters 176, 231 and 237. Rosa frequently appeals to Christ, God and the Virgin Mary in expressing both his affection and his frustration over his friends' reciprocity. See letters 45, 112, 113, 174, 198, 210, and 242. For other hyperbolic and quasi-"erotic" statements of affection see letters 33, 49, 102, 125, 129, 169 and 337.

[28] These ostensibly "erotic" statements are better understood in connection with chivalric and courtly declarations of undying loyalty, such as "I am your man" or "I am entirely yours". See Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," *French History* 2: 2 (1988): 136. On the chivalric (rather than classical) basis of early-modern ideals of male friendship, see Guy Fitch Lytle, "Friendship and Patronage in Renaissance Europe," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Kent and Simons, 51-2. On the "erotics" of male friendship in literary, conversational and other homosocio-cultural contexts, see for example Koestenbaum, *Double Talk*; Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke eds., *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, 2003); Michael Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships. Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*; Simons, "Homosociality and erotics in Italian Renaissance Portraiture"; and Bray, *The Friend*.

[29] Borelli, letter 337: "Vi prego per amor di Christo a credere ch'il mio desiderio altro non pensa che di vivere e morir con voi, e che non ho core da sapere amare altro ch'il vostro; e che la mia penna non si degna di scrivere più a nessuno di questo mondo, solo che a voi, e pur voi diffidate di me."

[30] In 1661 Rosa implies that his use of hyperbole is intended to convey sincere sentiment: "Vorrei che la vostra sagacità mi ricordasse un poco in qual tempo et occasione ho io adulato con hiperboliche esageratíoni il vostro affetto e la vostra amicitia.… Le mie veracissime espressioni dell'anima, voi date titolo d'hiperboli?... voi non havete … amico che più cordialmente e sinceramente v'ami alla mia misura.… Quest'è quanto mi detta la mia ingenuità, e non l'hiperbolici essagerationi che voi dite." Borelli, letter 245. In a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1645, however, Rosa seems to mock hyperbolic expressions of affection as commonplace. Borelli, letter 7.

[31] Sebaste, *Lettere & Filosofia*, 8.

a "gift", as "the surest argument of friendship", and as a sign of affection that touches the heart.[32] The writing of a letter, like the giving of a gift, is motivated by a desire to "remember",[33] both in the sense of "recalling" of past persons or events and "re-constituting" or giving presence to those bodies and activities.[34] The notion of the letter as both surrogate and gift is also closely connected with the analogy drawn between epistolary writing and conversation. Both practices aimed at the creation of a sense of reciprocity and balance, "with each interlocutor 'giving' and 'taking' in equal measure."[35] In order to achieve this balance, the writer was obligated to pattern his own text after that of his correspondent, as if to create a "mirror" image in response, a form of reciprocity that is echoed in the ideal of friendship.[36] Rosa's constant complaints to his friends about their inability to hold up their side of the correspondence (as a sign of friendship) reveal his desire to maintain the requisite illusion of reciprocity: "Do not dump on me the guilt which is manifestly yours," he writes to Giulio in 1649, "in view of the fact of the little friendship I know that you have with the ink and the pen."[37]

Humanists and intellectuals regarded the letter as a tool not only of self-presentation but of social identification that allowed them to "define themselves as literators, scholars, or scientists," in relation to their community.[38] Capable of representing either individual or social identity, the letter functioned alternatively as an instrument of privacy or publicity.[39] Rosa alluded to the "open" or

---

[32] Gianvito Resta, "Le Lettere del Tasso: Scrivere per esistere", in Doglio, *L'Arte delle Lettere*, 156, citing Tasso, Lettere, V: 1357, 69, letter to Niccolò dell'Oddi, Mantova, 22 October 1591.
[33] Hoff et al. eds., *La Lettre Dans Tous ses Etats*, 32
[34] Beugnot, "Les voix de l'autre: typologie et historiographie épistolaires,' in *Art de la lettre, Art de la conversation*, ed. Bray and Strosetzki, 47.
[35] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 29; Virginia Cox, *The Renaissance Dialogue. Literary dialogue in its social and political contexts, Castiglione to Galileo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 43; Wayne A. Rebhorn, *Courtly Performances*: *masking and festivity in Castiglione's Book of the courtier* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1978), 134-6.
[36] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 30.
[37] Borelli, letter 32.
[38] Toon Van Houdt et al eds., *Self-Presentation and Social Identification of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 3.
[39] Clericuzio and De Renzi. "Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy", 194.

semi-public status of one of his letters to Giulio when he asked that it be read aloud to the family.[40] That private letters could potentially become public ones, whether or not the sender or recipient intended it, was a frequent concern: "Please do not read my letters with anyone," Rosa wrote to Giulio in 1649, "because I do not want anyone to know my affairs or, to put it better, our affairs."[41] Rosa was particularly concerned for the privacy of his letters to Giulio, voicing his suspicion that the reason for his lack of response was that his brothers "take them, read them and then rip them up".[42] In order to avoid this problem letters were often sent and received "in the care of" another friend, a procedure often necessitated by the practicalities of mail delivery as much as by the requirements of privacy.[43]

The "self" inscribed into Rosa's letters – especially the letters written after his return to Rome – is a relatively consistent identity, anxious to keep alive the persona and reputation he had cultivated among academic colleagues in Florence. In a very real sense, Rosa's letters are the textual counterparts to his pictorial and highly performative self-portraits: like the canvas or the theatre, the page provided yet another "stage" for Rosa to assert his philosophical prowess. Rosa appears to have modified his epistolary identity according to his relationship with each recipient and to the changing nature of that bond: in his letters to Giulio Maffei, for example, Rosa's language turns increasingly from a language of deference to one of a more playful and jocular tone;[44] in letters to Ricciardi, he plays the affectionate and increasingly passionate "Amico Vero,"

[40] Borelli, letter 29. Also see letters 45 and 46.
[41] Borelli, letter 33: "Di gratia non leggete le mie lettere con nessuno perché non voglio che nessuno sappia i fatti miei o per dir meglio i nostri."
[42] Borelli, letter 36: "… che i Signori vostri fratelli le pigliano le leggano e poi le straccino. Parlo a questa maniera perché so il difetto di Casa Maffei in questo particolare, per haver veduto più d'una volta aprire le lettere al compagno (cosa appresso di me la più sacrilegha, la più empia che si possa imaginare)." Also see letters 51, 77, 96 and 99.
[43] Rosa often sent letters from Rome via Cosimo Brunetti (Borelli, letters 84-86), and Francesco Cordini (letters 52, 101, 119, 197). He also delivered letters and gifts himself on behalf of his friends. See Borelli, letters 80, 89, 197. Friends often included letters in the envelopes of other friends, or wrote on the same page as another friend, as Giulio Maffei did in one of Rosa's letters to Ricciardi. Borelli, letter 54.
[44] Compare the more deferent language of Borelli, letter 1 (1641) with the freer, more mocking tone of letter 66 (1650).

alternatively effusive or curt in his choice of words, at pains to demonstrate the authenticity of his devotion.[45] A comparison of two letters written on the same day to Giulio and Ricciardi reveals something of the different "selves" that Rosa presented to his two closest friends:[46] the letter to Giulio is a quarter the length of the excessively long missive he sent to Ricciardi. Rosa may have expressed himself more poetically in letters to Ricciardi in order to match the erudition of his scholarly friend.[47] In his letters to patrons (of which only a few examples survive), Rosa infuses the older language of clientage with the expressions of sincerity that characterize the more intimate discourse used with close friends.[48]

"*Amico Vero*": Friendship and Sincerity in the Making of an Epistolary Identity of Autonomy

Rosa's epistolary epithet "*amico vero*" encapsulates the prerogative of friendly sincerity that lies at the heart of his self-fashioning.[49] The phrase makes an appeal to the highest category of friendship in the ancient tripartite division: perfect or true friendship.[50] The "truth" or sincerity implicit in this relation is intimately bound to a pervasive category of early-modern identity essential to Rosa's self-image as a painter-philosopher, outlined by John Jeffries Martin. Debating the validity of post-structuralist and New Historicist readings of the Renaissance self as a "self-fashioned construct," Martin argues that the early-modern concept of sincerity acknowledged the constructed nature of the self but emphasized individual agency in that process.[51] In this way sincerity encapsulates the tension between an old and new social order, in which the individual was

---

[45] Compare Borelli, letter 49 (1650), letter 223 (1659), and the final letter of 392 (1673).
[46] Borelli, letters 45 and 46, both dated January 5 1650.
[47] In this letter Rosa highlighted Ricciardi's literary interests, calling him "Signor Horatio sanza brevità," likening him to Horace both for his "literary predilections" and for his long-windedness.
[48] In addition to the two letters to Don Antonio Ruffo, there is one other letter extant letter by Rosa to a patron – a certain "Marchese di Milano." See Appendix I.3.
[49] Rosa discusses "true friendship" on a number of occasions in his letters. See Borelli, letters 25, 29, 30, and 32.
[50] See my discussion of Aristotle's tripartite scheme in the introduction.
[51] Martin, "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence," 1330, 1333. Martin argues against the wholesale application of social theories of selfhood on the one hand, and essentialist interpretations of the Burckhardtian theory of self-directed individualism on the other.

conflicted by a desire to assert a self based on the sincere nature of interiority and an obligation to participate in the requisite dissimulation of public (courtly) life.[52] This tension is also apparent in Rosa's experience, in which an adherence to the ideal of the self as a product of individual agency and an expression of sincerity was essential.

Rosa's persistent anxiety to assert his sincerity as an instrument of his independence appears throughout his pictorial and textual production.[53] In his letters, Rosa frequently asserts his own sincerity and requires that his friends do the same.[54] In declaring the authenticity of his principles, opinions and feelings, Rosa affirmed his profound faith in self-agency; but the significant pains he takes in order to do so reveal an awareness of the continued threat of external pressures upon that self-directed subjectivity. The practice of friendship, which offered the individual a sense of self-directedness via its ideals of intimacy and egalitarianism, provided a crucial bridge between the old and new realms of self-fashioning. Rosa's letters reveal perhaps more clearly than any other document the significance of friendship as a strategy for asserting a sincere and therefore autonomous self.

In the related arts of letter-writing and conversation "sincerity" was given increasing emphasis in the second half of the seventeenth century over the obsequiousness and artifice that had characterized the written and oral forms of the previous generation. The practice of epistolary sincerity was closely linked to the rise of the informal letter (the category to which most of Rosa's extant letters belong), in connection with its status as an approximation of intimacy. Considered less and less a form of "naturalness" or "self-assuredness" and more a form of "authenticity," sincerity was characterized in verbal exchange by "disorder, unconditional adulation, and a total

---

[52] Martin, "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence," 1335-6ff; also see Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, 31.
[53] I have already mentioned the allegorical figure of "Sincerità" in his "*Genius*" etching, for example.
[54] Limentani also noted the centrality of sincerity to Rosa's epistolary writing. Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 31.

lack of self-control."[55] Anxiety over the question of how to verbally express sincere emotion was already being voiced in the sixteenth century by Stefano Guazzo in his treatise on conversation.[56] A simultaneous requirement to be informal and formal made letter-writing into a particularly fraught enterprise, reflective of the challenges of lived social experience. Letter-writers began more and more to seek personal, idiosyncratic expressions in place of stock statements. This is apparent in Rosa's own letters, where sincerity is both a recurring subject of discussion and a dominant structural feature of the text. Rosa makes a concerted effort to devise novel expressions that express a more profound, unique and individual sentiment, combining these with the more standard, ritualized statements that were dictated by classical epistolary decorum.[57] These strategies vary from repetition and emphasis to the use of hyperbole and metaphor, jocular and witty turns of phrase, and the construction of erudite statements consisting of quotations from literature or philosophy. (Rosa also had a frequent habit of citing from his own satires, a practice that redoubled his sense of autonomy and self-sovereignty by making himself into the authoritative source of his own sincerity.[58])

In letters to friends, informality created a level ground that permitted the writer to declare himself equal and therefore independent. Formality was adopted partly as a result of epistolary tradition but also as a way to co-opt the language of clientage formerly directed at flattering one's social superiors as a way to give import and *gravitas* to that relaxed mode of discourse. The

[55] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 35-6.
[56] One of Guazzo's interlocutors, the Cavaliere, considered that the "familiar and common way of speaking" used with servants and friends is more expressive of a sincerity of affection, while the formal speech used on other occasions by those poetical "professors of eloquence" demonstrated only an "insincerity of the heart." The Cavaliere's companion Annibale, however, pointed out the necessity of using the appropriate salutations and greetings with friends, since these have the power to induce and encourage friendship, and that forgetting to use them might be friendship's undoing; "we must always seek to pre-empt friends with these greetings," therefore, "and to win them with kindness." Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, 87, 110.
[57] In his *Il Segretario* (1625), Gabriele Zinano emphasized *convenienza, onore* and *decoro* in letter-writing, formulaic expressions derived from the Western medieval conception of the practice as a utilitarian activity, characterized by a rigid structure. Bolgar, "The Teaching of Letter-writing in the sixteenth century," 247.
[58] See Borelli, letters 50, 51, 69, 70, 103, 198, 231, 239 and 281. Many of these quotes appear in letters to Ricciardi, suggesting Rosa's desire to compete with his friend's erudition.

recurring "I kiss your hands" or "I kiss your feet" – which Rosa frequently used – are clear examples of this re-appropriation of servitude in the context of friends.[59] (The continued perception of this gesture as a demonstration of ceremonial decorum rather than sincere emotion, however, is suggested by Ricciardi's warning to Rosa that, if he did not prove his affection for Ricciardi was greater than that for Carlo de' Rossi, he would "no longer confide" in him and that they would become "*amici di bacialamano*" ("friends who kiss hands") – that is, friends who employ ceremony with each other rather that sincere intimacy.[60]) On certain occasions in letters to friends, formal expressions could be adopted in order to illustrate their own triteness, as Rosa seems to do in a letter to Giulio of 1662: poking fun at the tediousness of stock expressions of salutation, he writes, "don't forget to embrace Signor Cosimo for me, and to revere even the cats on my behalf".[61] Rosa seems to have made a distinction between letters intended to serve the causes of "commonplace terms of politeness" and those motivated by true friendship, as he assured Ricciardi in 1661.[62]

In letters exchanged between more disparate levels of social strata (as between patrons and clients) there emerged a tricky mixture of the two modes. While informal speech was adopted in

---

[59] Matt notes that the stereotypical forms of the epistolary *conclusio* (the closing phrase of the letter) from antiquity onward had to conform to "precise canons of courtesy", and thus tended to take on a standardized form. Matt, *Teoria e prassi dell'epistolografia Italiana*, 126-127. These phrases, and the physical action they represented, intended to convey a sincere and intimate affection, but they also had an element of social deference which extended from their earlier use with social superiors. The "obsequious and submissive" language which constituted the discourse to be used in letters to both friends and patrons in the seventeenth century was in part dictated by the continued emphasis on protocol and the traditional structure of patronage relationships, "which prevailed in Florence at least until the mid- to late- seventeenth century." Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 189. The hand-kiss derives from ancient pledges of fealty between men in both social and political contexts. In the context of the early-modern royal court, "it referred to the requirement that the office-holder *actually* kiss the hands of the Sovereign as a symbol of personal fealty and loyalty". Rodney Brazier, *Ministers of the Crown* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 28, 81–8. The mouth-kiss, to which Rosa also refers in his letters (see Borelli, letters 38, 67, 69) similarly symbolizes a bond of loyalty between men. Pasquinelli, *Il gesto e l'espressione* (Milan: Electa, 2005), 141.

[60] Borelli, letter 345.

[61] Borelli, letter 265. Rosa's occasional salutation of "a hundred thousand hand-kisses" to Ricciardi can likewise be considered a mockery of the triteness of such statements. See Borelli, letters 270 and 271.

[62] Attempting to allay Ricciardi's jealousies over Rosa's correspondence with other friends, Rosa writes: "Ricciardi caro, bisogna confessare che in molte cose non siamo quali ci siamo ad intendere d'essere. Si può sentire maggior debolezza, paragonare l'incompatibile nostra amicitia alla pontualità di cinque o sei risposte di lettere scritte al Signoretti, le quali hanno sempre hauto per fine il sodisfare i triti termini della creanza che ai stimoli geniali; e se in quel tempo che ho scritto a lui non l'ho fatto con voi, questo non è argomento di mancanza d'amore, come voi essagerate, replicandovi che sempre ho risposto perché così voleva la convenienza." Borelli, letter 245.

letters between clients and patrons as a strategy for asserting the client's parity and consequent autonomy, this casual way of speaking continued to be tempered with certain requisite formal expressions of old. One of Rosa's letters to his wealthy and influential Sicilian patron, Don Antonio Ruffo is a revealing example of the *seicento* epistolary tight-rope walk. Writing to Ruffo in April of 1666, Rosa famously informed his patron he will have to be patient for the painting he has requested since Rosa did not paint for money but "for my own satisfaction"; Ruffo would have to wait until the artist was sufficiently enraptured by his own "impulses of enthusiasm" to see any results. A daring display of confidence, yes – but the rest of the letter (usually passed over by scholars quick to cite this passage) adheres entirely to that older formal structure of flattery, deference and self-deprecation: Ruffo remains "Your Most Illustrious Lordship" who will be "punctually obeyed" by Rosa "from the heart".[63] The same language permeates another, earlier letter from Rosa to Ruffo of 1663.[64] Even as late as the 1660's, by which time Rosa had already long-established a position of autonomy, Rosa continued to combine a more informal language of friendship and affection with a mandatory, obsequious language of reverence. I will return to the complex nature of Rosa's relationships with his patrons in chapter five. Here I wish only to emphasize that both the content and form of his letters reveal the complex and often contradictory nature of his situation and self-conception, in which a constant interplay between the self and the social, freedom and dependency, sincerity and deception, and friendship and enmity is everywhere apparent.

[63] Borelli, letter 321. See Appendix I. 5.
[64] Borelli, letter 289. See Appendix I. 4. The only other extant letter of Rosa's to a patron (dated to June of 1662 and addressed to an unidentified "Marchese di Milano") also mixes the sycophantic language of clientage with assertions of his talents and rights for recognition. See Appendix I. 3; BiASA MS 77 (96361). More than this, Rosa's declaration of independence appeals to a trope of artistic "genius" with which Ruffo and other contemporary collectors would have been familiar.

III.2. The Letters of Rosa's Friends

Ricciardi

Few of Rosa's friends' letters survive, resulting in an inevitably one-sided view of his epistolary relationships.[65] None of Giulio Maffei's letters to Rosa are known, and only one of Ricciardi's has been discovered.[66] There is a post-script by Giulio in one of Rosa's letters to Ricciardi of 1650, written from Rome: Giulio asks Ricciardi to come to Monterufoli (probably at the request of Rosa, who often urged him to write to Ricciardi and reassure him of his affections), identifying himself as his "*amico vero*":

> "Dearest friend,
> I arrived, thank God, to enjoy my Signor Rosa, and up to now you are indebted to us for an incomparable toast, and we will dispose ourselves to return it to you at Monte Rufoli, where, God willing, we will be shortly; so get your beloved boots ready in order to visit our usual places and, in closing, I send you my respects.
> [Your] true friend, Giulio Maffei."[67]

The only known letter of Ricciardi's to Rosa, dated August 1661, is written on the back of one of Rosa's drawings:

> "Dear friend,
> Here there are none of your letters, from Rome or elsewhere. I arrived today and was [en route] to the city all yesterday, but only as soon as I could move. Today I am a little better. Tomorrow the water of the Arno will be good. I will go there as

[65] Attempting to explain the strange absence of letters written by Rosa's friends to the artist himself, Meroni has made the intriguing suggestion that Rosa destroyed them out of fear of their discovery by the Holy Office, who condemned him for living in sin with Lucrezia and for the satirical content of his work. Rosa wrote to Ricciardi in 1654: "non mi troveranno in casa altre scritture che le riceute della pigione." Borelli, letter 175. But why Rosa would have destroyed all of the letters and not just the "compromising" ones? Meroni suggests further that the lacuna may be due to Rosa's possible habit of not keeping letters, but it is apparent from Rosa's own letters how important his friend's missives were to him, so this seems unconvincing. See Meroni, "Un disegno sconosciuto," 69-70.

[66] Limentani mentions another letter by Ricciardi conserved in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge, but does not identify the recipient. Limentani, "Nuovi Studi e Ricerche," 38, note 21. The letters written to Rosa by other friends are relatively few in number, and I discuss some of them throughout this dissertation. Baldinucci claimed to have in his possession many of the letters and poetic compositions of Rosa's friends that were directed to the artist, including those by Torricelli, Dati, Rovai, Cavalcanti, Ricciardi, Salvetti, Bandinelli, Vendramin, Apolloni, Sgambati, Lasagnini, Abati, Desiderio Montemagni and other "persons of high affairs" like Cardinal Brancaccio, Niccolò Sagredo, Count Ermes Stampa, Count Carlo Bentivogli, Carlo Conti, Orazio Quaranta, Lazzero Ferro, Giuseppe de' Domemenici, Francisco Melosi, and Lodovico Leporio. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 463.

[67] Borelli, letter 54, April 2 1650: "Amico carissimo, Sono Dio gratia arrivato a godere il mio Signor Rosa e fino adesso ci sete debitore di non so che brindisi e ci dispensiamo a renderveli a Montc Rufoli dove Dio piacendo saremo in breve però mettete al ordine i vostri cari scarponi per visitare i nostri soliti posti e per fine la riverisco. Amico vero, Giulio Maffei".

> recommended for this churning [*ribollimento*] of blood. Everyone makes fun of me when I exaggerate this air, but I have witnessed how it effects me. I am in need of some book or other to take there with me. I wait for Sig. Lodovico and Sig. Marcantonio day by day. Signoretti is recovered, but doesn't want to get out of bed saying that it's not urgent, and he eats like a wolf. I haven't seen him though, not being able to walk in my usual way. Sig. D[ottor] Minucci greets you with every affection. So does my brother. So do I, and please greet Signora Lucrezia, and be as healthy and happy as you can. Florence, the [page torn] of August 1661.
> Your Lordship,
> most humble G. B. R."[68]

The letter reflects little of the ardent affection that radiates from Rosa's letters. Although it is dangerous to make judgements on the basis of a single letter – particularly one written during a bout of illness – the absence of profuse sentiment in Ricciardi's writing may have been characteristic of his letters to Rosa in general, in view of Rosa's constant complaints about the lack of his friend's affection, punctuality, and effort to respond in kind. The letter was probably written after Ricciardi left Rosa and his family at Strozzavolpe to check on the mail, take a brief reprieve for the sake of his health, and acquire some books.[69] Ricciardi mentions some of their mutual friends, but his comments suggest very little about the nature of his own relations with them. The letter is also written on the back of a drawing with a sketch for a "Judgment of Paris" that Rosa must have sent to Ricciardi, as he often did, in solicitation of advice [Figs. 108a and b].[70] The drawing points to the most meaningful aspect of their relationship: Rosa's reliance on his friend for approval,

[68] "Amico caro, Qui non sono vostre lettere, né di Roma né d'altrove. Io arrivai a giorno e stetti tutto hieri per la città, ma appena potevo muovermi. Hoggi sto un poco meglio. Domane l'acqua d'Arno sarà buona. Io vi anderò così consigliato per questo ribollimento di sangue. Tutti mi burlano quando esaggero di cotest'aria, e pure in me ne ho visti gli effetti. Sto in busca di qualche libro per condur meco costà. S'aspetta il Sig. Lodovico e Sig. Marcantonio di giorno in giorno. Il Signoretti è guarito, ma non vuole uscir di letto dicendo che non li urge e mangia come un lupo. Non però l'ho visto, non potendo camminare a mio modo. Il Sig. D[ottor] Minucci vi saluta con ogni affetto. Così mio fratello. Così fo io e salutatemi la Signora Lucrezia e state sani e allegri più che potete. Firenze li (strappo) agosto 1661. Di V.S., humilissimo G.B.R." Meroni, "Un disegno sconosciuto di Salvator Rosa ed un raro autografo di Giovanni Battista Ricciardi," *Prospettiva Firenze* 15 (1978): 68-70. The letter is in a private collection in Parma. The presence of the drawing is likely the reason for the letter's unique survival.
[69] In 1661 Rosa, his partner Lucrezia, and their son Augusto were in Strozzavolpe. Rosa stayed for the summer and part of the autumn drawing and designing engravings, leaving at the start of November to return to Rome, a journey that took five days. Meroni, "Un disegno sconosciuto," 68.
[70] The drawing also contains some small figure studies, and a sketch of a sword.

encouragement and inspiration.[71] Rosa may have given the drawing to Ricciardi as a gift which he then added to the "book of drawings" in which he collected Rosa's graphic work.[72]

Some sense of Ricciardi's personality can be gleaned from another extant letter of 1652, addressed to an unknown acquaintance of both Ricciardi and Rosa.[73] As Uberto Limentani notes, the letter, written when Ricciardi was twenty-eight years old, reveals something of his "jumbled erudition" and his aspiration to be recognized for his expertise in philosophy. In his letter Ricciardi was responding to a query about divination and magic, and he recommends a list of ancient and sixteenth-century authorities. Although not written to Rosa himself, the letter is significant in the context of his relationship with Ricciardi, who recommends Rosa to his correspondent for his *virtù* (that is, his knowledge of the subject at hand), a meaningful comment that suggests not only Ricciardi's admiration and esteem for the painter, but the degree of intimacy that permits him to offer Rosa's services on his behalf. It also points to the important role played by friends (and their letters) in supporting Rosa's reputation. A further sense of Ricciardi can be gleaned from letters written to him by Marcantonio Cesti and Paolo Minucci.[74] In a letter of 1661, Cesti wrote to his

---

[71] Meroni notes the possibility that, in this instance, the drawing was made by Rosa after receiving Ricciardi's letter, particularly in view of the fact that Ricciardi makes no comments in his letter on the subject of the drawing. He argues that "although the letter dates to 1661, Rosa could have drawn succesive parts of the drawing at a later date". Meroni, "Un disegno sconosciuto," 69. Meroni further suggests the possiblity that the subject, "strange among Rosa's oeuvre", was intended for an etching, a possibility in view of his engagement in designing prints at Strozzavolpe at that time. There are a few notes on the drawing in Rosa's hand, but they make no reference to the image itself. Meroni, *ibid*, 69.

[72] Ricciardi appears to have kept a book of drawings. See Borelli, letter 151 (1652), where Rosa refers to a "Libro de' disegni", and letter 182. For Rosa's references to "drawings" in general, see letters 254, 260, 261, 293, and 296. Rosa also made drawings on letters from other correspondents: on the back of a letter addressed to him by Cosimo Maffei (December 16 1651) Rosa drew a pen-sketch "in the manner of the bamboccianti". Meroni, "Un disegno sconosciuto," 70; also see P. Bigazzi, *A Voi Marchese Luigi Torrigiani…* (Florence, 1867). On the back of a letter from another correspondent, Rosa drew a bald, bearded man. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 211-12, no. 11.1.

[73] Limentani, *Poesie e Lettere*, 165-67. Lettera di G. B. Ricciardi, 12 Gennaio 1652. Limentani notes that the letter must be a draft copy, as this would explain its unique survival.

[74] Limentani, *Poesie e Lettere*, 168-172; and *idem*, "Nuovi studi e ricerche", 168-70. For Cesti's correspondence with Rosa, see Schlitzer, "A Letter from Cesti to Salvator Rosa," trans. Frank Walker, *The Monthly Musical Record* (July-August 1954): 150-152. On Cesti, see David L. Burrows, "Antonio Cesti on Music", *The Musical Quarterly* 51: 3 (1965): 518-529; Carl B. Schmidt, "Antonio Cesti's 'Il pomo d'oro': A Reexamination of a Famous Hapsburg Court Spectacle," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29: 3 (1976): 381-412; and L. Bianconi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 24: 281-94.

"*amico carissimo*" from Florence (signing himself as "*amico vero*"), sending his wishes for good health during an illness. He refers to the advice given by their mutual friend ("*il nostro*") Rosa, and indicates his reliance on both Rosa and Ricciardi for their advice and counsel.[75] In a letter of 1662, Minucci (who also signed himself as "*amico vero*") thanks Ricciardi for sending him snuff, and mentions he will send the letter along Rosa that evening with his own greeting.[76]

Despite the scarcity of Ricciardi's letters, a certain degree of insight into his attitude toward Rosa and their friendship can be gleaned from Rosa's own correspondence. Rosa often quotes Ricciardi in his letters, usually repeating statements of jealousy in order to refute them.[77] These quotations may offer evidence of a more ardent and expressive sentiment than is to be found in Ricciardi's only surviving letter to the artist.[78] In a letter of 1650, for example, Rosa writes: "You say in one of your [letters]: 'For the Love of God, dear friend, we search for all those means that can immortalize love between us, and we sever all the roads to suspicions and to the shadows that can be generated in our minds' ... is it possible that you make such an effort as to write to me: 'For the love of God, my Rosa, improve your opinion of me!'?"[79] The same jealousies continued over the long course of their friendship: in 1667 Rosa again quoted Ricciardi back to himself for accusing him of not wanting to leave "the many beautiful comforts and genial friends" of Rome in

---

[75] Limentani, *Poesie e Lettere*, 168-170; Limentani was unable to identify the context for this counsel. In April 1661 Cesti was trying to persuade Rosa to travel to the court at Innsbruck with him; Rosa wrote to Ricciardi of his refusal. Borelli, letter 245. In a letter of November of the same year (letter 252), Rosa wrote to Ricciardi concerning Cesti's tenuous relations with his Roman patrons and his desire not to return to Rome. To judge from this letter, Rosa had clearly been advising his friend against such a notion.

[76] Limentani, *Poesie e Lettere*, 170-2. The other letter from Minucci is dated October 14 1662.

[77] See for example Borelli, letter 245, where Rosa refutes a list of Ricciardi's complaints against him.

[78] However, in re-transcribing Ricciardi's statements with his own pen, it is impossible to know how selective Rosa was in his choice of quotations or to what extent he embellished them with his own characteristic flair.

[79] Borelli, letter 49: "Voi dite in una vostra le seguenti parole: Per Amor di Dio, amico caro, cerchiamo tutti quei mezzi che possano fra di noi eternar l'amore, e recidiamo tutte le strade ai sospetti et all'ombre che possano generarsi nelle nostre menti. … è possibile che voi havete tanta fatica di scrivermi: Per amor di Dio, Rosa mio, megliorati il concetto di me!?" Ricciardi appears to have been expressing jealousy and anxiety over what he perceived to be a desire on Rosa's part to not want to come and work in Pisa "in order not to have occasion" to give Ricciardi his "things". Borelli, letter 50: "mi scrivete d'haver creduto, e che credete, ch'io scrivessi di non voler dipingere in Pisa per non haver occasione di donarvi delle mie cose."

order to come visit him.[80] Ricciardi also seems to have expressed his "love" for Rosa in a manner similar to Rosa's own oft-repeated declarations of affection.[81] In 1654 Rosa told Ricciardi that a mutual friend had relayed to him Ricciardi's own words of praise: "Padre Cavalli has appeared, and after speaking at length said to me: 'In fact, I know that no one wishes you better than Signor Ricciardi, since he speaks about it with too much tenderness.' Consider, now, how I grow fat with such declarations."[82] There is also an indication in one of Rosa's letters of 1667 that Ricciardi preferred a more formal type of letter-writing than the "careless" manner Rosa frequently adopted.[83] Without the letters themselves, though, we are left to speculate on the actual nature of Ricciardi's epistolary persona.

Florentine Friends

The letters of Rosa's Florentine academic friends are filled with sentiments and expressions of friendship, affection, and obligation similar to those in Rosa's own letters, evidence that an interest in sincerity and its assertion was more generally pervasive among Rosa's group. Many of these letters have yet to be discussed or published, and some are mentioned here for the first time. In a letter of 1660 to Carlo Dati, for example, Volunnio Bandinelli writes to his Florentine friend from Rome with affection, servitude and gratitude, signing the note "from the bottom of my heart" ("A. Al.^{mo} di Cuore").[84] In one of his letters to Dati, Andrea Cavalcanti

---

[80] Borelli, letter 337: "Voi mi dite in una vostra ch'io difficilmente mi disporrò a lasciar tante belle comodità e tanti amici geniali e che la scusa del freddo mi serviva per cavallo di ritorno." Rosa asked God to forgive him for letting his "pen slip with similar kinds of nonsense" ("scappar dalla penna simil sorte di bestemie").

[81] See Borelli, letters 147 and 288, where Rosa quotes Ricciardi's declarations of love and affection toward him.

[82] Borelli, letter 178: "Il Padre Cavalli è comparso, e doppo molti discorsi mi disse: Infatti conosco che nessun vi vuol più bene del Signor Ricciardi, poiché ne parla con troppa tenerezza. Considerate adesso voi s'io ingrasso in sì fatte at testazioni."

[83] Borelli, letter 337: "Confesso in certe cose prevalermi un po' troppo dell'uso della carlona maniera. Ma che si vol fare; bisogna haverci una santissima pacienza et ammettere per ottimo tutto quello che non ha per fondamento la malizia."

[84] BNCF MS Baldov. 258 II 6. In another letter to Dati, Bandinelli thanks his friend affectionately for his gift of an oration. BNCF MS Baldov. 258 II 6: "… quando ella si compiace di favorirmeni, mi obliga sopra ogni misura, … Cosi è avvinuto nel dono, che V. S. mi là fatto della sua bella oratione, della quale la sing.^{re} ben vivam., e con

similarly expressed his desire to "serve him, and to enjoy his sweet and erudite conversation".[85] In 1660 Cosimo Brunetti wrote to Dati from Paris, declaring his affection for various members of the *Crusca*, and assuring him of his affection and obligation.[86] Some sense of Francesco Redi's friendship with Ricciardi emerges in a letter of 1688 from Redi to Giuseppe Valletta: lamenting Ricciardi's death in Pisa the year prior (actually 1686), Redi notes the "many moral and jocular things" he had written, highlighting in particular Ricciardi's poem on a "sanctimonious priest" (*un prete bacchettone*), like the *Il Bacchettone*.[87] In another letter to Giuseppe Lanzoni (a doctor and anatomist from Ferrara who had just become professor of philosophy at the University of Ferrara) of 1694, Redi praised Ricciardi as a "great and worthy man" whose compositions, though relatively few in number, were still "the best of their kind".[88]

III.3. The Panegyric Poetry of Friendship and the Social Sustenance of Identity: Rosa in the Eyes of his Friends

Rosa and his friends participated in an elaborate ritual of writing, exchanging and reciting encomiastic poetry. Rosa's friends contributed significantly to his poetic practice: Antonio Abati,[89]

---

pienezza d'affetto, e la aug. ogni bene. Di V. S. Roma 23 xbr. 1664. Affett.[mo] per serv.[la] sempre di cuore, V. Card. Bandinelli".

[85] BNCF MS Baldov. 258 III 7: "Illmo Sig. mio Pron. Oss.[mo] Mi trovo ogni giorno più obbligato dalla di lei gentilezza, la quale non tralassia ov:[ne] di multiplicare i miei debiti … dendero sempre haver fortuna di servirla, e godre dela sua dolce, et erudita conversazione … Un salva al nostro Sig. Franc. Cordini. Di Roma 26 xbre. 1649."

[86] BNCF MS Baldov. 258 II 35, 135r-v, June 12, 1660: Brunetti declares to be "sempre suo vero amico e servitore".

[87] BNCF MS Poligrafo Gargani, 1686 – Riccia-Ricciardi: (6 luglio 1899), sheet 155. "Gio B.[a] Ricciardi mori l'anno passato in Pisa sua patria; ha lasciate molte cose mss. e morali e buffone che tra le buffonesche, vaga una poesia contro un prete bacchettone…". Redi also mentions Ricciardi's illness and death in a letter to his student Diacinto Cestoni, of November 1686. *Ibid*, sheet 156.

[88] BNCF MS Poligrafo Gargani, 1686 – Riccia-Ricciardi: (6 luglio 1899), sheet 158: "… il Signor Ricciardi pisano fosse un gran valentuomo, imperocchè veramente fu tale a gran segno." Redi was clearly in possession of some copies of Ricciardi's poems, as he told Lanzoni that he would transcribe some of them and send them to him. BNCF MS Poligrafo Gargani, 1686 – Riccia-Ricciardi: (6 luglio 1899), sheet 167 (dated April 10 1694): "Farò trascrivere qualche Poesia del Signor Giambatista Ricciardi per poterla a suo tempo mandare a V.S." The following month he again tells Lanzoni "se V. S. avesse gusto di veder qualche sua poesia, me lo rammenti." BNCF MS Poligrafo Gargani, 1686 – Riccia-Ricciardi: (6 luglio 1899), sheet 158 (dated May 27 1694).

[89] Passeri implies that Rosa's satirical-poetic inclinations were largely encouraged by his friendship with Abati in Viterbo. Passeri, *Vite*, 419. Abati's satires in rhyme and prose, compiled in his *Le Frascherie Fasci tre* (Venice, 1651), exerted a particular influence on Rosa. On Abati, see R. Zapperi, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 1: 7-8. Abati's poem entitled "La Guerra" closely resembles Rosa's satire of the same name (dated to end of 1640's). Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 5-6, 33, 46-8. On the relationship between Abati's and Rosa's writings, see -

Lorenzo Lippi and Giambattista Ricciardi in particular played an important role in Rosa's development as a satirist. Here, however, I am less interested in the influence of friends on the structure and content of Rosa's writing than in their contribution to creating, bolstering and perpetuating his identity as a poet-painter. The nature and degree of that contribution is apparent in the panegyric compositions they dedicated to Rosa and his art, which frequently emphasize his rhetorical skills. Some of these poems, or fragments from them, have already been published. Others are included here for the first time.

Panegyric poetry was a vital component of the broader discourse of amity among Rosa's companions. Collectively, these texts functioned as an instrument of social self-fashioning. Some of these compositions were intended as private communications or for recital in the intimate setting of academic friends, while others were likely meant for wider public circulation. Many of them belong to the convention of *laude* or *elogie*, poems written in celebration of or defense of an individual or his (or her) work. The poems in praise of Rosa's art belong to the much more pervasive tradition of ekphrastic poetry of the period that engaged in an intimate dialogue with pictorial art, frequently treating the theme – as do Rosa's friends – of the artist's impressive verisimilitude.[90] Many of these poems also participate in a tradition of "burlesque narrative" taken up by Francesco Berni (c. 1497-1536) and Michelangelo,[91] and reflect, as Volpi puts it, "that

---

Francesco Moffa, "Le Frascherie di Antonio Abati e le Satire di Salvator Rosa," *Rassegna Pugliese* (Trani-Bari) XVIII (1901): 328ff; and Tomory, "Salvator Rosa: 'La Menzogna'". On analogies between Abati's poems and Rosa's paintings, see Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 127-8. In a letter of 1651, Rosa told Ricciardi he had just finished reading Abati's *Frascherie*. Borelli, letter 114. On Lippi's influence on Rosa, see my discussion of their relationship in chapter two. I discuss Ricciardi's influence on Rosa later in this chapter and in chapter four.

[90] Cropper has traced in particular the connections between Giambattista Marino's ekphrastic poetry and Caravaggio's paintings. See Cropper, "The Petrifying Art: Marino's Poetry and Caravaggio," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 26 (1991): 193-212.

[91] See for example, the obscene composition by Abati: "L'autore tornando di Milano a Firenze trovò che Lorenzo del Frate suo amico era in villa, e che gli cadevano i cappelli," in which Rosa's name is also cited. BNCF MS Magl. VII 357, 459. Volpi notes that it is entirely characteristic that, faced with the copious production of obscene poetry on the model of Berni and Aretino, Abati condemned solemnly in his Frascherie the modern Berniesque poetry. See *Delle Frascherie fasci tre*, Venice, 1651, 154, cited in Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 31, 43 note 33.

collusion between literature, philosophy and painting that Rosa achieved in Florence."[92] The themes of these poems often treat the themes of virtue, fame and fortune, subjects that were fundamental constituents in Rosa's self-conception.

Encomiastic poetry, in practice since antiquity, was in its application to the ruler an instrument of propaganda intended to publicize his or her virtues and the socio-moral ideals he or she represented.[93] In the context of the private academy the practice shares the same intent but is localized within the social microcosm of the academy itself. Indeed, the promotion of the activity of panegyric poetry among Rosa's circle of friends (particularly his Florentine academic colleagues) can be seen as part of the artist's more general effort to establish his own self-centric "court" of sincerity, distinguished (at least in ideal terms) as removed from the Grand Ducal setting he regarded as opposed to his intellectual and creative freedoms. Like a work of art, a poem could be presented to a friend as a gift that asserted certain aspects of his or her identity. In some cases, poems for friends devised a distinctive image or persona for the recipient. A good example is offered by Niccolò Simonelli's poem for Rosa of c. 1639 (the text of which has yet to be discovered) on the subject of his painting of *Tityus*: here, Simonelli depicts the ambitious young artist, then attempting to make a name for himself on the competitive Roman art scene, as the "Demosthenes of painting". In this instance as in others, the poetry of praise is not only about celebrating the subject but also an opportunity for the author to demonstrate his own creative and poetic virtuosity.

---

[92] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 88-89.

[93] Dempsey, review of *Pietro da Cortona at the Pitti Palace: A Study of the Planetary Rooms* and Related Projects by Malcolm Campbell, *Art Bulletin* 61: 1 (1979): 143; Joseph D. Falvo, *The Economy of Human Relations. Castiglione's 'Libro del Cortegiano'* (New York: Peter Lang, 1992), 13, 16, 44. On epideictic and encomiastic writing, see Theodore C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," in *Studies in Classical Philology* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902), III: 89-248; G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 152-203; and *idem*, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 21-23. On the early-modern theory of praise and its connection to rhetoric and poetry, see O. B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), 24-42; and Brian Vickers, "Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance," *New Literary History* 14: 3 (1983): 497-537.

Poems for Rosa

Passeri is the first to mention Simonelli's composition, written (according to the biographer) in combination with the exhibition of Rosa's *Tityus* at the annual exhibition of the Festa di San Giuseppe at the Pantheon (probably in 1638) in order to promote Rosa's talents as an emerging artist to the Roman art establishment.[94] The text is unknown, but the title – *The Demosthenes of Painting* – gives us some indication of its allegorical content. The conceit of likening artists to ancient poets was not new,[95] but in describing Rosa as the "Demosthenes of Painting," Simonelli selected an unusual philosophical exemplar. Scott has suggested that the epithet referred to Rosa's iconographic "eloquence", although he did not elaborate further on its significance in this regard.[96] Demosthenes (384–322 BCE), the great ancient Athenian statesman and orator, was recognized as the first among his profession to master rhetoric as part of his political repertoire. A particularly canny association between Rosa and Demosthenes is suggested

[94] Passeri, *Vite*, 420. Volpi has recently offered the most convincing solution to the long-standing debate over the identity of the lost *Tityus* referred to by Passeri, often confused with the Corsini *Prometheus* [Fig. 43]. She argues that the *Tityus* to which Passeri refers is the painting that once belonged to the Gerini collection, now known only through an eighteenth-century engraving by Ferdinando Gregori (Gabinetto delle Stampe della Galleria Nazionale d'arte antica di Roma) [Fig. 5]. The *Tityus* shows a stylistic resonance with Ribera and Rosa's early Neapolitan phase, while the Corsini *Prometheus*, with its dramatic and almost scientific depiction of viscera, seems to evince Rosa's exposure to the scientific interests of his Florentine academic friends in the early 1640's. (This aspect of the painting, too, is a feature of Paolo Vendramin's poem in praise of Rosa's *Prometheus*, which I discuss further below). It seems most likely that Rosa made the now-lost *Tityus* in Naples, sent it to Simonelli, and that it then passed to the Gerini. The Corsini *Prometheus*, instead, may form part of the 'philosophical' works that Rosa made toward end of Florentine period and the start of his second Roman phase. The *Tityus* is thus dated to c. 1638-9, and the *Prometheus* to 1641-2 or 1647. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 87; *idem*, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 30. Volpi had earlier argued that the style of the Corsini *Prometheus* was clearly in keeping with Rosa's Neapolitan style, and that Passeri's identification of the painting as a *Tityus* was thus an error of iconographic identification. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de' Rossi," 362, note 17; and *idem*, "L'ordine delle immagini," 78. Other scholars (including Scott), who considered Passeri to have confused the Neapolitan *Tityus* with the (likely) Florentine *Prometheus,* have consequently interpreted Simonelli's poem as based on the Corsini *Prometheus* and not the now-lost *Tityus*. But if Passeri's identification is to be trusted (as Volpi's recent argument suggests), then there is little reason to doubt that Simonelli's poem was written in honour of this first painting of *Tityus*. The existence of Paolo Vendramin's poem on Rosa's *Prometheus*, however, written during Rosa's Florentine period, suggests the alternative possibility that Simonelli's poem belongs to a broader poetic discourse on that painting among Rosa's friends. Without the text of Simonelli's poem or harder documentary evidence in support of either painting, the question will remain unsolved. On Simonelli, see Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 124, 135; *Fasto Romano*, 119-120; and Spezzaferro, in *Pier Francesco Mola 1612-66*, 43-9.

[95] Francesco Albani had been described as the "Horace of Painting", for example. Sohm notes that "Albani's genre of painting was described "as 'Lyric', and his style 'heroic' because it matched in painting what Torquato Tasso achieved in poetry." Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 137.

[96] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 11.

by a note in John Bulwer's *Chirologia* (1644): describing the ancient orator as the master of *actio* and paragon of expressive bodily rhetoric, Bulwer cites Plutarch's observation that Demosthenes was "wont to compose the action and gesture of his body by a great looking glass"[97] – a practice that Baldinucci records was taken up by Rosa in his devising of gestures for his paintings. Renowned equally for his skill in speaking as for his passionate pursuit of civic freedom, Demosthenes seems an apt choice for expressing concepts so intrinsic to Rosa's emerging artistic persona.[98] As a figure of steadfast fidelity, Demosthenes was also akin to other ancient exemplars that Rosa and his colleagues came to idolize as symbols of their own social solidarity.[99]

Roman theorists lauded Demosthenes as among the greatest orators of his age.[100] In his treatise *On the Sublime*, Longinus made him a fitting avatar for the *seicento* artist who aspired toward the mastery of a performative, poetic and moralistic art: Demosthenes "perfected to the

---

[97] Bulwer, *Chirologia: or the Natural Language of the Hand, and Chironomia: or the Art of Manual Rhetoric* [1644], ed. James W. Cleary (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974), 166. Bulwer cites Plutarch, "The Life of Demosthenes", in *Vitae parallelae*, xi, 2. "Chirologia" is "the natural language of the hand", and "Chironomia" is "the rule of the hand (which is "adjoined as the perfection and sublimation of chirology". Plutarch recounts Demosthenes' reputed emphasis on "actio" as central to the art of oratory: "...Demosthenes, being demanded the question, which was the first point of eloquence? he answered, 'Action'; which the second? he answered, 'Action'; and which was the third? he said 'Action', still." Bulwer, *ibid*, 169; Plutarch, *ibid*, iv, 406. On Bulwer and rhetoric, see Anne-Marie Lecoq, "Nature et rhétorique: de l'action oratoire à l'éloquence muette (J. Bulwer)," *XVIIe siècle* 132 (1981): 265-277.

[98] Adams, *Demosthenes and his Influence* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927), 3. "The art of Demosthenes is his command of persuasive argument and his skill in presenting a case in such a way as to give pleasure even to those who refuse to be persuaded." Pearson, *The Art of Demosthenes* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), iii. On Demosthenes and freedom, see Gustav Adolf Lehmann, *Demosthenes. Ein Leben für die Freiheit. Biographie* (Munich: Beck, 2004). Demosthenes gained popularity for his views on liberty among the religious reform movement in sixteenth-century Germany. Adams, *ibid*, 136-7ff; also see Daniel Tangri, "Demosthenes in the Renaissance: A Case Study on the Origins and Development of Scholarship on Athenian Oratory," *Viator* 37 (2006): 575ff; and Marc Fumaroli, "Le Corps Éloquent: Une Somme *D'Actio et Pronuntiatio Rhetorica* au XVIIe siècle, les *Vacationes Autumnales* du P. Louis de Cressolles (1620)," *XVIIe siècle* 132 (1981): 237-264.

[99] Demosthenes wrote on the subject of political concord itself. Goldstein, *The Letters of Demosthenes* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1968), 204ff. Like Atilius Regulus, who Rosa and Ricciardi would later idolize as a Stoic exemplar of fortitude, Demosthenes chose death over surrender. I discuss Rosa's adoption of Regulus as a symbol of friendship in chapter five.

[100] Cicero lauded Demosthenes as "the perfect orator" who lacked nothing, while Quintilian praised him as "the standard of oratory" who "stands alone among all the orators". Cicero, *Brutus*, 35; Quintillian, *Institutionis oratoriae*, X, 1, 6 and 76. Lucian reproduced an *Encomium on Demosthenes* among his writings, which may have influenced Simonelli's poem for Rosa. For the encomium, see Adams, *Demosthenes and his Influence*, 122.

utmost the tone of lofty speech, living passions, copiousness, readiness, speed".[101] Other authorities described Demosthenes as virtuous, shrewd and inventive in his arguments, skilled in extempore speech, and blessed with a particular ability to animate and inspire his listeners.[102] Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century commentators considered likewise, promoting Demosthenes as a central figure in the early-modern humanist study and instruction of oratory.[103] The German humanist Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560) even described him as "indignant" in his emotional passion,[104] while the French Jesuit priest René Rapin (1621-87) considered him a guiding figure in the study of oratory as a route toward virtue itself.[105] (It is tempting, in this regard, to suppose that Simonelli may have drawn some analogy between the moralizing dimension of Demosthenes' and Rosa's rhetorical style and the decidedly moral-ethical punishment exacted upon the lascivious Tityus in Rosa's painting.[106]) In his treatise on conversation Stefano Guazzo highlighted Demosthenes' fondness for receiving praise, a further point of resonance between the philosopher and Rosa. Borrowing from authorities like Cicero and Petrarch, Guazzo presented Demosthenes as a cautionary example in his discussion of merit and flattery: he is among the men "who are so delighted by Glory, that only upon hearing themselves named with praise are they consumed with joy".[107] The orator's ability to encapsulate and inspire the passions of the soul was the crucial faculty for early-modern Italian commentators like Leonardo Bruni, and it is a central theme in the contemporary discourse of *ut*

---

[101] Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 34.4.
[102] Adams, *Demosthenes and his Influence*, 57, 147; Alfred P. Dorjahn, "A Further Study on Demosthenes' Ability to Speak Extemporaneously," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 69-76.
[103] In the sixteenth century, Demosthenes became "part of the standard classical learning" in humanist education across Europe. Tangri, "Demosthenes in the Renaissance," 574. On Demosthenes' critical fortune and influence, see Tangri, *ibid*, 545-582; and Craig A. Gibson, *Interpreting a Classic. Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
[104] Melancthon, in *Against Aristogeiton* (*Corpus*, 1.837-838), in Tangri, "Demosthenes in the Renaissance," 576.
[105] Rapin, *A Comparison Between the Eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero*, trans. anon. (Oxford, 1672), 42.
[106] Tityus was the "son of Earth, damned in Hades for his lustful assault upon Latona, mother of Apollo and chaste Diana. As punishment, his liver, the seat of carnal passion, was to be devoured by vultures for eternity. The mythic sinner, victim of his own sexual appetite, became in the Renaissance a symbol of love's torment, specifically of the agonies of sexual desire." Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 189.
[107] Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, 54-55. On Demosthenes as an *exemplum* of vainglory, see Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, V 36, 103; Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae*, IX 23, 4; and Petrarch, *De vita solitaria*, II xii.

pictura rhetorica, in which "the arts of painting and oratory love each other mutually" and, in their shared expressive capabilities, spur each other onward to great moral heights. These are the words of Enea Silvio Piccolomini (1405-1464; later Pope Pius II), who – singling out Demosthenes and Cicero as his exemplars – observed that painting flourishes only in times when oratory does the same.[108] Simonelli may have intended his epithet for Rosa to exploit the same conceit: as a new Demosthenes and master of artful rhetoric, Rosa will revitalize and advance the art of painting. Simonelli's choice of Demosthenes as an alias for Rosa was highly suitable for the persona that the artist would strive to cultivate and uphold for the rest of his career.

Among the many poems written for Rosa and recited at the Florentine *Accademia dei Percossi* are compositions by Torricelli, Chimentelli, Lippi, Berni and (in all probability) Vendramin and Rovai. That Baldinucci singled out Torricelli's and Chimentelli's poems for particular praise suggests they were perhaps more broadly known beyond the confines of the academy.[109] Torricelli's ode, the *Encomio del Secolo D'Oro* (1640's), aligns the popular subject of the Golden Age with an erudite exaltation of Rosa's painting of *Astraea* (or *Justice)* [Fig. 21]. Replete with quotations from ancient authorities, his poem is guided in the main by Seneca's XC epistle, where "Seneca describes the innocent lives of early man before the Iron Age that followed the Golden".[110] Adhering to a popular conceit that runs throughout many of the encomia for Rosa, Torricelli praises the virtuous, encyclopedic and naturalistic "marvels" of Rosa's paintbrushes. In his long composition in honour of Rosa's birthday, Chimentelli plays with the conceit of the "rose,"

---

[108] Demosthenes regained popularity in the philological studies of late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century writers like Bruni. Tangri, "Demosthenes in the Renaissance," 555, 562; Bruni, *De studiis et litteris liber* 19, in C. W. Kallendorf ed., *Humanist Educational Treatises* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 108-111. On the theme of "*ut rhetorica pictura*", see John R. Spencer, "Ut Rhetorica Pictura: A Study in Quattrocento Theory of Painting," *JWCI* 20: 1/2 (1957): 26-44; for Piccolomini's comment, see Spencer, *ibid*, 27, cited from Piccolomini, *Letters*, edited by Rudolph Wolkan in *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini* (Vienna 1918), II, 100, note.

[109] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 453.

[110] Appendix VII. 2. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence," 190.

an obvious allegory also taken up by other friends and by Rosa himself.[111] In his poem, Chimentelli compares the rose to the sun, to love and affection, to the target of envy, and to the sovereign of all flowers, implicating Rosa's own sublime and beneficent reign over the academy. He praises Rosa for his "Stoic purity and simplicity" in contrast to the corruption of the court.[112] The recurring reference to thorns offers the most intriguing allegory: they are likened to the "darts", "stinging bitterness," and "lacerating" of the satirist who "paints with the needle."[113] The allegory of thorns was also taken up by Rosa in his poem *Risposta di Giobbe alla Moglie* and his satire *L'Invidia*.[114] It also appears in Francesco Melosi's "*Capitolo*", where, defending Rosa against his Roman academic detractors, the author gives in evidence of Rosa's authorship of his biting satires the "sour punctures" of the rose's thorns.[115] Chimentelli's poem on the subject of Rosa's painting of *Peace* [Fig. 20], which was read to the academy by Rosa himself and subsequently dedicated to the Sienese *cavaliere* Ludovico de' Vecchi, was likely similar in form and tone to Torricelli's encomium on the *Astraea*.[116]

---

[111] Appendix VII. 1. The "rose" conceit also appears in Francesco Melosi's *Capitolo* for Rosa and Abati's letter to Diego Gera, both of which I discuss further below. There are a number of poems in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence, among the manuscripts of texts by Rosa's friends and colleagues, which may treat the subject of the "rose" as an allusion to Rosa himself. One is a *canzone* by the musician Orazio Persiani entitled *Esser molto difficile del farsi un Amico, Sonetto*, in which the rose is compared to friendship. Persiani was an associate of Rosa's friend Padre Bonaventura Cavalli, and may also have known Rosa himself. See Appendix VII. 16. The other poems include a piece entitled "Al Sig. Dottore N. che havea fatto un discorso in lode della Rosa, e del Giglio," by Giorgio Baffo (1694-1768) (BNCF MS Magl. VII. 872, 719), and one by an unidentified author that begins "Rosa superba Rosa" (BNCF MS Magl. VII. 935, 4r-v). It seems more likely, however, that the latter two poems treat the rose as a more general allegorical symbol than as an explicit allusion to Rosa himself.

[112] Langdon, *Salvator Rosa*, 138

[113] See Appendix VII. 1: "Quindi Filostrato con grazioso paralello la Rosa ad Amore simigliantissima scorge …"

[114] "Pensi, Femmina ria,/ Che la Strada del Ciel non sia sassosa; / Quasi possibil fia / Senza le spine sue coglier la rosa". Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, I: 151. Rosa refers to his "irateness" and "bile" in the same poem: "Creommi irato, è vero,/ Et inviommi estri di Bile al Core." In the *L'Invidia* (vv. 703-720 ff) Rosa constructs an elaborate allegorical *paragone* between the bee and the rose. Another example occurs at the end of the *L'Invidia*, vv. 997-999. Roworth notes Rosa's self-referential use of roses in the *Allegory of Fortune* (1659, J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu) [Fig. 98], where they are trampled by animals' feet. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 226 note 9.

[115] See Appendix VII. 6. It is significant in this context to note that the rose was also a symbol of martyrdom, a convenient connotation in connection with the name "Salvator," which Rosa occasionally used as an emblem of his persecution at the hands of his critics. In his "Sonnet Against Those who Doubt the Author of the Satires", Rosa compares himself to the crucified Christ. See Appendix I.2. Rosa also used the metaphor in his letters. See Borelli, letters 114 and 134.

[116] *Ragguaglio della Pace, dipinta da Salvatore, composto da Valerio Chimenteli, dedicato poi a Lodovico de' Vecchi*. The text of Chimentelli's poem has not yet been discovered. Baldinucci refers to it in his biography of

In the *Malmantile Racquistato*, Lippi made a number of amusing but affectionate references to Rosa. He compared him to Francesco Rovai as a "uomo della sua tacca" ("a man of his cut"), humorously touting his artistic skills (as capable of surpassing all other artists in whitewashing), his polymathic erudition, and his improvisational and theatrical abilities.[117] Paolo Vendramin's poetic letter for Rosa on the subject of the Corsini *Prometheus* [Fig. 43], a document of particular value in helping to solve the problem of the painting's date,[118] constructs a *paragone* of poetry and painting, highlighting the emotional efficacy of Rosa's graphic representation of torture: the visceral depiction of the vulture tearing at Prometheus' innards incites sheer terror in the viewer. Professing his true friendship to Rosa and lauding him as a "*filosofo nel dipingere*," Vendramin draws an explicit analogy between Rosa's rhetorical skill and theatrical performance: "You have expressed Prometheus in an attitude so savage because your workshops are Theatres, your Canvases are veins, your colours are events, and your figures are performances which purge with a moral imitation the emotions [*affetti*] of the spectators".[119] The hand that painted this image reveals its owner to be a master of "*docta loqui digitis*," that is, of "talking with the fingers".[120]

Rosa (*Notizie*, 453), and Pascoli paraphrases his description in his *Vite* (136). Fumagalli notes that the poem may also refer, like Rosa's large Palazzo Pitti *Battle Scene* [Fig. 9a] to the birth of Cosimo III. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 176.

[117] Lippi, *Malmantile*, Canto II, 63, IV, 14, and XI; Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 276-7. As Luigi Cretella has noted, Lippi's first reference to Rosa in the *Malmantile* praised, in particular, "the comic abilities of his friend and the affection which joined them" together, and which they "reciprocally and with generosity helped each other". Cretella, *L'Ideale di Salvator Rosa e le 'Satire'* (Trani: V. Vecchi, Tipografo-Editore, 1899), 29.

[118] Volpi recently published Vendramin's poem. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 91-2. As a work authored by a member of Rosa's Florentine academy, Vendramin's poem indicates that the Corsini painting may have been made in the Florentine years and not, as has been believed until now, in Naples or Rome. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 30. Volpi notes that Rosa may have made it toward the end of the 1640's, when he began to enlarge his figures, perhaps with the intention of sending it to Rome in order to prepare for his return.

[119] "Voi avete espresso Prometheo in atto si fiero perché le vostre officine sieno Teatri, le vostre Tele siano vene, i vostri colori siano accidenti, le vostre figure sieno spettacoli a purgare con una morale imitatione l'affetti a gli spettatori." Vendramin's emphasis on Rosa's efficacious verism is echoed in Lord Byron's poem on Rosa's *Prometheus*: "Silent suffering – and intense/ The rock, the vulture, the chain!/ All that the proud can feel of pain,/ The agony they do not show,/ The suffocating sense of woe,/ Which speaks, but in its loneliness;/ And then is jealous lest the sky/ Should have a list'ner, nor will sigh/ Until its voice is echoless." Boetzkes, *Salvator Rosa*, 70. It is tempting to connect Vendramin's emphasis on Rosa's verisimilitude with Prometheus's own life-giving power: in one of Marino's poems on a statue of a beautiful woman, he cites Prometheus's ability to give life to inanimate stone. See Cropper, "The Petrifying Art: Marino's Poetry and Caravaggio," 202.

[120] "Possi ben dunque dire che la mano, che l'ha formato, *docta loqui digitis*."

Like the great Apelles, who was able to paint thunder, Rosa has achieved even the effect of sound with his screaming protagonist.[121] Likening himself to Protogenes, Vendramin makes himself into Rosa's incapable poetic imitator, unable to imitate or surpass him in expressing his painterly merits with the pen.[122] His concluding line conveys, perhaps, the mixture of sincerity and jocularity that characterized Rosa's and his friends' attitude toward the activity of encomiastic poetry: "I praise you greatly," writes Vendramin, "if I break the pen in not knowing how to praise you."[123]

Baldinucci records that Francesco Berni recited to the *Percossi* "Rosa's satire on painting", perhaps the *La Pittura*.[124] But there is also another poetic composition by Berni himself, recently published by Volpi, which appears to treat the subject of a satirical painting by Rosa on the subject of *Pittura*. Entitled "*La Satira del Rosa*", Berni's poem is an ekphrasis of a painting (real or fictive) that Rosa purportedly showed or proposed to the academy, and which was, as Volpi notes, "deemed appropriate for treatment in a series of ekphrases by friends present at the academic meeting."[125] According to Berni, the subject of the canvas was (or was to be) based on the Medici frescoes at the Palazzo Pitti, and was intended to level a "violent accusation against ignorant patrons incapable of

[121] "Io venero le relazioni dell'antichità, ne voglio oppormi a chi ne riferisce, che Apelle abbia saputo dipingere il Tuono (quantunque sia negato all'impossibile) ma dirò bene, che se nessuno ha mai potuto destar con oggetti invisibili il senso dell'udito, il vostro Prometheo grida così altamente, che se fusse possibile egli si farebbe prima sentire che vedere."

[122] "Tanto più che in vostra commendatione vengo a dir tutto, quanto confesso il saper dir nulla. Così fattomi imitatore del vostro Protogene dopo che havrò tentate tute le vie per esprimere il di voi merito con la penna, lo farò forse spiccare più vivamente col conficcarla, e romperla su questa carta, poiché l'inchiostro indistinto che la macchierà dirà che è impossibile distinguere le vostre glorie e nel pieno di questa virtuosa disperazione la fiacchezza della mia natura servirà meglio alle meraviglie della vosta arte."

[123] "Vi lodo assai quando rompo la penna per non sapervi lodare." The sentiment is echoed in one of Rosa's letters to Giulio Maffei where he writes: "Se questo non basta, avisatelo, che vi tesserò un panegirico in cambio di tanto cascio." Borelli, letter 111. Vendramin's poem is one of a number of *laude* written for Rosa's *Prometheus*. Volpi notes that there are various poems in praise of Rosa's *Prometheus*, to be found in Rome and Florence. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 29. Scott, who considered Passeri to be referring to Rosa's Corsini *Prometheus* and not the lost painting of *Tityus*, identified a poem on Rosa's *Prometheus* among the Kempner manuscripts in the BiASA. See Appendix VII.10. BiASA Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 4v-8r. Rosa himself mentions Prometheus in a poem entitled "Amplificazione del Testo di Giobbe, dove la Moglie tentandolo dice: *Et adhuc manes in Simplicitate tua?*," published by Cesareo, where the aritst writes: "Dov'è la tua Scienza?/ Dunque tu credi e pensi/ Che sian dalla sovrana Intelligenza/ Concessi indarno alla nostr'Alma i sensi?/ Creder ciò non conviensi:/ Chè se ciò fare il Grande Iddio volea./ A che dunque occorrea,/ Che, per rapir i raggi al Dio di Delo/ Per vil fango, Prometeo andasse al Cielo?" Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, I: 146-150. The same manuscript contains two other poems for Rosa by unidentified friends. See Appendices VII. 11 and VII. 12.

[124] See chapter two, 131, note 267, above.

[125] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 94-5.

favour, or at least of protecting the arts" – a *concetto* that echoed Rosa's and his friends' shared conviction about the academy as a place of righteous virtue in direct opposition to the court. [126] Berni also emphasizes the sensory efficacy and performative nature of Rosa's painterly rhetoric, describing how the satirical figure of *Pittura* – placed in the center of the painting – is suddenly revealed by the raising of a curtain. The painting in question may be the now-lost *Paesaggio con la Pittura*, cited in the 1647 inventory of the Casino di San Marco, perhaps also one and the same with the so-called "*Pittura solitaria*" that Fabrizio Piermattei owned in Rome in 1640.[127]

The "*Pittura solitaria*" also received an encomiastic treatment by Rosa's friend Antonio Abati in a long poetic letter of 1640 addressed to his Sienese patron Diego Gera.[128] In his letter, Abati describes Rosa's painting as a wild landscape with the allegorical figure of *Pittura* seated alone on a large stone, far from the city. He also praises Rosa's reputation and expounds upon the reasons for it in great detail. Like Rosa's other friends,[129] Abati emphasizes Rosa's encyclopedic talents as a painter, capable of depicting a broad range of natural phenomena. He notes the

---

[126] *Ibid*, 88-89. Volpi notes the resonance between the painting as described by Berni and Rosa's early version of *Fortune* [Fig. 28]. *Ibid*, 98. The painting Berni describes "is probably the same one that Rosa exhibited at the annual exhibition of S. Giovanni Decollato on Aug 29 1639 or 40. See Salerno, *L'opera completa*, 83. Berni's poem "renders explicit the close tie between the image of fortune and that of 'ingiusta fama', and how this concept was at the time a recurring motif in the laments on the state of art by artists in the seventeenth century". Also see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 120.

[127] If it is the same painting, then Piermattei must have sent it from Rome to Gian' Carlo in Florence, perhaps, as Volpi suggests, before the subsequent commissions from the Cardinal in 1642. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 32.

[128] Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, II: 149-55; from a manuscript in the Biblioteca Communale, Siena, L. V. 9, 29. On Abati and Gera, see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 62 note 29; on Abati's letter, see Roworth, *ibid*, 54-5. Abati interprets Rosa's *Pittura* as proclaiming herself a satire of the city: "Io, che fui già appellata dalle Citta Poesia Muta hor converrà, che rompa lo scilinguagnolo, e doventi à danni delle medesime loquace pittura. Io, che con la forza della mia Arte trasportai alla Deità dei Principi l'imitatione do i simulacri di là su, perché l'imitassero, hor converrà che fra i Satiri de'Boschi diventi Satira de' Cittadini."

[129] Another example in this regard includes Andrea Cavalcanti's Latin poem for Rosa, which turns on the conceit of *ut pictura poesis* and the citation of ancient exemplars. Appendix V.3. The poem concludes "Andreas Cavalcantes interiturae amicitie", suggesting his authorship. There is also a poem for Rosa by "Abbate Inghirami" (probably Valerio Inghirami) that describes Rosa as the successful rival of both Nature and fate, his "eternal colours" capable of "reviving the dead". Appendix VII. 9. Inghirami's first name is not indicated, but the "Abbate" suggests it was Valerio, who was Protonotario Appostolico and Vicario Generale of Prato, and a friend of Francesco Redi. Rosa sends his greetings to an "Inghiramo Inghirami" (probably Valerio's better-known relative Curzio (1614-55)) in a letter of 1641. Borelli, letter 4.

theatrical and performative character of his work and its rhetorical efficacy.[130] Abati makes recourse to the usual *topoi*: Rosa has mastered *invenzione*, *giudizio*, *diligenza*, *varietà* and *rapidità*; he is likened to the sun and Zeuxis; and he is almost God-like in the range and degree of his creative abilities. In his description of Rosa's painting, the themes of the vices of the city, the melancholy solitude of the country, and freedom and moral rectitude predominate. Abati puts a spin on the traditional conceit of *ut pictura poesis*, interpreting Rosa's figure of *Pittura* as active and "loquacious" (rather than passive and "mute") poetry. (At the same time, however, the effusive power of poetry is implicit in Abati's letter, which is above all an opportunity for Abati to show off his own poetic skills.) For all of these reasons, says Abati, Rosa is deserving of the fame that brought his name to Gera's ears. Abati also wrote at least three poems in praise of other paintings by Rosa, including the *Arion on the Dolphin* [Fig. 40], the *Alexander and Diogenes* (c. 1640-5, Collection of Lord Spencer, Althorp) [Fig. 29], and the *Fortune* [Fig. 28].[131]

Antonio Malatesti's poem for Rosa, in honour of one of the *Percossi*'s academic dinners, also belongs to the artist's Florentine years.[132] Putting a playful spin on Rosa as "savior"

---

[130] Abati notes that, for Rosa, the human figure represents the "spectator" of nature. His landscapes "bewitch," "entice, and horrify in such a way, that they make one yearn to run away," and his figures are expressive in their broad range of gestures. In support of Rosa's ability to paint figures, Abati cites his talents as a landscapist, drawing an analogy between figures and trees: "man is also an inverted tree", after all.

[131] The poem on the *Alexander and Diogenes* is a particularly humorous example that centers on the motifs of the barrel and wine and seems "fully in keeping with the gluttony that animated the *Accademia dei Percossi*." Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 128. See Appendix V.4. In the poem on Rosa's *Fortune* Abati uses the theme of the senses, the painter wielding his brush in opposition to Fortune's blindness and deafness, only to conclude that "Muto pennel de la Fortuna è il fabro." See Appendix V.5. Rosa's *Arion* is connected to the more pervasive interest in music among his Florentine friends, especially Abati and Francesco Cordini who shared an interest in the *castrati* that Rosa lampooned in his satire *La Musica.* The *Arion*'s connection to Rosa's satire (1640), suggests a similar date for the painting. Rosa's painting was made for Cordini, perhaps in response to his "erotic tastes", to which Cordini responded with two poems: one on a beautiful young man and another directed to Abati, entitled "Al sig. Abbati che richiese l'autore d'un sonetto in lode di una castrato". See Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 125, 135, n. 88; and Volpi, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, cat. 18. Cordini's poem is BNCF MS Gal. 157, 117-118. In another manuscript transcription of the poem (BNCF MS Magl. CL. VII 871, 'Poesie diverse', 164r-v) the composition is referred to as a letter from Ricciardi to Salviati. On Abati's poems for other artists and dignitaries, see Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 128; and Abati, *Poesie postume* (Vienna 1676), 353. On Rosa's *Fortune*, see Roworth, "Salvator Rosa's Lost Painting of 'Fortuna'," *Burlington Magazine* 117: 871 (1975): 663-4.

[132] See Appendix IV.1. The poem is discussed briefly by Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 15, and Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore, Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 64.

("Salvatore"), Malatesti writes with humour about the various foods offered up by Rosa to his academic friends. It also seems likely that Rovai's short poem for Rosa in honour of his painting of *Astraea* (or *Justice*) [Fig. 21], like the poem he dedicated to the *Improvvisi* and the *Loda la Solitudine*, was intended for recital to the *Percossi*.[133] Here Rovai praises Rosa through the use of a number of well-known *topoi* on the theme of naturalism, including jealous Nature and the petrified Medusa. Ciro di Pers, a poet at the court of Gian' Carlo de' Medici who likely met Rosa during in Florence, wrote a short poem in praise of Rosa's skills of imitation that may have been read to the academy.[134] In 1645, the poet Fulvio Testi (1593-1646), then in the service of the Duke of Modena, was invited to compose a poem in honour of Rosa,[135] indicative of the spread of Rosa's fame and the desire on the part of his colleagues, even at courts outside of Florence, to participate in his praise.[136] Reginaldo Sgambati's poem for Rosa, in honour of the birth of Grand Prince Cosimo III, urged Rosa to "take up your brushes" and "prophecy in paint the mighty infant's destiny" as a conqueror of infidels.[137] There is a poem by Count Filippo S. Martino d'Agliè (1604-1667), an important military figure in Northern Italy during the *seicento*, among the Kempner manuscripts in

[133] For the poem on *Astraea*, see Appendix III.2. The poem for the *Improvvisi* is Appendix III.1. For Rovai's "Loda la Solitudine, e biasima il Lusso mondano: Al. Sig. Salvator Rosa," which treats the subject of solitude and the denial of worldly luxury, see Rovai, *Poesie di Francesco Rovai Accademico Fiorentino*. Dedicate al Serenissimo Reverendissimo Signor Principe Cardinale Gio. Carlo di Toscana (Florence: 1652), 196-308; cited in Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 112.

[134] *Lodasi Salvador Rosa, pittor famoso*. See Appendix VII.5. Floriana Conte was first to draw my attention to this poem. Conte, "Fortuna di Salvator Rosa". On Pers, see Michele Rak, ed., *Ciro di Pers. Poesie* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1978).

[135] The poem, if indeed it was written, has not to my knowledge been identified. The invitation was extended in a letter of September of that year by the Duke's ambassador, Marcello Cimicelli, who asked Testi to write one of his "miraculous poems" in honour of the "virtuous" Rosa, court painter to Gian' Carlo. See Giuseppe Campori, *Gli Artisti Italiani e Stranieri negli Stati Estensi* (Rome: Multigrafica editrice, 1969), 412-13. Campori mistakenly identified Ricciardi's *Sotto rigida stella* as Testi's poem.

[136] Scott noted that a note attached to the letter stated that "Rosa… has earned the praises of most of the pens of Italy and, in the public academies of this city, panegyrics have been given entirely devoted to the honour of his paintings." Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 57.

[137] Appendix VII.3. Scott's translation, in *Salvator Rosa*, 39-40. Also see Nicola Merlat, "Una citazione inventariale per Salvator Rosa," *Artes* 5 (1997): 220. Baldinucci noted that Sgambati's letters were "full of praises of the paint-brush of Salvatore" and a "friendly mixture of graceful jokes". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 492. For Rosa's comments on Sgambati, see Borelli, letters 10, 13, 19, 51. In his poem, Sgambati's detailed prescription for the components of the painting seems incongruous with the attitude Rosa would later express toward being told what to paint. Sgambati may have been aware of Rosa's attitude, and his poem was perhaps intended partly in jest. If not, then it is possible his composition was not particularly well received by Rosa. For Rosa's aversion to being told what to paint, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 487-9.

Rome that appears to be dedicated to Rosa.[138] Putting a twist on the usual trope of the paired paintbrush and pen, D'Agliè adds a third instrument to the mix – the sword: "Swords, pens and paintbrushes, oh with what arts of war, poetry and painting, I see blood, ink and colours drip onto the weapons, canvases and pages." The association perhaps appealed to Rosa as a metaphor for his satiric rage and moral indignation – in a manner akin to the numerous martial metaphors that appear in his satires[139] or the combative iconography of his soldier self-portraits [Figs. 9b, 12 and 13]. Indeed, D'Agliè aligns "fighting" explicitly with the creative endeavours and valorous aims of painting and writing.

Also among the Florentine poems is a composition by Ricciardi entitled *Democrito redivivo*. It is undated, but it is tempting to link the subject with Rosa (whose fascination with the philosopher would have been well known to Ricciardi), or perhaps even with the artist's 1651 painting of *Democritus in Meditation*: the poem reflects the bitter and melancholic interpretation of the laughing philosopher seen in Rosa's painting, and the title's conceit of "rebirth" suggests an acknowledgement of Rosa's revision of the more usual iconographic presentation.[140] More explicitly evocative of Rosa's philosophical ideal is Jacopo Salviati's poem in honour of Rosa's painting of *Moral Philosophy* (c. 1643-5, Palazzo Enzelberg a Campan, Caldaro (Bolzano)) [Fig. 31], painted for Francesco Cordini, which receives special mention by Baldinucci.[141] In the poem the themes of fate, time, mortality and worldly suffering are contrasted with the valorous actions of ancient heroes and leaders. Baldinucci says that Salviati, a specialist in "lugubrious verse", dedicated a poem beginning "Quel gelido pianeta…" ("That icy planet…") to Rosa as "a famous

---

[138] See Appendix VII.18.
[139] On Rosa's use of a combative and violent type of imagery in connection with his "indignant" satiric spirit, see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 27, 111, 175 and *passim*.
[140] See Appendix II.5.
[141] Appendix VII. 4. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 455-6. Baldinucci cites the first lines of the poem: "Quel gelido pianeta, / Che di luce non sua vago risplende, …"

painter of moral things".[142] The latter conceit, however, does not appear in the poem to which Baldinucci refers. It may be that the phrase appeared in the title of the version known to Baldinucci; the variance of its title is suggested by a manuscript copy in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence, where it is entitled "On the Glory of Constancy in Hard Work". It is also possible that the line appeared in a different version of the poem, or even that Baldinucci confused two of Rovai's poems. But there is a conceit akin to the "famous painter of moral things" at the end of the particular poem the biographer cites: here Salviati proclaims Rosa as a "painter of the most eminent proverbs of the wisest Latin," who works with "incomparable industry." This poem highlights Rosa's desire to be known as a painter of histories and philosophical subjects, rather than as the landscapist celebrated by Abati and other colleagues. The iconographic message of the *Moral Philosophy* concerned the practice and achievement of philosophical self-knowledge, and one is tempted to see in Salviati's composition a poetic interpretation of the same theme – not only in general terms, but as applicable specifically to Rosa's own professional identity.

Among the poems of Rosa's later Roman period is a long poem by Ricciardi known as the *Sotto rigida stella*.[143] It appears to have been intended primarily as a consolatory musing on the subject of fate and an encouragement of determination in the face of suffering. Baldinucci connected the poem directly with Rosa's *Umana Fragilitas* (c. 1657-8, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge) [Fig. 97], which bears an inscription borrowed from the poem itself. It may also be closely linked with Rosa's portrait of a poet-philosopher for Ricciardi [Fig. 64], which I discuss at length in chapter four. Ricciardi's poem is meaningful in the context of Rosa's encomiastic self-fashioning: he describes Rosa as the "*gran' re de pennelli*"[144], crowned with the "twin laurels of poetry and painting" – a conceit that also appears in a poem by an unidentified friend in the

[142] See Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 72; and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 247.
[143] Appendix II.1. The full title of the poem is "Che non hanno intervallo o termine le avversità, e che l'essere scopo delle disgrazie è proprio della Virtù; quindi si deve compor l'animo a prepararlo con costanza."
[144] Cesareo considered the soubriquet "a little Spanish" in tone. Cesareo, *Poesie e lettere*, 402-3.

Biblioteca di Archaeologia e Storia dell'Arte in Rome.[145] More than this, however, Ricciardi praises the "candid splendor" of Rosa's moral habits, with which he can fight against destiny and "live three great lives" like the divine three-bodied Gerion.

Also belonging to Rosa's second Roman phase are Francesco Melosi's *Capitolo a Salvator Rosa* and Orazio Ricasoli Ruccellai's *Memoriale di Salvator Rosa alla Sacra Conversazione*, both written in defense of Rosa as the author of his satires.[146] Melosi and Rosa belonged to the Roman *Umoristi*, whose members had leveled attacks of plagiarism against Rosa regarding his satires. In a letter of September 4 1654, Rosa informed Ricciardi of his own apologetic sonnet in defense of his authorship, the "*Sonetto contro quelli che non lo credevano autore delle Satire*". In his letter Rosa also cited directly from Melosi's composition, which clearly provided the inspiration for his own diatribe.[147] Rosa's letters indicate that Melosi maintained a close relationship with Rosa from 1652 until at least 1665.[148] In his poem, Melosi bolsters Rosa with words of support and encouragement, concluding that "the rose has a restorative perfume, and yet everyone wants to give you the nose." In addition to Melosi's and Ruccellai's poems, the Modenese *letterato* Camillo Rubiera also presented a panegyric in defense of Rosa against the accusations of plagiarism leveled at him by the Roman *Umoristi* in 1654, although the text itself appears not to have survived.[149]

In 1669, the Roman academic and humorist Michele Brugueres (1644-1722) wrote a hyperbolic poem in honour of Rosa's altarpiece of the *Martyrdom of SS. Cosmas and Damian* for

[145] Appendix VII.11. The poem is entitled "Al Salvator Rosa erudiss.mo Poeta e Pittore Napolitano" (BiASA, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 3v) and it begins "Rosa, la mano tuo regge dui strali / Il Pennello, e la penna: ..."
[146] For Melosi's poem see Appendix VII.6. Cesareo published Ruccellai's "Memoriale" in 1893 and noted the likelihood that the poem was not by Rosa but rather by a friend, in imitation of Rosa's poetic style. Cesareo, "Bricchiche Rosiane," *Giornale Storico della letteratura italiana* 22 (1893): 192-99. Floriana Conte recently discussed the poem as authored by Ruccellai. BNCF Panciatichiano 322, 57r-68r: "Memoriale di S. Rosa alla Sacra Conversazione, perche non probisca le sue satire stampate"; see Conte, "Fortuna di Salvator Rosa".
[147] Borelli, letter 186. Rosa's poem is Appendix I.2. Rosa transcribed Melosi's poem for Ricciardi, as he indicated in a letter of June 13 1654. Borelli, letter 179. Melosi's use of the analogy of the "Saviour denied by the Hebrew race" likely inspired Rosa's own use of the conceit of the "crucified Saviour" (Salvatore) in his own poem. Rosa referred to Melosi's apologetic composition of 1654 in other letters to Ricciardi. See Borelli, letters 179, 181, 182 and 186.
[148] See Borelli, letters 129, 266, 292, and 310.
[149] See Borelli, letters 177 and 178.

the church of S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini in Rome, executed that same year.[150] He praises the artist's "industrious colours" which put "blind Envy to shame" and "silence Apelles", and commends his ability to fool the senses with his skilful illusionism. In his *Carminum lacobi Albani Ghibbesii*, *Pars Lyrica* (Rome, 1668), for which Rosa made the frontispiece, the English physician and poet and fellow member of the *Intrecciati* James Alban Gibbes (1611-77) dedicated one of a series of Latin poems to Rosa.[151] Langdon notes that Gibbes' ode "praises a satire that Rosa had written on a common enemy" – possibly Agostino Favoriti, who had been embroiled with Rosa in a fiery dispute at the *Umoristi* – and "urges Rosa to strike again." (Favoriti had himself participated in the encomiastic praise of Rosa's art: in 1651 he delivered a poem to the *Intrecciati* in honour of a battle painting by Rosa, possibly the *Grande Battaglia* in Vienna.[152]) Gibbes also extols Rosa's skills of verisimilitude and laments the disadvantages of finding success at court.[153]

Lorenzo Magalotti's poem in praise of Rosa's *Conspiracy of Catiline* (1663, Casa Martelli, Florence) [Fig. 121] once again emphasizes Rosa's confident rhetorical skill in depicting the passions and in terrifying the viewer, even to the point of rivaling Sallust's original poetic account of the story.[154] It is interesting, however, to compare Magalotti's praise for Rosa on this occasion with his later characterization of Rosa as an example of that irritating brand of sanctimonious and self-congratulatory poet: in a letter to Francesco Maria de' Medici of May 4 1686, Magalotti writes

---

[150] Appendix VII.7. I am grateful to Philip Sohm for bringing this poem to my attention.

[151] Langdon, "Two Book Illustrations," 698. Rosa's image "shows Apollo with his lyre on Mount Parnassus". Langdon notes that the book and Rosa's frontispiece reveal something of Rosa's literary circle in 1660's Rome. The first two books of Gibbes's text contain poems addressed to prominent Roman scholars and dignitaries like Lelio Orsini, Flavio Chigi, Athanasius Kircher, Kenelm Digby and Salvator Rosa, who is the only artist in the group.

[152] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e cardinale Brancaccio", 129; see Carpano, *Fasti dell'Accademia degl' Intrecciati*, 39: "Agostino Favoriti, Sonetto per un quadro di battaglie dipinto da Salvator Rosa".

[153] Gibbes "praises the accuracy of Rosa's description: 'You, Rosa, who are skilled in both depicting and describing with life-like accuracy whatever you love, could not have more nearly equalled with your paints the loathsome face of Zoilus". Zoilus is perhaps a reference to Rosa's attack on Favoriti. Langdon, "Two Book Illustrations," 699.

[154] Magalotti's letter is reproduced in Bartolomeo Gamba, *La Vita di Salvatore Rosa scritta da Filippo Baldinucci fiorentino con voci aggiunte* (Venice, 1830), 37-9. Also see Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 141; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 176-177; and Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 53-54.

"Poets go into a rage and accuse those, who upon hearing their compositions read aloud and not throwing themselves out of the window in amazement, must have an ass for brains. This is encountered in different times, and in our own day Salvator Rosa was famous in this way".[155] His comment speaks to the fraught nature of encomiastic poetry itself, always in danger of insincerity and artificiality. It also indicates Rosa's significant reliance on both *encomia* and their performance for sustaining his desired identity and buttressing it against his ever-present insecurities.[156]

Poems by Rosa for Friends

Among the poems written by Rosa for his friends is a *Lamento* for Ricciardi that begins "*Non ha tregua*", a meditation on fortune and fate that bemoans the ill-fortune of the painter and his neglect by the court.[157] The poem may have been written in the 1640's, as is suggested by Rosa's allusion to his two large marine seascapes for the Medici [Figs. 7 and 8a] and by the possibility that his some-time Florentine friend Antonio Bandini set the poem to music.[158] The subject and tone of the poem, however, suggest it may have been written later, perhaps even in the second half of the 1650's, as a response to Ricciardi's poem for Rosa, the *Sotto rigida stella*. There is also a

---

[155] BNCF MS Gal. 314, 206r: "Poeti entrar in collera e dar dell'asino per la testa a chi udendo legger le lor composizioni non si gettava per le finestre dalla maraviglia. Se n'e veduti in diversi tempi e a nostri giorni, Salvador Rosa è stato famoso in questo genere, ma Profumieri e con lettieri nessuno."

[156] Rosa's epitaph on his tomb in S. Maria degli Angeli in Rome is a final poetic ode of friendship, although the identity of the author is uncertain. Passeri records the inscription: "D.O.M./ SALVATOREM ROSAM NEAPOLITANUM/ PICTORUM SUI TEMPORIS/ NIELLI SECUNDUM/ POETARUM OMNIUM TEMPERUM/ AUGUSTUS FILIUS/ HIC MORENS COMPOSUIT/ SEXAGENARIO MINOR OBIIT/ ANNO SALUTIS MDCLXXIII/ IDIBUS MARTII" ("D.O.M./ Salvator Rosa, Neapolitan/ painter, second to none of his time/ poet of the first rank of his generation/ Augusto, his mourning son, here lays him to rest/ having reached almost sixty years of age/ in the year 1673/ he bids farewell/ March 15, 1673.") Passeri, *Vite*, 439. Lady Sydney Morgan attributed the epitaph to the Roman Jesuit priest and general Padre Domenico Oliva, though none of the artist's early biographers identify the author. Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, II: 74; Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 208. Passeri, who considers it a little "pompous", cites it only in connection with Augusto's commission for the tomb and bust.

[157] Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 50-2; and Cesareo, *Poesie e lettere*, 133-5. Limentani's transcription is based on Charles Burney's version in the "Libro di Musica," while Cesareo's is based on a ms. in the Biblioteca Riccardiana, Florence. The version I reproduced in Appendix I. 1 is taken from BNCF MS Magl. VII 935, 32-38. Various other poems possibly attributable to Rosa can be found in the so-called in the BiASA, Misc. Ms. B. 1. 14.; Ms 77 and Ms 31 B.

[158] Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 52, note 1. Burney noted Bandini's musical contribution in the "Libro di Musica". Rosa fell out with Bandini in 1646 for unknown reasons. See Borelli, letters 7 and 14.

humorous reference in the poem that points to Rosa's Roman years. Amid a list of complaints about his hard luck, the protagonist says: "I have no villa or room, while others have silver even in the urinal; riches are only a dream".[159] In his biography of the artist, Baldinucci described Ricciardi's surprise during a visit to Rosa's house in Rome at finding a large silver basin in his bathroom, recently given to the painter by a "Roman baron" and valued at a hundred ducats. Ricciardi had laughed at the object, an incongruous symbol of Rosa's desire to be known as "the true heir of the spirit and customs of the ancient sages".[160] The basin may have become a kind of "inside joke" between the two friends as a symbol of the tension inherent in the nature and acquisition of Rosa's desired professional persona.

Poems among Rosa's Friends

Ricciardi wrote a number of poetic compositions for other friends. The *Sotto rigida stella* for Rosa, a long composition on fate and mortal suffering and the need for courage and resolution in its wake, shares its theme with another lengthy poem entitled *Il Tempo*, written for Francesco Cordini in or before 1658. Treating the subject of fate, time, the seasons, the Four Ages of man, and friendship, Ricciardi concludes by rallying his friend to "keep a steadfast courage" upon encountering Time, and to be ready to fight alongside him.[161] A similar conceit appears in Ricciardi's poem for Volunnio Bandinelli, entitled *Che la forza del dolore eccede la capacità dell'umano intendimento*, which offers a particularly expressive and almost pictorial image of

[159] "Villa non ho nè stanza;/ Altri han d'argento in fin'a l'orinale!/ Ricco son di speranza…"
[160] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 501.
[161] Appendix II.2. In stanza 32, for example, Ricciardi repeats the sentiment found in other of his poems: "*Breve è la vita umana*". In stanza 33 Ricciardi refers to the "nakedness of bone", recalling his reference to a "naked skull" in his poem for Rosa; here, however, the naked bones are turned into the trumpets of fame. He refers to Cordini in three instances (stanze 31, 35 and 39), and one of these references may suggest the poem's motivation: Ricciardi makes friendship itself a feature of his moral musings on the passage of time; he urges his friend "not live by himself, and give your days from friends to fate", and later on he again makes friendship central in the fight against time. Like the *Sotto rigida stella*, the *Il Tempo* is in essence an endorsement of the value of friendship, hard work, and moral values in the quest for fame and battle against fate. Rosa acquired a copy of the poem in January 1658 through Marcantonio Cesti, and he praised it highly. See Borelli, letters 214, 216 and 236.

doleful emotion.[162] The theme of resolute persistence in the face of fate, fortune and time is among the most pervasive *concetti* in the poetry of Rosa and his friends, and it points to the artist's and his colleagues' concern for the preservation of a fragile identity and the faith they invested in the social practice of encomiastic poetry as an effective instrument in that endeavour.[163]

Other poems of note that were exchanged among Rosa's friends include a lament for Volunnio Bandinelli by Francesco Baldovini; an ode by Carlo Dati in honour of Paolo Vendramin's departure from Florence; Federico Nomi's poem *L'Amore* for Ricciardi; an ode by Valerio Inghirami for Francesco Redi, entitled *Sino a quanto si permesso il dolorsi al Savio, e come si possa praticare la detta dottrina* (in which the author refers to the "heart as the friend" and the "soul as the mother"); a sonnet on the death of Ricciardi by Giovan Cosimo Villifranchi; a poem by Antonio Malatesti entitled *La Tina da Castello* for Francesco Cordini; a poetic letter by Malatesti to Lorenzo Lippi on the subject of the *vita solitaria*; three poems by Francesco Rovai for Andrea Cavalcanti; numerous poems in honour of Rovai's death; Pier Salvetti's poem for Carlo Dati on the death of his nephew, entitled *Che è meglio esser Medico che Poeta*; a poem for Jacopo Salviati by an unidentified author (perhaps Romolo Bertini) entitled *Che la forza della Poesia è maggiore di*

---

[162] Appendix II.3.

[163] Other poems by Ricciardi that make use of the same theme include a long poem in praise of God, entitled *Iddio*, for Padre Bonaventura Cavalli; two poetic letters for Luigi Lanfreducci and Jacopo Salviati, the former a humorous composition on Ricciardi's poor health, in the treatment of which he had received numerous recommendations from friends; a poem directed to an unidentified and apparently suicidal friend, entitled *Amico sulla corda*, where the author professes to prefer a "stable friend rather than a swinging one"; a long poem entitled *Vita umana fugace, consigliera* ("Counsel on the Fleetingness of Human Life") which again treats the theme of mortality ("death is the school of life", he resolves gloomily) and was likely intended for a friend – perhaps Rosa himself; and a sonnet called *Ad un' Amico che domanda un Sonetto, e non dice sopra che*, the amusing title of which indicates its intention to mock the conventions of encomiastic poetry itself. For the poem for Cavalli see Appendix II.8. The poem was written in or before 1656, as is signaled by Rosa's reference to it in a letter to Ricciardi of June 19 of that year. Borelli, letter 198. Ricciardi had apparently sent it to Cordini first, who was sending it on to Rosa and who in turn would sent it to Cavallo. Also see letter 199. The letter for Lanfreducci is Appendix II.9. Borelli refers to the letter as a 'poetic joke'; see also Limentani, *Poesie e Lettere*, 70, n. 13. The letter for Salviati is BNCF MS Magl. CL. VII 871, 164r-v, entitled "Al Sig.re Aff.te che richiese l'Autore d'un sonetto in loda d'un Castrato". For the advice of friends concerning Ricciardi's health, see Borelli, letters 127 and 129, for example. The *Amico sulla corda* is Appendix II.4. The *Vita umana fugace* is Appendix II.6 and II.7. And the *Ad'un amico* is BNCF MS Magl. VII. 621, 79r.

quella d'ogni altra Virtù; and Benedetto Menzini's (1646-1704) satirical poem on Ricciardi.[164] Some of these poems elicited direct and immediate "responses", as in the exchanges between Ricciardi and Cintio Romagniosi, Andrea Cavalcanti and Antonio Abati, or Francesco Cordini and Averano Seminetti.[165] Alongside poems of praise, there are also compositions with a derisory and slanderous intent that use many of the same poetic conventions as their encomiastic counterparts. Rosa's poem on the death of Ottaviano Castelli and Menzini's satire against Ricciardi both take particularly sarcastic jabs at their subjects.[166]

III.4. The Art of Conversation: Speaking, Silence and Recitation

The letters and poetry that were so vital to Rosa's self-fashioning have a third ally in conversation, another category of social discourse intimately bound to the practice and theory of friendship.[167] In the flood of sixteenth-century courtesy manuals, the skill of conversation was emphasized not only in connection with behaviour but for its particular usefulness in "making

[164] Baldovini's poem is Appendix VII.15. Volpi notes that Dati's ode "laments the departure of Vendramin from Florence and confirms his familiarity with Rosa's Florentine circle". Volpi, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 148, cat. 30. On Nomi, see G. Bianchini, *Federico Nomi. Un letterato del '600. Profilo e fonti manoscritte* (Florence, 1984). Inghirami's ode is BNCF MS Magl. CL. VII 871, 67r-70r ("Nostro Core è l'Amico, Alma la Moglie"). Villifranchi's sonnet is Appendix VII.14. Malatesti's poem is BNCF MS Magl. VII. 233 (La Tina da Castello – Equivoci Rusticali di Antonio Malatesti dedicati al Sig.[re] Franc.[o] Cordini. Con altre Poesie del Medes:[mo], 1650"). Malatesti's letter to Lippi was previously published by Giulio Piccini in 1867, and recently re-published by Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 94. The poems by Rovai are: "Al Sig. Andrea Cavalcanti", by Rovai (BNCF MS Magl. VII 872, 139-146); "Al Sig.[re] And[a] Cavalcanti", by Rovai (BNCF MS Magl. VII 872, 199-204); and a poetic letter, "Lettera del Sig. Francesco Rovai scritta di Villa al Sig. Andrea Cavalcanti" (BNCF MS Magl. VII. 872, 567-572). Various members of Rosa's circle wrote poems on Rovai's death: Dati wrote a funeral oration while Nicolo Strozzi, Alessandro Adimari, Camillo Lenzoni, and his fellow *Percossi* Jacopo Salviati and Pietro Salvetti wrote poems. Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 61. Salvetti's poem for Dati is Appendix VII.17. The poem for Salviati, probably by Bertini, is BNCF MS Magl. VII 641, 29r-36r ("Che la forza della Poesia è maggiore di quella d'ogni altra Virtù; Al'Eccell:[mo] Sig:[re] Duca Jacopo Salviati, Poeta eruditissimo"). Menzini's poem for Ricciardi is Appendix VII.8.

[165] "L'Ottava Meraviglia. In Segnio di devozione: Cintio Romagniosi Al. Sig. Ricciardi – Segue poi la risposta", BNCF MS Magl. CL. VII no. 871, 158v-160v. Romagniosi's poem is followed by Ricciardi's response. Cavalcanti wrote a composition for Abati entitled "Una Conversazione di Gioco vulgarmente, detta una Badia al Sig. Antonio Abati invitandolo a giocare" (see Appendix V.1) to which Abati responded directly (Appendix V.2). Cordini wrote a poem for Seminetti entitled "Sopra Girolamo Signoretti, Libraio, e Stampatore, Capitolo, Al Sig.[re] Averano Seminetti" (Appendix VI.2) to which Seminetti responded with a "Risposta del Sig. Averano Seminetti al Capitolo del Sig. Francesco Cordini" (Appendix VI.3).

[166] For Rosa's poem on Castelli see chapter one, 62. In Menzini's poem (Appendix VII.8) he mocks Ricciardi as a "moral Cato", a "fool inclined to loquaciousness" who pretends to be a Zeno but is really an Epicurus.

[167] Quondam, "Introduzione", in *L'Arte della Conversazione*, v.

friends."[168] The necessity of conversation to a social or performative brand of self-fashioning is implicit in Stefano Guazzo's comments on the subject: "By means of civil conversation," he argues, "a man may not only cleere himselfe of cowardly abjection [*viltà*] and vaine presumption, but besides cloathe himself with the knowledge of himselfe. For if you consider it well, the jugement which wee have to knowe our selves, is not ours, but wee borrow it of others."[169] In the privileged social circles of the seventeenth century "individual worth" was determined by "[c]ollective judgment and public opinion" and the "daily interactive rituals" (like conversation) in which those judgements were formulated and expressed.[170] Conversation revealed both the nature of individual selves and their social constitution.[171] In this regard it warrants further attention as a constituent of Rosa's identity.

Academic *Conversazione*: Making Selves of Words

As I indicated in chapter two, conversation was a defining feature of the private academy (or "*conversazione*") and held a special place among the academic rituals of Rosa's Florentine friends, particularly in the context of the academic *symposie*.[172] Implicit in the word's usage, then, was an intimate semantic connection between the act of speaking and the friends who perform the

---

[168] Peter Burke, *The Art of Conversation* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), 90. These texts include Pietro Bembo's *Gli Asolani* (1505), Paolo Cortesi's *De Cardinalatu* (Libro II – *De Sermone*) (1510), Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* (1528), Tullia D'Aragona's *Dialogo della infinità d'amore* (1547), Anton Francesco Doni's *I mondi e gli inferni* (1552-3), Giovanni della Casa's *Il Galateo* (1558), Stefano Guazzo's *La Civile Conversazione* (1574), Girolamo Bargagli's *Dialogo de' giuochi che nelle vegghie sansei si usano da fare* (1574), and Torquato Tasso's *Il Malpiglio overo de la corte* (1582-3). For a survey of this literature, see Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*.
[169] Whigham, "Interpretation at Court," 629; from *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo* (1574), trans. Geroge Petti (Bks. I-III, 1581) and Bartholomew Young (Bk. IV, 1586), intro. Sir Edward Sullivan (London, 1925), I: 115. On the performative nature of Guazzo's treatise, see Freitas, "Singing and Playing," 512.
[170] Goldsmith, *'Exclusive Conversations'*, 5. Nicolas Pasquier summarized popular opinion when he claimed that "One is to be judged by the company he keeps." Pasquier, *Le Gentilhomme* [1611], 42; in Goldsmith, *ibid*, 18.
[171] As a psychological index of the speaker's mind (one could interpret the "hidden intentions of others by paying close attention to their speech"), conversation was a key to the unique qualities of persons; but as a ritual of true friendship that physically articulated its ideals of similitude and reciprocity, it was an index of the social constitution of individuality. Burke, *The Art of Conversation*, 90; Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, XXVIII.
[172] For Seneca, *conversatio* implied intimacy, and in its later Italian derivation it came to mean the "company" of others. Burke, *The Art of Conversation*, 95. In the sixteenth century this notion of conversation persisted in the idea of the *societas*, a "group of persons who share and reciprocate the rules of good companionship, and amongst whom there is a 'similarity' in birth, inclination, and even cultural or political interests", culminating the eighteenth-century "assembly" or "party." Quondam, in *L'Arte della Conversazione*, xxviii; Burke, *ibid*, 95.

discourse. Rosa's frequent reference to the "*conversazione*" of his Florentine friends in letters from Rome signals verbal exchange, the group of friends who practiced it, and the moral-intellectual virtue that results from that ritual.[173] It also refers to the dialogic nature of the letter itself, which Rosa exploits in the hopes of keeping alive his Florentine *conversazione*.[174]

Conversation derives a great deal of its academic significance (and this is especially the case for Rosa and his friends) from its close relationship to the ideals and practices of moral philosophy. In Fumaroli's conception, the moralist and conversationalist are one and the same: conversation is an "act of speaking" and a "mode of being", both of which "are inseparably based on this fine knowledge of 'characters' and 'manners' which begin with self-reflection."[175] The community of scholars, in which the individual and the group are tied together in the ideal bond of friendship, considered the communal practice of writing and speaking as integral to their ultimate endeavour: the search for a higher perfection of beauty or truth, an idea that extended back into the ancient history of the academy (with Plato at the helm) and would continue in the academies of the modern era.[176] For the humanists, oral argumentation was integral to the acquisition of knowledge itself.[177] Preoccupied with moral philosophy and its cultivation as a central feature of his

[173] Quondam, in *L'Arte della Conversazione*, xxvi. Conversation has a long history in academic practice, and it played a key role in the ritual and identity of civility cultivated by Rosa's *seicento* contemporaries, such as Poussin. See Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, chapter 2 and *passim*. Taking up the "bee" analogy that Guazzo had used to emphasize the requisite sociality of virtuous men, Federico Zuccaro advocated *conversatione virtuosa* in the statutes of the newly founded *Accademia di San Luca* in Rome as the "the mother of study and the true foundation of every science," allying it with friendship as an essential factor in academic enterprise. Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 60; Quiviger, "The Presence of Artists in Literary Academies", in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Chambers and Quiviger, 111, citing Zuccaro, *Lettere à principi Signori amatori della pittura*, in *Scritti d'arte di Federico Zuccaro*, ed. Detlef Heikamp (Florence: Olschki, 1961), 114.
[174] For Rosa's many references to the subject of conversation (as a ritual or sodality) see Borelli, letters 48, 61, 66, 105, 118, 134, 150, 176, 179, 252, 264, 310, 311 and 312, for example.
[175] Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence," 43.
[176] Fumaroli, "The Republic of Letters", 136.
[177] Cox, *The Renaissance Dialogue*, 98; Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 25. "[T]he humanist faith in discussion as a means of access to the truth", writes Virginia Cox, expressed a "shared faith in the possibility of reaching truth – a human and collective truth – by means of disputation." Cox, *ibid*, 62. Both Michel de Montaigne and Battista Guarini (in his *Il Segretario* of 1594) considered that the "jealousy" provoked in an actual conversation provided the "heat and vigour" which the study of books did not; Guarini suggested that dialogue offered a "remedy" to this lack because it approximated "the structure of an oral exchange." Cox, *ibid*, 108.

professional identity, Rosa naturally found in *conversazione* a social practice essential to his ambitions.

A particular type of conversation, cultivated among Rosa's Florentine *seicento* academic colleagues, may have influenced his own conception of its value. Jay Tribby has articulated the epistemological role of *conversazione* among the scientific academies in particular, in the pursuit not only of moral perfection but a new, empirical truth. Instead of being regarded as a thing produced "outside the grasp of rhetoric and history" (as it is today), knowledge was seen by *seicento* scientific-humanist communities as attainable via a form of pan-historical discourse in which scholars were connected with both contemporaries and ancient forebears in a grand, far-reaching project of debate, comparison and competition, all aimed at attaining an ultimate truth.[178] In Francesco Redi's highly successful scientific study *Observations on Vipers* (1664), for example, he treated the viper as a "civil *concetto*" and, along with his fellow academics at the *Cimento*, made the ability to "deconstruct *concetti* by means of a kind of discursive combustion" a particular preoccupation in his writings.[179] A similar notion of the "conversable past", in which knowledge is found in dialogue with one's academic colleagues and with ancient authority, informs Rosa's creative practice. The *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62], for example, is a particularly salient example of Rosa's engagement in this discursive process: the erudite iconography of the painting results in large part from the input of both ancient and contemporary authorities on natural science

---

[178] Tribby, "Cooking (with) Clio and Cleo: Eloquence and Experiment in 17th-century Florence," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 52: 3 (1991): 439. The early-modern experience of the past was essentially "aurally mediated", and the "civil interlocutor" was in "encouraged to comment upon and embellish with his own words everything around him". He learned from Castiglione, Guazzo, Faret, and the Jesuits "that those able to 'reply' to the world by drawing upon their varied *esperienze* … would always be 'highly regarded' by their peers." Tribby, *ibid*, 419. Tribby describes the "verbal materialization of cultural artefacts" undertaken by the early-modern academic, who established dynamic relations with "every entity around him", making whatever he heard or read or spoke about into "always and already verbalized artifacts of culture", with associations to analogous subjects or entities from the past, present and future. "Through the tropes and figures of conversation" these things "acquired a kind of materiality once more. … In certain venues such as the academy of experiment … they even became entities that one could touch with the hand." Tribby, *ibid*, 420-421.

[179] Tribby, "Cooking (with) Clio," 423.

and the occult, and it spurred (as Rosa likely hoped) a significant degree of interest and discussion among Rosa's colleagues.[180]

The essentially improvisory and informal nature of conversation, too, would have appealed to Rosa and his friends in their cultivation of an "improvisatory" brand of theatrical performance and poetic composition. Deriving their association of conversation with an intimate form of sociality from Cicero's distinction between two types of spoken discourse – *eloquentio* and *sermo* – early-modern academics favoured the latter as a freer and more familiar form of speaking.[181] The informal discussions held by the *Percossi* likely followed the same trend. The great grammarian of the second century BCE, Aulus Gellius, had explored the subjects of conversation and *sermo* in his *Attic Nights* (a book that Rosa consulted), and advised the ideal "urbane man" to show an interest in *conversazione*.[182]

The naturalness and freedom that characterized the practice of *sermo* also linked it closely with the concept of *otium* and the democratic and sincere ideal of friendship: as Fumaroli summarizes, because friendship is "the natural social bond par excellence, in opposition to the artificial bonds inseparable from the city and civilization", then the dialogue and philosophical conversation between friends "is therefore the most complete form of *otium*, free of any calculation

---

[180] Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 28ff and 47ff; Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini", 80; *idem*, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 36-7. See chapter two, 77, note 50. A similar influence can be detected in the anatomical preoccupation of the large *Prometheus* [Fig. 43] which Volpi has argued shows the impact of the Florentine scientific community. Redi's criticism of the "artistic license" of contemporary artists who diverge from the "textual truths of ancients" (a comment that reflects his empirical vision of truth) also has a particular resonance with Rosa's own ideas concerning both "historical accuracy" and the pursuit of novelty in painting and writing. For Redi's comments on the nature of Cleopatra's death as part of his scientific study of snake venom, and his assessment of the accuracy of contemporary artists' and poets depictions of the event, see Tribby, "Cooking (with) Clio," 435-7. For Rosa's comments on novelty and historical accuracy, see my discussion in chapter five.

[181] On Cicero's distinction between *sermo* and *eloquentio*, the former of which was preferred by sixteenth-century writers like Castiglione, Guazzo and Tasso, see Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence," 31-32. Fumaroli notes that *sermo* was taken up in the Renaissance as a desirable alternative to the older models of eloquence controlled by the Church and the State and filled with grand oratorical rhetoric.

[182] Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence," 37. For Rosa's reference to Aulus Gellius, see Borelli, letter 305.

of interest and any selfishness of a party or social class."[183] For Rosa and his academic friends, the notion of conversation as free, natural and sincere – and its repeated assertion as such – made it a practice integral to the egalitarian ideal of friendship. As I described in chapter two, the *Percossi* cultivated a self-image of respite and selective sociality in contradistinction to the calculated contrivance, artefice and deception of the court setting. The contemporary perception of *conversazione* as an oral and corporal manifestation of these collected ideals made it an imperative ritual in Rosa's self-fashioning. Indeed, many of his epistolary remarks make conversation tantamount to existence itself: "I have more need to talk with you", he wrote to Ricciardi in 1652, "than of the air that I breathe."[184]

Conversazione was not localized solely in the academic setting. In the seventeenth century, it was conceived of as an activity that could take place in a variety of contexts. As the Chevalier de Méré wrote in his *De la conversation* (1688), "*conversazione*" could describe chance encounters, brief exchanges between friends or strangers, discussions between friends during walks or travel together, talking at the table "with good company", or a place designated specifically for some sort of "assembly".[185] A sense of the spatial range of *conversazione* is suggested in Rosa's use of the term, and it emerges in the biographies, where conversation provides the context for both anecdotal and decisive moments in Rosa's career.[186]

---

[183] Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence," 33-36. Cicero paired *sermo/ eloquentia* with *otium/ negotium*. Fumaroli describes the significance of *otium* for the literary man, as described by Cicero and Seneca: "According to Cicero, *otium literatum* (literate leisure) was the most perfect form of *otium cum dignitate*, but for him it was in particular a means for a man of action, temporarily removed from the political scene, to 'reinvigorate' himself. For Seneca, on the other hand, especially in his last works, *studiosum otium* (studious leisure) became, for the first time in Rome, a sort of higher way of life, sufficient in itself." Fumaroli, "The Republic of Letters", 140.

[184] Borelli, letter 133.

[185] Montandon, "Les bienséances de la conversation," in *Art de la lettre, Art de la conversation*, ed. Bray and Strosetzki, 64, citing Méré, *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1930), II: 102-103.

[186] Passeri discusses the long evening walks that Rosa took atop the Trinità dei Monti, near his house, where he drew to him the most eminent *letterati* of the city. Passeri, *Vite*, 432. An account of their conversations, writes Passeri, would warrant a large volume. Bellori described Nicolas Poussin's walks with friends on the Trinità dei Monti in his biography of the artist, during which he would often "mingle with the foreigners who customarily gather there." Bellori, *Lives*, 322. The possibility of Rosa's friendship with Poussin remains a matter of speculation. Rosa only mentions him once in his letters, in reference to his death (see letter 315, dated October 31

Conversation and Solitude: Solitude as a Social Space

Rosa's attitude toward social life is not reducible to any of the stereotyped roles that precede him: he does not fall easily into either pole of the dichotomy that contrasts the "sociable" Raphael with the "solitary" Michelangelo or Leonardo, for example. He was not a generally garrulous person, and his participation in conversation was restricted to an elite and intimate group of like-minded friends. Baldinucci suggests, in fact, that it was Rosa's reluctance to converse with other artists during his early years in Rome that elicited suspicion and slander from the city's art establishment.[187] Solitude and isolation are recurring themes in both Rosa's own writings and those of his colleagues. However, as I tried to make clear in chapter two, the solitude Rosa sought was not one of complete isolation but rather a selective sociality, in which close friends (who by definition reflect Rosa's own exceptionality and individuality) are desired as a palliative against loneliness and a reinforcement of personal ideals. Rosa's misanthropy – directed above all at the constituents of society that threatened his

---

1665; Poussin died on November 18). The idea of a "friendship" between Rosa and Poussin was first suggested by the Earl of Shaftesbury in his *Second Characters or the Language of* Forms (written in 1712, published in 1914) in which he described the two artists as "honest moral men" who came to be good friends in Rome. Their friendship has also been forwarded on the basis of their status as neighbours in the vicinity of the Trinità dei Monti, along with the larger community of foreign artists living in that quarter of Rome. The two men also had a number of close friends in common, including Carlo Dati, the connoisseur Abbè Nicaise (who was also a friend of Bellori), and Niccolò Simonelli. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 45 and note 80; also see Elizabeth Manwaring, *Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England* (London: F. Cass, 1925; reprinted 1965), 35; and Sunderland, "The Legend and Influence of Salvator Rosa," 787. Conversation is a recurring theme in Baldinucci's biography, which describes the "beautiful conversations" of Rosa and his friends at the villas of Volterra; the "fierce and lively" conversations Rosa shared with Lorenzo Lippi in his studio; the "excellent conversationalist" Francesco Cordini; the discussions Rosa shared with friends in the company of the Florentine inn-keeper Anna Gaetano; the invitations that Don Mario Chigi (the brother of Pope Alexander VII) extended to Rosa to work at his bedside during his illness, so that he could enjoy Rosa's "conversation"; and the exchanges that took place at Paolo Minucci's house, where Rosa frequently stayed on his trips from Rome. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 451, 458, 461-2, 480-1, 499-500. It was at Minucci's house that Rosa became engaged in a particularly important (and entertaining) discussion with a servant nicknamed "*lo filosofo nigro*", that seemed, at least in Baldinucci's opinion, to have profoundly influenced Rosa's attitude toward his philosophy and his profession. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 499-500. Rosa expounded to his new friend on "precepts of Stoic doctrine, the laws of friendship, the depreciation of riches and other moral virtues," informing him that it was "vile" to work for money and boasting that he made a hundred *scudi* an hour. Calling Rosa a lazy fool, the servant retorted that he should apply himself to his work for five or six hours a day and make a fortune. Rosa confessed to Minucci that he was profoundly affected by the servant's words, and Baldinucci considered that they were likely the reason why the artist became so prolific and accumulated almost twelve-thousand *scudi* by the time of his death.

[187] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 442.

self-conceived identity (the immoral and corrupt who were denounced by moral-philosophical authority, the court and its leaders who imposed control on creative freedom, the academics or artists who challenged or rebuked his art or poetry) is at once a temperamental inclination and a purposeful "act" that allows him to cultivate a persona and position of distinction in a challenging professional climate. As a state apart from the mundane world that permitted access to a supreme morality and to a higher, divine understanding both the self and external things, solitude became a requisite condition of the inspired creative writer and artist: it is the realm of secrecy and the birthplace of "novel" and "original" ideas.[188] The "exclusivity" of solitude – in the dual sense of detachment and exceptionality – was a central aspect of its appeal for Rosa. But this exclusivity remained a requisitely social experience.

In the early-modern discourse on the self, conversation was commonly conceived as both contrary and preferable to solitude, in terms that are very similar to the way that friendship is described as preferable to isolation. The idea is cogently expressed in Cesare Ripa's allegorical personification of "*Conversatione*", who holds a motto from Proverbs condemning the solitary life: "*Veh soli*" (or, "Woe unto him who is alone").[189] Others, however, drew a less sharp distinction between solitude and the social space. Petrarch, for example, regarded solitude as a dimension of selective sociability. In his *Rerum memorandum*, he describes the solitary life as a complete withdrawal from the noises of the world ("*rumore monando*") and a devotion to study and the acquisition of knowledge; however, although the crowd is excluded, the solitary life does not prohibit good books or true friends. In the *De vita solitaria*, Petrarch writes specifically on the necessity of friends and friendship within the realm of "solitude":

> "…I say that it is necessary to escape the crowd, not friends, because if someone thinks to have a crowd of friends, see first if he does not fool himself. Above all, [friends] reveal

---

[188] Agnes MacKay, *An Anatomy of Solitude. Towards a New Interpretation of the Sources of Creative Inspiration* (Glasgow: William MacLellan, 1978), 23-5 and *passim*.
[189] Ripa, *Iconologia*, 494-6; see also Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 105.

> unforeseen necessities and changes of fortune which, just as they are not desirable for the wish to have experiences, so, if they do take place, they are very useful for experience and for the elimination of errors. … I will not urge the solitary man to flee from his friends, rather to want them to come and find him one at a time instead of in a crowd, in order to bring to his tranquility not an annoyance, but a relief and an aid."[190]

As I noted in chapter two, Rosa's own identification with this socially-participatory brand of solitude is encapsulated in his large painting of the *Philosophers' Grove* [Fig. 23a], where a young man – probably Rosa himself – is engaged in a lively discussion with a group of philosophers who have gathered in the wilderness, far from the city in the distance. This ideal form of solitary life was one of two types of solitary leisure ("*otium*") outlined by Petrarch, the first of which consists in "sleep and inertia" and the second (the superior of the two) determined "not just by hatred for the city but by love for letters and virtue".[191] The solitude that Rosa and his friends idealized was the latter of the two, a solitude which was not devoid of any contact, but which by its very nature necessitated study, conversation, and friendship. It consisted in extracting the best elements of social experience (including its friendships) from the "*vita civile*" and applying them to the preferable context of the "*vita solitaria*", devoid of the pitfalls and vices of common society.[192] The acquisition of knowledge, moreover, necessitated both study and conversation – the "*vita commune*". In Guazzo's treatise, one of his interlocutors challenges the other to name any philosopher who did not at some point engage in conversation, either with students or with colleagues.[193] Diogenes the Cynic, who features prominently in Rosa's pantheon of self-referential

[190] Petrarch, *De vita solitaria*, 104-105. Petrarch's idea is based on Seneca's seminal prescription that "*otium* [leisure] without study is death, and man's living tomb." Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 248. Seneca, *Ad Lucilium*, LXXXII, 3: "Otium sine litteris mors est et hominis vivi sepultura."
[191] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 248-9.
[192] The "*vita solitaria*" was considered spiritually and philosophically superior to the "vita civile" or living and working amongst the mêlée of the common populace, often described as distracting, corrupt and even a form of physical or mental incarceration. Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, 22. Petrarch condemned the "*vita cittadina*" as the life of the "busy, unhappy inhabitant of the city' in contrast to that of the "solitary [man] and the one who practices *otium*, happy." Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 249. But, as Guazzo noted, solitary men who have no knowledge of the vices of the city will have no awareness of the "disciplines, the manners, the habits, the friendships, the goings-on" therein, and will be like wild savages devoid of civil qualities. Guazzo, *ibid*, 24.
[193] Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, 25.

philosophical icons,[194] is offered as the primary example of the philosopher who deplores the common man but also loved conversation, perhaps more than any other of his kind. While Diogenes promoted freedom and self-sufficiency above all as the keys to happiness (a central aspect of his appeal for Rosa) he did not endorse a life of complete solitude.[195] Like other Cynics, he "remained within society in order to enlighten people about their depravity and to show them the natural way of life free of culture."[196] This is the most appropriate way to conceive of Rosa's ideal of solitude: a brand of "selective sociality" among friends, but also a place of self-righteous distinction where he could be both different and superior to the aspects of social life he claimed to detest.

Democritus, another of Rosa's most cherished philosophical mentors, was also famed as a lover of solitude, a despiser of riches and worldly possessions (like Diogenes), in addition to being an expert in the study and knowledge of everything ranging from natural science and medicine to politics and mathematics. Rosa identified himself with Democritus on more than one occasion in his letters.[197] Democritus's love of solitude stemmed in large part from his profound melancholia, a

---

[194] Diogenes was one of ancient philosophers profoundly contemptuous toward humanity (the other being Timon the Misanthrope) with whom Rosa frequently self-identified. See Borelli, letters 39, 49, 236, 241, and 389.

[195] Diogenes has often been described as endorsing a life of complete solitude, but - as Bracht Branham and Goulet-Cazé have shown - the general impression generated by the actual anecdotes and aphorisms of his life (even if they were not in themselves authentic) show that he "is no more portrayed as a solitary figure uninterested in social life than is Socrates. "Although he attacked convention (nomos), his agenda was not the abandonment of all forms of social organization but a radical critique of the Greek polis. … The Cynic is conventionally anti-social in his contempt for what he takes to be irrational conventions. Nothing, however, suggests that he is required by his principles to opt out of all forms of cooperative life." Branham and Goulet-Cazé, *The Cynics*, 40-41.

[196] Robert Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, *The Cynics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 359.

[197] Responding to his Roman critics in 1654, for example, he wrote to Ricciardi in the guise of the laughing philosopher: "I laugh and grow fat from their chatter." Borelli, letter 176. He repeats the sentiment again, much later, in 1666, informing his friend on three separate occasions of his resolution to "laugh" in the face of destiny. See letters 330, 331, 332. Earlier in 1651 Rosa had aligned himself directly with the subject of his painting, *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62], painted at Monterufoli. Having trouble finding a buyer for the canvas, despite its triumphant reception at the Pantheon exhibition (letter 90), he suggested that the reason may lie in his personal affinity with the protagonist himself: "The picture of Democritus still finds itself in my possession, and I don't know if it's because of this philosopher's desire to practice with a Stoic like me, or for the aversion that philosophy has always had toward being locked up in the palaces of the rich." Borelli, letter 101: "Il quadro del Democrito si trova ancora in mio potere non so se per genio che s'habbia quel filosofo di pratticar con uno stoico come me o per antipatia ch'have havuta sempre la filosofia di serrarsi ne' palazzi de' ricchi." In April of 1651,

quality encapsulated by Robert Burton ("Democritus Junior") in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1628).[198] Burton's vision of Democritus as both "in the world" but aloof toward it represented a more pervasive early-modern understanding of melancholic solitude as a contentious experience, holding both the promise of self-knowledge and creativity and the danger of loneliness and even madness.[199] The dichotomy is apparent in Burton's important and influential discussion of "voluntary solitariness".[200] Its sentiment is echoed in many of Rosa's own comments on solitude, regarded as both a blessing and a burden, a desirable choice and necessity as well as an encumbrance. Conversation and writing were widely regarded by their early-modern practitioners

---

apparently refusing to sell it for the "meagre" two-hundred and fifty *scudi* that he received as a first offer, the painting remained with him through May. The problem, he claimed, was that no one in Rome was willing to pay what he deemed appropriate for a painting of such fresh novelty and high quality. In January of the following year, the painting was still in his studio, but this did not seem to bother him too greatly, since "il suo prezzo non è ancora potuto passare le cinquanta doble. Ma per dirvela questo è un quadro da farsene qualche conto ed ogni giorno più piace magiormente." Borelli, letter 119. This anecdote is also revealing of Rosa's contradictory nature: Rosa regards his protagonist – depicted in the painting as a decidedly melancholic philosopher, pondering mortality and worldly goods – as a representative of his own person, yet, despite their shared repugnance to imprisonment in "palaces of the rich", Rosa is nonetheless anxious to sell the painting for a sizeable amount of money. Like the philosophical ideal of solitude, which posed a threat to melancholic rationality (notwithstanding its impracticability in the socially-bound contexts of *seicento* artistic practice), the ideal of poverty also presented Rosa with an equally profound paradox in the experience of real, everyday life. I return to this important contradiction in chapter five.

[198] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed . Holbrook Jackson (New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001), 16. Burton notes that his ancient forebear was "very melancholy by nature, averse from company in his latter days, and much given to solitariness … wholly addicted to his studies at the last, and to a private life," occasionally returning to civilization and laughing at the "ridiculous objects" he saw.

[199] Julius H. Rubin, *Religious Melancholy and Protestant Experience in America* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 38. *Seicento* authors frequently repeated the idea that "isolation allowed one to enter a place of more profound spirit". Morabito, *Lettere e letteratura*, 127.

[200] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 246-9: "Voluntary solitariness is that which is familiar with melancholy… Most pleasant it is at first, to such as are melancholy given, to lie in bed whole days …to walk alone in some solitary grove …to meditate upon some delightsome and pleasant subject… So delightsome these toys are at first …that they hinder their ordinary tasks and necessary business …these phantastical and bewitching thoughts so covertly… and so continually set upon …them, they cannot, I say, go about their more necessary business… until at last the scene is turned upon a sudden by some bad object, and they, being now habituated to such vain meditations and solitary places, can endure no company, can ruminate of nothing but harsh and distasteful subjects. Fear, sorrow, suspicion, *subrusticus pudor* [a rustic bashfulness], discontent, cares, and weariness of life surprise them in a moment, and they can think of nothing else … this infernal plague of melancholy seizeth on them and terrifies their souls … I may not deny but that there is some profitable meditation, contemplation, and kind of solitariness to be embraced, which the Fathers [ancient authorities] so highly commended … a paradise, a heaven on earth, if it be used aright [since this can result in] the bettering of their knowledge … the perfection of arts and sciences. … A man alone is either a saint or a devil… *Veh soli*, in this sense, woe be to him that is so alone."

as domains of the creative products of melancholia, and curatives for its detrimental effects.[201] Rosa's awareness of both the necessity and palliative effects of sociality in general – and conversation and writing in particular – to his pursuit of a solitary and distinctive identity is apparent in his paintings, especially the portrait he painted for Ricciardi which I discuss at length in chapter four.

III.5. Rosa's Visual Rhetoric: Speaking and Silence in Rosa's Art

The importance of orality (or its absence) to Rosa's professional persona is apparent in the rhetorical character of his pictorial production. In many ways, Rosa's images are counterparts to the variably loquacious and taciturn discourse of his satires and letters. His paintings, etchings and drawings convey an almost obsessive interest in constructing a visual language of gestural poetics, the self-consciously theatrical nature of which was frequently noted in the encomiastic poetry of his friends.[202] The emphasis they placed on Rosa's visual rhetoric and its efficacy suggests that this aspect of his art was not only observed by his contemporaries but encouraged by Rosa himself in an effort to promote his status as a painter-philosopher – a title for which the practice and mastery of rhetoric was essential – on par with the likes of Domenichino, Nicolas Poussin, or Pietro Testa. The close analogy that Rosa and his friends drew between the rhetorical efficacy of his art and his

---

[201] For some they were even utterly opposed to the melancholic humor: Giambattista della Porta (c. 1535-1615) associated a love of conversation with the "jocund man", noting that "philosophers say that this nature comes from the blood and clarity of the spirits, as well as from the absence of melancholic humor". Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, chapter XXVIII, 881.

[202] Hayden Maginnis cautions against the misapplication of the term "language" to the repertoire of pictorial gestures in Renaissance painting. Instead, he argues, gesture should be conceived more like a "vocabulary" – "a vocabulary whose meaning shifts with usage and context". Maginnis, review of *Giotto and the Language of Gesture* by Moshe Barasch, *Burlington Magazine* 130: 1026 (1988): 702. In the *seicento*, however, pictorial gesture was often understood and described in linguistic terms (particularly in the genre of classical history painting), and was dictated by a set of rigorous (although occasionally flexible) regulations. Struhal has also noted the emphatically gestural nature of Rosa's art: "In his narrative paintings Rosa combined synesthetic effects with a passionate style that involved expressive bodily movements. The combination of acoustic effects and the bodily expression of the passions become a powerful tool in Rosa's ambitious striving to achieve an emotional impact on the beholder." (Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements") Rosa's interest in a visual rhetoric appears in the work of his Florentine phase, but becomes increasingly apparent in his production after his return to Rome in 1649. Roworth notes that "Rosa's compositions from the 1650's became increasingly simplified, utilizing fewer figures, emphasizing the *affetti*, and clarifying the gestures." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 351-2.

written or oral production is apparent in one of Baldinucci's anecdotes: two Roman prelates had paid a visit to Rosa's studio, where they saw his large painting of the *Allegory of Fortune* [Fig. 98]; upon leaving, they encountered Don Mario Chigi and told him of having "seen" as well as "heard" "certain satires" at the artist's house. By this they meant to infer, to Chigi's apparent bewilderment, that Rosa's *Allegory* was as much a "satire" as the written poetic compositions he recited aloud in his friends' company.[203]

Rosa's images reveal his conviction about the body (especially his *own* body) as a communicative instrument and locus of identity.[204] In this Rosa expresses the more pervasive Aristotelian conception of subjectivity as a corporeal entity, and – in its early-modern interpretation – also a fundamentally manipulable one, capable of being fashioned as well as scrutinized.[205] As I tried to show in chapter one, Rosa made his own body the veritable tool with which to establish his reputation in Rome in the 1630's, and it would continue to play a central role in his later professional activities. In the classical tradition of painting, both the making and reception of painting consisted in an intertextuality – a "poetics" of painting that engaged directly with the theory of poetry and rhetoric and that required the viewer to "read" the image and the *affetti* of its figures.[206] Whether seeking earnestly to engage their interlocutors in discussion, or sequester

---

[203] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 446-7.

[204] On the early-modern debate over identity as located in the body or the soul, see Broadbent, "The Image of god, or Two Yards of Skin," in *The Body as a medium of expression*, ed. Benthall and Polhemus, 306; on the ancient sources of this discourse, see Eric Alliez and Michael Feher, "Reflections of a Soul," in *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, Part Two, ed. Michael Feher et al. (New York: Zone, 1989), 47-127. On the body as the locus of early-modern identity, see the discussion by Anna Bryson, "The Rhetoric of Status: Gesture, Demeanour and the Image of the Gentleman in 16th- and 17th-century England," in *Renaissance Bodies*, ed. Gent and Llewellyn, 139, 142ff.

[205] Sharon Fermor, "Movement and gender in sixteenth-century Italian painting," in *The Body Imaged*, ed. Adler and Pointon, 131. On the role of the body in early-modern self-fashioning, see Herman Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body. Perspectives on Gesture in the Dutch Republic* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2004). For two of the most influential modern views on the body as the site for both early-modern sociality and identity, see Norbert Elias's *History of Manners* (the first 3 vols. of *The Civilizing Process,* 1939), and Mikhail Bakhtin's *Rabelais and his World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).

[206] Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 116; also see Blunt, "Poussin's Notes on Painting," *JWCI* 1 (1937-8): 344-51. Cropper and Dempsey argue that "the familiar literary and historical subjects chosen by Poussin were also conceived by him as matters for critical interpretation on the part of both the painter and the viewer, for whom the painting initiates a kind of dialogue." Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 13-14, 19. For a survey of the

themselves in secluded spaces, the figures in Rosa's images convey his commitment to the literal "embodiment" of self-defining philosophical ideals. Rosa shares with his contemporaries a faith in both the erudite potential of the *affetti* as a language that can speak (through the complexity and variety of its poses and in the choice of novel subjects) to a select initiate of intelligent, like-minded viewers – best described, for all intents and purposes, as friends.

Rosa and the Theatrical Poetics of the Image

As Anna Bryson has noted, the "representational" preoccupation of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century discourse on manners and its gestural manifestations make "demeanour and deportment an almost theatrical art," in a way that implies "a sense of the continual interpretative gaze of a social audience".[207] Discussions of painting also addressed its theatrical component. Alberti, Leonardo and Giovan Paolo Lomazzo, among others, borrowed from the ancient association drawn between acting and rhetoric by Horace, Demosthenes, Quintilian or Longinus, and encouraged artists to emulate the actor and orator by studying their own emotions as a source for the *affetti*.[208] The idea was also popular among *seicento* theorists, who urged the painter to model himself on the actor and feel the emotions of his subject in order to convincingly portray them in paint. In response to Horace's command to rhetoricians, "If you want to move me to tears,

---

scholarly discussion of Poussin's "ut pictura poesis", see David Carrier, *Poussin's Paintings*, 9-10; Colantuono, "The Tender Infant"; and Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting*, 6. Unglaub also outlines the structural correspondence between Poussin's paintings and Tasso's poetry. *Ibid*, esp. 2-6. According to his biographer Joachim von Sandrart, Poussin's own preparative process of painting consisted partly in "read[ing] carefully all the available texts [on the subject matter in question] and ponder[ing] over them." Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 118; see Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie* [1675], ed. A. R. Peltzer (Munich, 1925), 258; translated in Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin* (New York, 1967), 242.

[207] Bryson, "The Rhetoric of Status," in *Renaissance Bodies*, ed. Gent and Llewellyn, 144-5.

[208] See Lee, "*Ut Pictura Poesis*: The Humanistic Theory of Painting," *Art Bulletin* 22: 4 (1940): 217ff. Svetlana Alpers connects Alberti's vision of painting to the broader Renaissance conception of the world as "a stage on which human figures performed significant actions based on the texts of the poets," and in which history painting was privileged for its potential in demonstrating that the representation of motion and gesture was the most crucial aim of painting itself. Alpers, *The Art of Describing: Dutch art in the seventeenth century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), xix. Lomazzo dedicated an entire book of his *Treatise on Painting* (1584) to a discussion of *moti* and their empathetic efficacy in painting, making the actor the exemplary master of the passions. Bolzoni, *The Gallery of Memory*, 164, citing Klein, *La forme et l'intelligibile: écrits sur la Renaissance et l'art moderne*. Articles at essais réunis et présentés par André Chastel (Paris: Gallimard, 1970), 174-192.

you must first feel grief yourself", Karel van Mander promoted acting as a guide for painting, defending the "histrionics" and gestures of comedy players.[209] Samuel van Hoogstraten counselled the ambitious history painter to "transform" himself into an actor in order to depict the passions.[210] Self-embodiment of one's subject or "*provare in se*" also informed the working methods of Michelangelo, Caravaggio, Rembrandt, Bernini, Domenichino, Andrea dal Pozzo, and Lorenzo Lippi, among others.[211]

Rosa's own experience as an actor exerted a profound impact on his painting, and the theatricality of his art was inspired in large part by the movements of his own body – as Baldinucci noted, Rosa used the large mirror in his studio in order to study the gestures and expressions of his body and face in preparation for composing the figures in his paintings.[212] Both Baldinucci and Passeri noted the vivacity of Rosa's recitals among the *Percossi*, dazzling and confounding his listeners with his "admirable expression of voice and gestures" to such a degree that he seemed to

[209] Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 222; Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, 150; Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boek*, I: 159.

[210] Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, 150. He explicitly recommended the study of the artist's own expression in the mirror, "where you are simultaneously the performer and the beholder", and he observed that here "a poetic spirit is necessary in order to imagine oneself in another's place." Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 222.

[211] Michelangelo famously used models to "act out" the emotional sufferings of his subjects. Caravaggio is infamous for his use of a dramatically lit indoor "set" of models. And Rembrandt used to have his students "perform" scenes from the narrative text of the subject to be painted, and his interest in a markedly theatrical procedure is implicit in his pervasive "costuming" (see my discussion in chapter four). For Bernini's use of his own body as model, see Levy, "Chapter 2 of Domenico Bernini's *Vita* of his Father: Mimesis," in *Bernini's Biographies. Critical Essays*, ed. Delbeke, Levy and Ostrow (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 172; Baldinucci, *Vita del Cavaliere Gio. Lorenzo Bernino*. [1682] (University Park and London: Pennsylvania University Press, 1966), 13; Bernini, "The Life of the Cavalier Gian Lorenzo Bernini," in George C. Bauer, *Bernini in Perspective* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1976), 26. Andrea del Pozzo's activity as a stage-designer, too, played a significant role in the "theatrics" of his large-scale ceiling decorations. Domenichino "played out" the roles of the figures he painted, in emulation of the Carracci – and Agostino in particular, who had "taught that figures would appear stiff and artificial unless the artist understood them through his own physical imitation." Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 222. Baldinucci noted Lippi's ability to use his face to convey the sentiment of his witticisms. D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 117, citing Baldinucci, *Notizie*. On the body of the artist and its "traces" in the work of art, and the inherent physicality of artistic practice, see Kathleen Adler and Marcia Pointon, *The Body Imaged. The Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

[212] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 582. Leonardo discussed the role of the mirror in the artist's mastery of his emotive subject: "When you wish to see whether the general effect of your picture corresponds with that of the object represented after nature, take a mirror and set it so that it reflects the actual thing, and then compare the reflection with your picture … The mirror ought to be taken as a guide." MacCurdy ed., *The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci* (Connecticut: Konecky & Konecky, 2003), 879, Ms. 2038 Bibliothèque Nationale, 24v.

"paint them with language."[213] Rosa himself alluded to the requisitely performative nature of his poetry in a letter of 1658: "I am not sending you one of my satires," he told Ricciardi, "because I want, in person, to have the fortune to communicate it to you, in addition to which it would be weakness and the least precaution to trust to the pen that which is only intended for speech."[214] The encomiastic poetry of his friends, too, located the efficacy of Rosa's pictorial rhetoric directly in relation to the theatre and acting.[215] Rosa's belief in the body as an effective carrier of not only subjective but moral meaning echoes the more general early-modern conviction among courtesy theorists that the body was not only a social locus of identity but a "text" from which one's moral character could be "read."[216] Little information survives regarding Rosa's procedure of planning and executing his paintings, but it seems plausible that certain aspects of his approach emulated those of his fellow pictorial rhetoricians. Certainly he shared with them (and with Poussin in particular) a devotion to the text as a source – his continual dialogue with Ricciardi over the choice of appropriate books for the iconography of his images is proof of this. Rosa also shared with Poussin in particular a concern for historical accuracy, not only in adhering to the textual source but in modulating the gestures of his figures accordingly. This is clear from Rosa's concern in 1669 over the appropriate gesture [*positura*] and action [*atto*] of the figure of his *Saint Torpè* (1670, Museo d'Arte, Pisa) [Fig. 130].[217] The rhetorical preoccupation of Rosa's art has generally been

---

[213] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 496-7 (see chapter two, 131-2, above); Passeri, *Vite*, 427-8.
[214] Borelli, letter 214: "Non vi mando una mia satira perché voglio di persona haver fortuna di comunicarvela, oltre che sarebbe debolezza e pochissima prudenza fidare alla penna quello che appena è riserbato alla lingua." Rosa often uses the terms "*recitare*" and "*leggere*" to refer to the reading or performance of satires. Borelli, letters 47, 52 and 80.
[215] See for example Vendramin's poem above, 189-90.
[216] Bryson, "The Rhetoric of Status," in *Renaissance Bodies*, ed. Gent and Llewellyn, 148. In the *De Civilitate* (1537), for example, Erasmus asserted that "good manners are the exterior signs of inner character". "He defines 'civility' as the 'outwarde honestie' which should mirror the virtuous condition of the soul. He calls the body and its adornment the 'habyte and apparayle of the inward mynde' and, in the process of defining correct demeanour, he lists facial and gestural faults as a catalogue of representations of inner vice and folly." Bryson, *ibid*, 144.
[217] Borelli, letter 369; also see letter 363, note 3. As Roodenburg notes, the technique of *positura* – that is, "techniques used to lend a standing figure a certain elegance, to endow it with the suggestion of movement" – was an important skill in the education of early-modern artists. Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, 114; see Jaap Bolten, "A 'commercial copy' by Nicolaes Lauwers", *Delineavit et Sculpsit* 6 (1991); and J. J. Tikkanen, *Die*

neglected – or taken for granted – by scholars of the artist, but it is a vital component of both his desired professional identity and an indicator of its fundamental sociality.

Striking Poses and Making Faces

Rosa's pictorial *oeuvre* presents innumerable opportunities to explore his rhetorical use of gesture and facial expression. His interest in exploring physical gesture, in particular, is most apparent in the large-scale figure paintings of his second Roman phase (from 1649 onward), although there are examples from his earlier years. Rosa employs the entire body in his pursuit of an expressive gestural rhetoric, and often pays heed to the symbolic associations of physical minutiae such as hair and dress.[218] But the hand and the face – the two most important carriers of meaning within the physical repertoire of *moti* and *affetti* – are the central rhetorical components of Rosa's art. Taking their cue from the ancient precepts of oratory, early-modern theorists posited that the hand was the eloquent instrument of the mind, and the face was the key to personality and identity.[219] The idea was reiterated in treatises on gesture, elocution, physiognomy, dancing and theatre that began to flourish in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, as well as in the

---

Beinstellungen in der Kunstgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der künstlerischen Motive (Helsingfors, 1912).

[218] It is tempting, for example, to associate the long hair of the self-referential figure standing to the left of Diogenes in Rosa's *Philosophers' Grove* with what C. R. Hallpike has identified as an "ascetic" comportment. As a ritual or social symbol, Hallpike argued that long hair is frequently "associated with being outside society ... not [in the sense of] the total exclusion of ascetics and similar categories, but rather an attitude or condition of rejection of which the asceticism of the anchorite or sannyasin is the ultimate expression, or, again, the possession of certain traits such as spiritual power by reason of which the possessor is not fully amenable to social control... 'cutting the hair equals social control'." Hallpike, "Social Hair," *Man* 4: 2 (1969): 260-1. The same symbolic meaning may appear in Rosa's images of isolated figures like the *Philosopher in Meditation* (c. 1656, private collection, Rome) [Fig. 89], or the *St. Paul the Hermit* (c. 1661, Brera, Milan) [Fig. 104], and may (in combination with the *seicento* fashion for long hair) also inform the *Portrait* for Ricciardi [Fig. 64]. Giovanni Bonifacio discussed the symbolic potential of clothing in his treatise on gestures. Bonifacio, *L'Arte de' cenni* (1616); see Kendon, *Gesture*: *Visible Action as Utterance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 23-24.

[219] Leonardo argued that "the intention of the mind" is hard to paint because it "has to be represented through gestures and movements of the limbs". Leonardo, *Trattato*, I: 60v; Martin Kemp and Margaret Walker ed., *Leonardo on Painting*, *an anthology of writings* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 144; cited in Spicer, "The Renaissance Elbow," in *A Cultural History of Gesture, From Antiquity to the Present Day*, ed. Bremmer and Roodenburg (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 85. Also see Chastel, "Gesture in Painting. Problems in Semiology", in *The Language of Gesture in the Renaissance*, ed. Konrad Eisenbichler and Philip Sohm, 19; and Kendon, *Gesture*, 23, citing Bonifacio, *L'arte de' cenni*, 17.

more established discourse on behaviour and comportment and the self-reflexive texts of writers like Montaigne, John Evelyn, La Bruyere and La Rochefoucauld.[220]

Many of Rosa's Florentine paintings show his early interest in a physical brand of visual rhetoric. In the *Battle Scene* (or *Battle between Christians and Turks*) [Fig. 9a], the most impressive and engaging of his many battle pictures, Rosa took full advantage of the opportunity offered by a large group of figures to display a wide range of gestures and emotions. The *Prometheus* [Fig. 43], celebrated by Rosa's friends for its emotional animation and convincing illusionism, is among Rosa's most profound declarations of his rhetorical skill. Here Rosa aimed to create a hyperbolic *exemplum doloris* by rendering the tortured *dolor* (pain) of his subject, in emulation of the ancient painting of *Prometheus* by Euanthes and the famed Laocöon.[221] Combining it with a poetic *energeia*, Rosa endeavoured to exert a profound emotional impact on his viewer, hoping to elicit marvel in the simultaneous experience of fascination and disgust.

Rosa's *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15] is also an interesting demonstration of the artist's simultaneous credence in and scepticism toward the language of gesture, particularly in the court context that granted it such import. Here, Rosa "the actor" employs the gestural *concetto* of the "hand-on-hip" with jutting elbow, made popular in Renaissance portraiture. As Joaneath Spicer has shown, this pose – as employed in male portraiture – traditionally sought to express the masculine virtues of the protagonist. Describing the pose as a salient example of the social and

[220] Such as Andrea De Jorio's *La mimica degli antichi* (1532), Arias Montanus's *Liber Ieremiae, sive de actione* (1571), Giambattista della Porta's *De humana fisognomia* (1586), Bonifacio's *L'arte de' cenni* (1616), Carlos Garcia's *Antipatia de los franceses y espanoles* (1617), Louis de Cressolles's *Vacationes autumnales, siue de perfecta oratoris actione et pronuntiatione libri tres* (1620), Francesco Bartolomeo Ferrari's *De veterum acclamationibus et plausu libri septum* (1627), John Bulwer's *Chirologia* and *Chironomia* (1644), Michel Le Faucheur's *Traite de l'action de l'orateur* (1657), Fabrizio Cornazano's *Il ballarino* (1551), Giovanni Domenico Ottonelli's *Della misericordia diuina considerata come consiglio buono, mà abusato dal peccatore in vita* (1661), and Andrea Perrucci's *Dell'arte rappresentativa* (1699). (Burke, "The language of gesture in early modern Italy")

[221] See Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 239, who discuss Rosa's *Prometheus* as a rendition of *dolor* in connection with contemporary paintings like Rubens' *Prometheus Bound* (1611-12, Philadelphia Museum of Art), Poussin's *Martyrdom of St. Erasmus* (1628, Vatican Pinacoteca, Rome), and Luca Giordano's *Ulysses Slaughtering Phineas and the Suitors of Penelope* (early 1680's, National Gallery, London), and poems like Giovan Battista Marino's *Strage degli Innocenti* (1632). A similar observation may be made Rosa's earlier, now-lost *Tityus* [Fig. 5] intended to re-introduce him to the Roman art market via public exhibition.

gendered nature of early-modern gesture, Spicer argues that the jutting elbow conveys that highly self-conscious mode of self-manufacture and self-presentation.[222] It denotes a protective, controlling and proud performance, often associated with the profession of the soldier.[223] Above all, it connotes a "self-possession" facilitated by "social assurance," particularly evident in images of the seventeenth century, where, as in Rosa's portrait, the figure's elbow often "challenges the picture plane" and seems to extend that self-possession to the space beyond the frame.[224] On the one hand, Rosa's use of this pose conveys a sincere faith in the traditional connotations of established gestural language. That is, the elbow's denotation of masculine virtue and potency is taken up in the service of asserting both his own character and that of his role as Pascariello.[225] On the other hand, Rosa's self-portrait – a depiction of self-as-actor – is implicitly about the artificiality of that same language, and it signals his awareness of its potentially contrived nature. This duality of faith in and mistrust of the traditional codes of masculine gesture and deportment is also apparent in the shredded glove. Usually worn on the left hand, as it is in Rosa's self-portrait, the glove was a long-standing symbol of masculine nobility and courtly, humanist elegance in male portraiture, representing a lack of manual labour.[226] With his torn and tattered glove, Rosa-as-Pascariello seems to undermine this conventional aristocratic symbolism. It is even tempting to imagine that he

---

[222] Spicer, "The Renaissance Elbow," 85.
[223] "…the arm akimbo is found … typically a male military figure registering self-possession and control, either the assertion of success or defiance". Spicer, "The Renaissance Elbow," 85-6. "Later portraits of artists, including self-portraits …will show a marked preference for an assertive body language which …would normally be associated with military power or social position of a kind rarely enjoyed by painters." On occasion, the hand of the arm with elbow outstretched could rest "on the pommel of a dagger or sword as a rather obvious aspect of threat display". This pose was adopted in particular by the standard bearer who, as John Hale has noted, "was the focus of regional or unit pride". Spicer, *ibid*, 92-3; John R. Hale, "The soldier in Germanic graphic art of the Renaissance," in *Art and History: Images and their Meanings*, ed. Robert Rotberg and Theodore Rabb (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 87.
[224] Spicer, "The Renaissance Elbow," 97-101, 120.
[225] This conviction is echoed in a letter to Ricciardi of 1667, where Rosa equates the pose with a proud and obstinate attitude: "... me ne stavo con le mani a cintola. Si può sentire mostruosità maggiore? Giovan Battista Ricciardi scrivere a Salvator Rosa di non volerli più scrivere per haver abusato delle sue confidenze?" Borelli, letter 341.
[226] *Titian: Prince of Painters* (Munich: Prestel, 1990), 192.

incorporated this emblem as a feature of his unique interpretation of the wily, antagonistic *zanni*.[227] From the standpoint of the moral philosopher, Rosa likely shared the view of his *seicento* contemporaries who commented on the dangerous affectation of the pose.[228] In combination with the well-dressed appearance of the figure, the haughty elbow, uplifted chin and torn glove become conspicuous markers of Rosa's simultaneous desire to both engage in and undercut contemporary authoritative traditions.

Another of Rosa's early self-images conveys a more sincere faith in rhetorical gesture. The *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10] is a commentary on the philosophical virtue of silence and the mastery of appropriate speech. Here, Rosa has included a pithy maxim, "*Aut tace aut loquere meliora silentio*", traceable to a phrase attributed to Pythagoras by Stobeas: "Keep silent, unless your speech is more profitable than silence".[229] His refutation of a "useless" type of speech may also intend to signal a conviction not only in the power of painting as "mute poetry" but also in the "mute eloquence" of physical gesture and facial expression as the key components of painted

[227] The conceited and gentlemanly qualities that infuse the rest of the painting show an effort on Rosa's part to participate in the tradition of heroic male portraiture. Compare Rosa's portrait, for example, to Titian's *Portrait of a Man* (MFA, Boston). For the painting, see Tiziana Scarpa, in *Tiziano e il Ritratto di Corte da Raffaello ai Carracci*. Exhibition catalogue (Naples: Electa, 2006), 130, cat. 13. On the social function and symbolism of gloves, see Cristiana Cella, *La mano, il guanto* (Milan: Idealibri, 1989). Discussing Rembrandt's use of gloves in his self-portraits, Chapman notes that "[g]loves…acquired special significance in sixteenth-century portraits of artists, where they indicate that painting is an intellectual pursuit, not a manual craft." Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*, 63.

[228] In his *Chironomia* (1644), John Bulwer deemed the pose "unbeseeming the hand of an orator" for its connotations of pride and ostentation. Bulwer, *Chironomia*, "Certain prevarications against the rule of rhetorical decorum ...", section 9. In his *L'arte de' cenni* of 1616, Giovanni Bonifacio discussed the elbow and arm akimbo as "giving the impression of strength", citing passages from various authors who criticize men always with their hands on their hips, such as Plautus who derided them as 'handle men'." Spicer, "The Renaissance Elbow," 95.

[229] See Eckhard Leuschner, "The Pythagorean Inscription on Rosa's London 'Self-Portrait'," *JWCI* 57 (1994): 278-283. "Stobeaus writes (iii. 34. 7): 'From Pythagoras: Pythagoras said one ought to be silent or say something better than silence'." Another saying, which shares the imperative as the London portrait, appears earlier in Stobeaus (iii. 34. 1): "Either say something better than silence or be silent." The motif of prudent speech appears in other of Rosa's images, such as the *vanitas* drawing of an *Allegory* (1640's, Teylers Museum, Haarlem) [Fig. 47]. Here, a figure with the winged attributes of Hermes, the god of eloquence, gestures toward a pit filled with bones and an inscription in Rosa's handwriting that reads: "*Delle Reliquie Tue Colmo é il Terreno*" ("The earth is filled with your remains.") Mahoney notes that "[i]n 1594 an attribute of Harpocrates, who represents mystical silence, was transferred to Hermes" and considers that "perhaps Rosa was acquainted with the iconographical identification of silence and eloquence." Mahoney, *Drawings*, 223-224; Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), 20.

rhetoric.[230] (He perhaps intended, too, to offer in this image an *ut pictura poesis* in praise of his own painting as incapable of verbal description, playing on the rhetorical topos of *aporia* or speechlessness that preoccupied many early-modern art theorists.)[231] Rosa employs the strategies of physiognomic and gestural expression to convey the same idea: his furrowed brow and tightly pursed lips convey to the viewer the figure's almost furious demand for cautious speech. In chapter four I discuss these features as signs of philosophical melancholy; here I would like to emphasize only that the gestural, physiognomic or "affective" nature of Rosa's pictorial rendering of melancholia points to his own awareness of the intrinsic theatricality of the doctrine of humorology.[232]

An even more intriguing rhetorical feature of Rosa's self-portrait is the "hidden hand", or, as it came to be known and popularized in the portraiture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the "hand-in-waistcoat" pose. The conceit of the "hidden hand" has a long association with laziness and sloth, and in this context is also linked to the iconography of melancholia which connotes as

---

[230] Leonardo discussed the ancient trope of painting as "mute poetry", citing King Matthias of Hungary by way of example: reading a panegyric poem that was directed to him, the King stopped when he was "presented … with a portrait of his beloved"; when the poet asked him to keep reading, he replied: "Silence, O poet … Give me something I can see and touch and not only hear." Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 65. In condoning the "mute eloquence" of the *affetti*, Rosa may have taken a page from Bonifacio, who argued (as other authors had done before him) that a revival of "[t]he mute eloquence of gesture" would create a universal language to unify and reconcile the depraved and confused state of contemporary religious and philosophical doctrine. Kendon, *Gesture*, 23-24.

[231] Philip Sohm has outlined some of the important *seicento* contributions to this discourse. Bellori, for example, "silences himself at the end of a lecture to the Accademia di San Luca [in 1660] because, 'just as sight is more effective than words, I therefore have nothing to say and remain silent.'" Rosa's biographer and friend Passeri, too, "extended the conceit of silence to include *aporia* and used it as the subject for his lectures to the Accademia, including one called 'Il Silenzio.' He proposed silence as the best response to good paintings because the confusion and astonishment that they evoke cannot be conveyed in words." Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 45-46.

[232] On the enduring appeal of the doctrine of humorology in the seventeenth century, and its "affective" nature, see Paster, *The Body Embarrassed*, 6-7. "Humoral materialism lingers in our propensity to describe ourselves as – and, I suggest, *feel* ourselves to be – 'filled' with emotion, but the subjective effects of humoralism in an earlier time that lived it as true were far more pervasive." Paster, *ibid*, 7. On the seventeenth-century decline of Galenism, see Lester S. King, "The Transformation of Galenism," in *Medicine in 17th Century England*, ed. Allen G. Debus (Berkeley: University of California Press 1974), 7-31. The theory of humorology still held a powerful appeal for Rosa and his contemporaries, particularly in connection with their creative professions and their subjective proclivities: humorology endowed the individual with a sense of self-agency. Paster, *ibid*, 12.

much a creative, intellectual faculty as it does a destructive or inactive one.[233] It is related, in part, to the "hand on chest" motif, a highly multivalent gesture that denotes interiority and self-affirmation, intimacy, intensity or sincerity of conviction, a state of concentration, and a "propensity toward self-withdrawal."[234] In the context of rhetoric, however, it derives from the ancient Roman "arm-sling" pose that originated with a Greek fourth century BCE Hellenistic bronze portrait statue of the statesman and orator Aeschines of Macedon (389-331 BCE), replicated in a Roman statue of c. 79 ACE in the National Archaeological Museum in Naples [Fig. 221].[235] Aeschines was one of the ten Attic orators, famed for his voice and expressive skill in acting and oratory, and for engaging in a rivalry with Demosthenes over the subject of rhetorical silence itself.[236] Aeschines was the first to explicitly link the "arm-sling" or "hand-withdrawn" pose (which also performed the practical and decorous function of holding the toga in place) to an ideal of oratorical and

---

[233] Gerlinde Notarp, "Jacques de Gheyn II's 'Man Resting in a Field'. An Essay on the Iconography of Melancholy," *Simiolus* 24: 4 (1996): 314, citing Koslow, "Frans Hals's Fisherboys: exemplars of idleness," *Art Bulletin* 57 (1975): 418-32.

[234] The gesture is popular, for example, in the iconography of saints in isolation, where it conveys a dialogue with the transcendent. In this sense conveys intensity and sincerity of conviction or faith. Pasquinelli, *Il gesto e l'espressione*, 44. The related gesture of the "fingers resting lightly on the chest" was associated by Quintilian with sincerity" but also with protestation. Spicer, "The Renaissance Elbow," 85; Gombrich, "Ritualized Gesture and Expression in Art," in *The Image and the Eye*, 64. Bulwer noted in the *Chirologia*, that "The hand brought to the stomach and spread gently thereon is a gesture of rhetorical asseveration [that is, expressing the passions of the breast]." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, Canon XVII, 179; and Canon XXVIII, 182.

[235] For the original bronze portrait of Aeschines, see Martin Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*. vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 511. Arline Meyer notes that "while the hand is actually exposed rather than masked, the arm's confinement effects the same idea of modest restraint as do 'hand-in' portraits." Meyer, "Re-dressing Classical Statuary: The Eighteenth-Century 'Hand-in-Waistcoat' Portrait," *Art Bulletin* 77: 1 (1995): 57. Also see Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, 79-80, 153-4; G. M. A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks* (London: Phaidon, 1965), II: 212-15; and R. R. R. Smith, "Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century AD," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 88 (1998): 65-66. The gesture was adopted in portraiture more generally, usually in male portraits but occasionally in female examples. See Duby and Daval eds., *Sculpture. From Antiquity to the Present Day*, 209.

[236] Aeschines touted his modesty and silence in a speech "Against Timarchus", and also defended his silence, against the accusations of Demosthenes, in his speech "Against Ctesiphon", where he retorts: "My silence, Demosthenes, is the effect of my moderation and frugality. A slender fortune contents me; and I covet not more upon dishonourable conditions: so that I am silent, or speak, as I think it advisable; and am not necessitated to it by the prodigality of my nature." Andrew Portal, *The Orations of Aeschines against Ctesiphon and Demosthenes de Corona* (Oxford: Munday & Slatter, 1814), 82. Meyer notes the important gestural contrast between the statue of Aeschines and a statue of Demosthenes, in the Vatican [Fig. 220], which originally depicted him with his arms crossed and (as Plutarch indicated) with interlaced hands. The contrasted poses of the two figures was intended to refer to their passionate arguments over political and rhetorical matters. Meyer, "Re-dressing Classical Statuary," 57 and note 62. In the introduction to his Latin translation of their orations, Cicero distinguished between the 'force' of Demosthenes and the 'sonority' of Aeschines. Adams, *Demosthenes and His Influence*, 108.

philosophical modesty and self-restraint.[237] As Arline Meyer notes, “Aeschines claimed that, in the decorous days of Pericles and Themistocles, speaking with the arm outside the cloak was considered ill-mannered, and men of old refrained from doing so.”[238] It is this fundamental notion that informs the subsequent interpretations of the gesture, such as John Bulwer’s claim in his *Chirologia* that “the hand restrained and kept in is an argument of modesty, and frugal pronunciation, a still and quiet action suitable to a mild and remiss declamation.”[239] In male (and occasionally female) portraiture from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, the gesture was frequently adopted as a symbol of both virtue and good breeding.[240]

The pose, which seems to have been relatively rare in sixteenth-century portraiture,[241] is more frequent in seventeenth-century images, particularly in the work of Northern artists like Frans Hals, Rembrandt, and Anthony Van Dyck, but also in paintings by Italian and Spanish artists like Jusepe de Ribera, Diego Velazquez, Giovanni Bernardo Carbone, and Carlo Maratta.[242] A

---

[237] Meyer, “Re-dressing Classical Statuary,” 57. As Christina Riggs notes, “the subject supported his weight on his left leg and wrapped a Greek mantle decorously around his body so that his right arm, clasped to his chest, held the draped garment in place.” Riggs, “Facing the Dead: Recent Research on the Funerary Art of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 106: 1 (2002): 97. Also see Sebesta and Bonfante eds, *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001), 20ff.

[238] Meyer, “Re-dressing Classical Statuary,” 57. In support of his argument Aeschines referred to the statue of Solon, erected in the Salaminian market, where he was shown with his arm inside his cloak. The gesture, he reiterated, was a sign of the orator’s modesty and self-control in speaking. Aeschines, *Speeches*, 24-25.

[239] Meyer, “Re-dressing Classical Statuary,” 57; Bulwer, *Chirologia*, “Sixth Canon for Rhetoricians”.

[240] The pose was particularly popular in English portraiture of the mid-eighteenth century as a sign of social quality. Meyer, “Re-dressing Classical Statuary,” 49.

[241] It appears, for example, in the *Portrait of a Young Man* attributed to Giovanni Cariani (c. 1520, Collezione Etro, Milan) [Fig. 222]. On Cariani’s portrait, see *Tiziano e il ritratto di Corte*, 198-9, cat. C13.

[242] Hals was particularly fond of the gesture, and it appears in many of his male portraits. See for example the *Portrait of a Man Holding a Pair of Gloves* (1637, Sotheby’s) [Fig. 223] (which is a pendant for a portrait of a woman holding a handkerchief; here the male figure’s sense of self-control and self-assurance is also conveyed by the gesture of his other hand, pointing his thumb pointing upward toward himself); the *Portrait of a Man* (1648-1650, National Gallery of Art, Washington) [Fig. 226] (here the left-hand in the “arm-sling” pose is combined with right hand placed against chest in gesture indicating sincerity and sensitivity); the *Portrait of a Man* (1634, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest) [Fig. 228]; and the *Portrait of a Man* (c. 1655, Liechtenstein Museum, Vienna) [Fig. 227].
Other examples include Rembrandt’s *Portrait of the Printseller Clement de Jonghe* (1651, etching, Rijksprenten-kabinet, Amsterdam) [Fig. 234]; Van Dyck’s *Portrait of a Bearded Man* (1615, Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, Ohio) and *Portrait of Pieter Bruegel the Younger* (from the *Iconography* series, begun c. 1630; pen drawing, Teylers Museum, Haarlem) [Figs. 229 and 230]; Ribera’s *St. Andrew* (Museo de Belas Artes, La Coruña (in deposit at Prado, Madrid) [Fig. 235]; Velazquez’s *Aesop* (c. 1640, Museo del Prado, Madrid) [Fig. 236]; Carbone’s *Portrait of a Gentleman* (c. 1675, Indianapolis Museum of Art, Indiana) [Fig. 59]; and Maratta’s

particularly pertinent example as a point of comparison for Rosa's self-portrait is Francesco Albani's portrait of the lawyer and priest *Andrea Calvi* (1636, National Museum of Wales, Cardiff) [Fig. 233]. The pose also seems to have been adopted in seventeenth-century female portraiture as a sign of virtue and modesty, such as Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger's *Portrait of Mary Throckmorton, Lady Scudamore* (1614, National Portrait Gallery, London) [Fig. 224] and his *Portrait of Catherine Killigrew, Lady Jermyn* (1614, New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection) [Fig. 225]. In seventeenth-century France it was reserved for documentary prints and costume plates, where it was displayed as "part of the language of social decorum" alongside "the ritual of bows, honours, and formal courtesies set by the French court".[243] For Rosa and his portrait, however, the gesture was more about connecting himself to the ancient tradition of philosophical oratory itself, rather than referring himself to a more general, collective social code of masculine civility. The relative rarity of the gesture in portraiture would also have appealed to Rosa's predilection toward obscurity and novelty. In Rosa's self-portrait, the "arm-sling" gesture pointed to his mastery of rhetoric and associated him –as Simonelli had done in his poem on the *Tityus* – with one of the great masters of ancient oratory.[244] In choosing to associate himself directly with the great rival of Demosthenes, however, elected by Simonelli as Rosa's namesake, Rosa may have intended to co-opt and even rival Simonelli's poetic tactic of self-fashioning by creating his own ancient philosophical "persona" in painted form.[245]

Portrait of Robert Spencer (1702, Althorp, UK) [Fig. 232]. Also implicit in the use of the "hand withdrawn" or "arm-sling" pose, particularly in self-portraiture, is its potential resonance with the broader goal of the artist to suppress the "manual" nature of his or her craft.

[243] Meyer, "Re-dressing Classical Statuary," 53.

[244] It is possible that Rosa sought a direct personal association with Aeschines himself, whose surviving speeches show "a tendency to forthright and forceful expression, free use of rhetorical figures, variety of sentence construction, fondness for poetical quotations, and ready wit." "Aeschines", *Encyclopedia Brittanica*.

[245] Rosa may have been assisted by Ricciardi in his choice of philosopher, although it is likely he would have been familiar with the rivalry between Aeschines and Demosthenes from the study of popular texts like Castiglione's *Courtier*, which refers to the argument between the two philosophers. Castiglione, *Il Cortegiano*, 85.

In some ways the London *Self-Portrait* encapsulates Rosa's frequent self-contradiction, in particular the disparity between his lofty philosophical ideals and the reality of their execution (an inconsistency he would himself be the first to acknowledge). Ubaldo Meroni expressed his amusement and scepticism toward interpreting the painting as a self-portrait of Rosa, considering how loquacious he was in his poetic and epistolary composition.[246] Indeed, Rosa often lamented the "silence" of his friends in replying to his letters, frequently contrasting it to the open, free-flow of words that express both the sincere nature and degree of true friendship.[247] In a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1651 Rosa appeared to make light of the very philosophical precept of silence that he touted in the London *Self-portrait*: complaining about his friend's lack of response to his letters, Rosa accused Giulio of wanting to make of himself "a scholar of Pythagoras," the same philosopher whose precepts on the virtue of silence he advocates in the painting.[248] Other letters convey the sincerity of Rosa's conviction about the pursuit of such philosophical ideals as verbal restraint and the identity they represent – an identity, moreover, that guarantees the intellectual rights and freedoms of the *seicento* artist.[249] Paired with Pythagoras's axiom, Aeschines's gesture represented the exercise of self-control and self-mastery that reflects not only Rosa's engagement in the contemporary discourse on controlling bodily gesture, but also a central precept of his personal and professional mission.

---

[246] Meroni, "Salvator Rosa: autoritratti e ritratti di amici," 65-66. He suggests that, for this reason, the painting is better understood as a portrait of Ricciardi.
[247] The scowl of the righteous philosopher, who prefers silence over unnecessary verbosity, seems conspicuously incompatible with the "real" Rosa who longs to hear as much as possible from his friends. For Rosa's hyperbolic complaints about his friends' silence in writing to him, see for example Borelli, letters 42, 45, 112, 133, 186 and 286.
[248] Borelli, letter 112: "né da quel hora in qua ho hauto mai più nuova di voi: che Domine sarà con tanto silentio? Che volete forse, farvi scolare di Pitaghora? Ma parliamo d'altro." Plutarch refers to Pythagoras's recommendation of silence as a virtue in his *Life of Numa*, 8.
[249] In 1651, Rosa writes to Giulio Maffei: "Questa matina che siamo ai 30 di Luglio ricevo una vostra ripiena delle solite offerte et amorevolezze, alle quali non rispondo attesoché la mia gratitudine non ha voci che con quelle habino proportione, e per questo la passerò in silentio." Borelli, letter 105. Similarly, in a letter to Ricciardi of 1664, Rosa stops himself from complaining about his misfortunes since "sarà meglio il tacerli". Borelli, letter 304.

Rosa's interest in a decidedly purposeful and meaningful gesture is apparent in many of his other images.[250] The stiffness of many of his figures, often associated with Rosa's shortcomings as a painter of anatomy, may instead be explained by a conscious desire on his part to privilege the symbolics of gesture itself over a naturalism of the human form. As Keith Christiansen has noted, "the object of declamatory gesture [in *seicento* painting] was not to give an impression of spontaneous reaction or to imitate nature but to provide movements that were at once dignified, noble, and expressive in a paradigmatic or demonstrative sense."[251] (Emphatic gesture, however, was described by commentators like Della Porta as inherently animated and vivacious;[252] thus, even if naturalism was not Rosa's primary aim it was an intrinsic byproduct of his rhetorical technique.) Connectedly, Rosa may have sought in the erudite vocabulary of gesture a route to access the status of "painter-philosopher" represented by the great *seicento* masters he emulated, in which a skilful mastery of the human figure was paramount.[253] Rosa's use of an almost pedantically emphatic and purposeful repertoire of physical gestures and facial expressions are present throughout his *oeuvre*, but they are most apparent in the later large-scale figure paintings of his second Roman period – arguably the most competitive phase of his career. In his use of a limited and focused set of

[250] Mahoney also noted Rosa's apparent "obsession" with rhetorical gesture. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 367-8.
[251] Christiansen, "Tiepolo, Theater, and the Notion of Theatricality", 679.
[252] Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 455. According to Della Porta, gesturing while speaking denotes "a passionate and lively nature."
[253] On the early-modern development of this prerogative, see Gent and Llewellyn eds., *Renaissance Bodies*, 2ff. Rosa frequently protested his desire to be known as a figure painter and history painter, rather than a landscapist or battle painter. Baldinucci recounts the story of a visit paid to Rosa's studio by the amateur landscape painter and priest Francesco Ximenes. Rather than "satisfy the desire" of his visitor by showing him his landscapes, Rosa exhibited a selection of his figure paintings. When asked to see the landscape paintings, Rosa replied: "Sappiate, ch'io non so far paesi: sò ben fare le figure, le quali io procure che sian vedute dagli studiosi dell'arte e da persone di ottimo gusto, come voi sete, per cavare una volta del capo alla gente questo fantastico umore, che io sia pittore da paesi, non da figure." Baldinucci concluded this was evidence of Rosa's "delusional" concept of his own talents, and he goes on to note that Rosa strove to achieve a status as "figure" painter with his extensive practice of printmaking, especially with engravings based on his own history paintings. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 479.

gestures, too, Rosa may have been responding to his own call in the London *Self-Portrait* to exercise a calculated and decorous restraint in wielding his pictorial rhetoric.[254]

To return again to the prevalence of the hand gesture in Rosa's *istorie*, it is significant that Rosa's contemporaries made special note of this feature of his pictorial production.[255] Simonelli's poem in praise of Rosa as "Demosthenes" may have been based on Rosa's early proclivity – already evident in paintings like the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* (c. 1639, Museo Civico, Viterbo) [Fig. 1a], the *St. Jerome* (c. 1639(?), San Venanzio, Fabriano) [Fig. 4] and the *Tityus* (to which his poem was dedicated) – toward the use of emphatic hand gestures in particular. Demosthenes was renowned for his use of the "speaking hand".[256] This is the hand of the orator, described most famously by Quintilian and Cicero, which adopts various motions and positions in order to convey specific mental and linguistic "registers."[257] In Rosa's images it is often employed in conjunction with the

---

[254] Gestural restraint was also a precept of Alberti's *De pictura*: writing on the subject of depicting gestures in *istoria*, Alberti prefers that "a philosopher, when speaking, to show modesty in every limb rather than the attitudes of a wrestler." Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. Cecil Grayson (London: Penguin Classics, 2004), Book II, 73. The strange mixture of vigour and rigidity displayed by Rosa's figures (and by those in the works of many of his *seicento* contemporaries) may have been informed by contemporary standards of deportment that emphasized the display of self-control in one's gestures as a sign of inner virtue. On the notion "solemnity" or the "frozen, petrified quality" of figures in *seicento* history painting, see Martin Weyl, *Passion for Reason and Reason of Passion: Seventeenth Century Art and Theory in France, 1648-1683* (New York, 1989), 194; Unglaub, "Poussin's Reflection," *Art Bulletin* 86: 3 (2004): 505-528; and Juliana Barone, "Seventeenth-century illustrations for the chapters on motion in Leonardo's *Trattato*," in *The Rise of the Image*, ed. Rodney Palmer and Thomas Frangenberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 27ff. On moral codes of bodily comportment see Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, 165; and Burke, "The language of gesture in early modern Italy," 78-79.

[255] In his letter to Diego Gera, Antonio Abati noted the "querulous" gestures of the figures in Rosa's landscapes. Abati singled out the occasional appearance of a "seafarer" who "expresses with an upward gesture … an action of his [the seafarer's] querulous Nature". See Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, II: 149-55.

[256] In the *Chirologia* Bulwer singled out Demosthenes as the paragon of manual rhetoric. Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 166.

[257] The "speaking hand" signifies that action of speaking, discourse, and all possible linguistic registers. The gesture is typically used in representations of preachers, judges, and sovereigns, orators, philosophers, masters, tutors, or every subject or theme that represents a communicative relation between one or more figures. Quintilian describes the "speaking hand" in his *Institutio Oratoria*, outlining the various positions of the fingers as appropriate to conveying different states of mind and intentions. He writes, "other portions of the body merely help the speaker, whereas the hands may almost be said to speak." Quintillian, *Institutio Oratoria*, XI, 3, 85-7, 4: 289. In his *Chirologia*, Bulwer reiterated the central importance of the hand as a link to the mind, proclaiming that "Reason is the intellect of the hand; speech, that of reason; the hand, that of speech." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 15-16, 19, 155. On the modern physiological explanation for the correlation between speaking and hand gestures, see Kendon, "Gesture", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 109 (1997): 109-127, and J. A. V. Bates, "The communicative Hand," in *The Body as a Medium of Expression*, ed. J. Benthall and T. Polhemus (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1975), 175.

open "speaking" mouth.[258] In *seicento* painting, the "speaking hand" is tied to the range of pictorial strategies of "theatrical" verisimilitude and mimeticism that seek to create a "speaking likeness".[259] Rosa shared with his contemporaries an interest in this function of gesture, but his own efforts are directed more toward its moral-didactic potential than its ability to convey "lifelikeness". His emphatically gesticulating figures, engaged in heated conversations or absorbed in solitary moments of self-introspection, embody Rosa's own moral-philosophical identity and the social nature of its construction.

Rosa's paintings employ a set repertoire of "speaking hands." In the *Christ Casting out Devils* (c. 1662, private collection, Rome) [Fig. 119], the figure on the far left, with his back turned and his hand raised to the crowd, appears to be silencing them with the gesture of *silentium postulo* (the demand for silence) as described by Bulwer.[260] The figure of Xenocrates in Rosa's *Phryne and Xenocrates* (1662-3, private collection) [Fig. 117] holds his hand in the manner of the *respuo* (rejection).[261] The protagonists in *The Conspiracy of Catiline* [Fig. 121] use the gesture of *data fide promitto* (the pledge of faith).[262] In the *Job and his Comforters* (c. 1663, Uffizi (Corridoio Vasariano), Florence) [Fig. 118], the figure of Job employs the *manu pantea* which, in combination with the hand drawn close to the chest, signals that he speaks in subjective terms of his own

---

[258] For example, the *Diogenes Casting away the Bowl*, the *Lo Spavento*, the *La Menzogna*, the *Phryne and Xenocrates*, the *Parable of St. Matthew*, the *St. John the Baptist Preaching in a Landscape*, the *Joseph Interpreting Dreams,* the *Pan and Pindar*, or the *Christ among the Doctors*. [Figs. 61, 26, 34, 117, 54, 102, 100, 126, 101]

[259] On the *seicento* "speaking likeness", see Andrea Bacchi et al eds., *Bernini and the Birth of Baroque Portrait Sculpture*. Exhibition catalogue. (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles; National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, 2008), 185ff.

[260] "The becking with the raised hand hath been ever with all nations accounted a sign of craving audience and entreating a favorable silence." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 45-6.

[261] "The flirting out of the back part of the hand or put-by of the turning palm is their natural expression who would refuse, deny, prohibit, repudiate, impute, or lay to one's charge, reject or pretend to lay for an excuse, or would twit and hit one in the teeth with a thing, and signify disdain." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 50.

[262] "To strike another's palm is the habit and expression of those who plight their troth, give a pledge of faith and fidelity, promise, offer truce, confirm a league, buy, sell, grant, covenant, bargain, give or take counsel, engage themselves in suretyship,... engage themselves to be true and trusty, warrant and assure." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 77.

wisdom.[263] And in the *St. John the Baptist Preaching in a Landscape* (1660's, Galleria Colonna, Rome) [Fig. 102], the figure of St. John uses the gesture of *numero* (enumeration) in order to illustrated the point of his argument to his listeners.[264]

Most prevalent among the gestures in Rosa's paintings, however, are the outstretched open hand and the pointing index finger – the two principal gestures of the orator.[265] The open hand was an iconographic symbol of rhetoric itself: in Ripa's *Iconologia*, the personification of "*Rettorica*" holds her right arm out with an open palm, in order to show that "Rhetoric discourses in a more open way than Logic."[266] Zeno had earlier distinguished between the "open hand" of rhetoric and the "closed fist" of logic, associating the former with a "reasoned" and "conciliatory" manner of persuasion.[267] The multivalent nature of the outstretched hand with open palm is clear from Rosa's images. In the *Jonah and the Whale* (c. 1665, Sotheby's) [Fig. 125], the *St. Jerome* [Fig. 4] or the *Pythagoras Emerging from the Underworld* (1662, Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth) [Fig. 112], for example, it is an expression of surprise. In the case of the soldier in the *Job and his Comforters* [Fig. 118], the *Madonna del Suffraggio* (1661-2, formerly Brera, Milan) [Fig. 106], or the *St. Philip Baptizing the Eunuch* (c. 1657, Chrysler Museum, Norfolk) [Fig. 96] it is a gesture of *oro* (prayer), *admiro* (admiration), or *asservatione Deum attestor* (calling God to witness, with asseveration).[268]

---

[263] The *manu pantea* is commonly found on sarcophagi of Roman consuls, and signals "I am wise," "I am a judge" or "I teach". Described as a gesture for orators by Apuleius in second century ACE, it was adopted by Christians as a sign of benediction. Bates, "The Communicative Hand," in *The Body as a Medium of Expression*, 178-9.

[264] "To begin with the first finger of the left hand and to tell on/to the last finger of the right is the natural and simply way of numbering and computation." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 140.

[265] The orator's "speaking hand" is usually shown in an open, relaxed form. The horizontally-placed hand, with palms extended outward alludes both to the words being pronounced by the speaker and to the expectation of a response by the listener. Pasquinelli, *Il gesto e l'espressione*, 148-9.

[266] Ripa, *Iconologia*, 381-2. In the frontispiece to Bulwer's *Chirologia*, Rhetoric (or Eloquence) was "visually distinguished from Logic." Meyer, "Re-dressing Classical Statuary", 57.

[267] Conversely, the "closed fist" symbolizes "rhetoric that seeks persuasion through 'non-rational, non-sequential, often nonverbal means'." Bushman, "A conversation of Gestures," 253; Edward P. J. Corbett, "The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist," *College Composition and Communication* 20 (1969): 288.

[268] The gesture of "*oro*" (prayer) is "To raise the hand conjoined or spread out toward heaven … a natural and universal form of prayer practiced by those who are in adversity and in bitter anguish of mind, and by those who give public thanks and praise to the most high." Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 23. The gesture of "*admorir*" (admiration) consists in "throw[ing] up the hands to heaven", an expression of "admiration, amazement, and astonishment,

In the *Jonah Preaching to the Ninevites* (1661, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen) [Fig. 105] it is a gesture of proclamation. The outstretched, open hand also has a variety of other rhetorical connotations, including supplication, invitation, protection, and reward.[269] The frequency of this gesture in Rosa's paintings suggests that it held a particular appeal for the artist as an emblem of his own rhetorical eloquence.[270]

The equally multivalent "pointing hand" also makes a frequent appearance in Rosa's *oeuvre*, as for example in the *La Menzogna* [Fig. 34], the *Parable of St. Matthew* (1651, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples) [Fig. 54] or the *Diogenes Casting away the Bowl* (1651, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen) [Fig. 61]. It connotes admonition, command, demonstration, accusation, affirmation or a suggestion of which path to take. In the strict practice of oratory, when pointed upwards it refers to an invocation, entreaty or appeal; when directed horizontally, it signals a request for attention. Most importantly, it indicates an individual, self-assertive volition and a desire to "indicate" (*indico*).[271] This was Leon Battista Alberti's interpretation of the gesture, which

---

used also by those who flatter and wonderfully praise, and have others in high regard." Bulwer, *ibid*, 33. The gesture of *asservatione* is "[t]o extend and raise up both hands to heaven", an expression of "establishment and a most strong kind of asseveration implying as it were a double oath." Bulwer, *ibid*, 48.

[269] Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 21, 42, 55-6, 173, 174, 179, 187.

[270] While Burke cautions art historians in their attempts to align the gestures described by Quintillian with those seen in Renaissance portraits, noting in particular the cultural and temporal distinction between antiquity and the early-modern period, he also acknowledges that "his recommendations were taken seriously in early modern Italy." Burke, "The Presentation of Self in the Renaissance Portrait," 156-8. For a survey of issues confronting the interpretation of pictorial gesture in early-modern art, see Chastel, "Gesture in Painting". Also see H. James Jensen, *The Muses' Concord: Literature, Music and the Visual Arts in the Baroque Age* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 60-3; Gerard LeCoat, *The Rhetoric of the Arts, 1550-1650* (Bern and Frankfurt: Herbert Lang, 1975); and Spencer, "Ut Rhetorica Pictura". Michael Fried's interpretation of the proffering figures in Caravaggio's paintings as self-referential indices of the artist himself is equally – if not more – applicable to Rosa, whose figures are in a very real sense "representatives" of his own rhetorical skill in painting and poetry. Fried, "Thoughts on Caravaggio," *Critical Inquiry* 24: 1 (1997): 55. Salerno noted that the pointing or outstretched hand gesture that appears frequently in paintings by Nicolaes Berchem (ca.1620-1683) (who was strongly influenced by Rosa) was self-consciously allusive to Caravaggio's work. Salerno also suggested that Berchem was possibly influenced by Rosa's *Landscape with Travellers asking the way* (c. 1638-9, Matthiesen Fine Art Ltd, London), which he may have seen in Italy around 1640. Whitfield notes that the gesture is "painted with the consciousness of that most celebrated naturalistic image, Caravaggio's *Calling of St. Matthew* in S. Luigi dei Francesi, which underlines the real roots of *Bambocciante* painting in Rome." Whitfield, in *Painting in Naples*, ed. Whitfield and Martineau, 235, citing Salerno, *L'opera completa*. The gesture also has implicit associations with Michelangelo's *Creation of Adam* on the Sistine Chapel ceiling, where it also refers to a self-sufficient creativity.

[271] See Pasquinelli, *Il gesto e l'espressione*, 10; and Gombrich, "Ritualized Gesture and Expression in Art," in *The Image and the Eye*, 67. Bulwer, who noted the particularly self-interested nature of the gesture, writes, "The

he recommended painters include to inform “the spectators what is going on” and to “beckon them with [the figure’s] hand to look”.[272] The demonstrative and self-interested nature of the gesture are among its most salient meanings for Rosa, who likely regarded it as a ready strategy to draw the viewer’s attention to his erudite subjects. In this sense, the pointing hands of Rosa’s figures can be seen as rhetorical-poetic “doubles” for Rosa’s *painting* hand: in “acting out” Rosa’s *istorie*, the figures and their gestures translate and enact the initial creative performance of the painter’s own hand.[273]

Rosa found in both the open hand and the pointing finger what Chastel describes as the “perfect way of compensating for the spoken word” – that is, the way in which to make painting into a visual correlate for the poetry and literature that he emulated.[274] The recurrence of the indicating, “pointing” hand and the reacting “open” hand as a dyad of gestures in Rosa’s images highlights the intention of the painter to focus the viewer’s attention on an individual exchange between two interlocutors. Indeed, a number of Rosa’s images that display a pronounced interest in intimate conversations.[275] In the previous chapter I mentioned this phenomenon in connection with

---

forefinger put forth, the rest contracted to a fist, is an express of command and direction …This finger being called *index* from *indacando*, ‘showing’ (*deicticos*), that is, called ‘demonstrator’.” Bulwer, *Chirologia*, 124-5.

[272] Chastel, “Gesture in Painting,” 18; Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. Cecil Grayson, 2: 80-3.

[273] On the “divine” hand of the artist, see Patricia A. Emison, *Creating the “Divine” Artist: From Dante to Michelangelo* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), chapter 7; Richard Spear, “Di sua mano,” in *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volumes*. vol. 1, The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity (2002): 79-98; and David Summers, *Michelangelo and the Language of Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981). As Ann Berthoff has argued from a socio-linguistic standpoint, the hand has a creative as well as a symbolic agency that lends it – in its ability to “form” and “compose” – a faculty for knowledge. “[S]ince forming and composing are both activities done by hand, then it follows that knowing is also done by hand.” Berthoff, “The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand,” in *The Making of Meaning*: *Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing Teachers* (Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1981), 61-67, cited in Bushman, “A conversation of Gestures,” 254. The idea is central to the socio-anthropological theory of scholars like Mead, who argued that thinking, writing and communicating share a physicality, and who saw the human hand “as the evolutionary forebear of language”.

[274] Chastel, “Gesture in Painting,” 18.

[275] For example the *La Menzogna* [Fig. 34], the *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31], *Christ among the Doctors* (1660’s, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples) [Fig. 101], the *Job and his Comforters* [Fig. 118], the *Pan and Pindar* (1666, Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia) [Fig. 126], the *Joseph Interpreting Dreams* (c. 1657-60, Palazzo Altieri, Rome) [Fig. 100], the *St. John the Baptist Preaching in a Landscape* [Fig. 102], the *Parable of St. Matthew* [Fig. 54], the *Death of Socrates* (early 1650’s, private collection) [Fig. 59], the *Phryne and Xenocrates* [Fig. 117], the *Philosophers’ Grove* [Fig. 23a], the *Mercury and Argus* (c. 1664, private collection, Rome) [Fig. 123], the

Rosa's idealization of the Tuscan villa and countryside as the desired location of a "selective" academic brand of sociality. In Rosa's later paintings, his figures often engage in private conversations that – while frequently dictated by the traditional narrative or iconography of the subject itself – also seem in their recurrence to announce the painter's own affection for this activity. Pairs or small groups of figures are frequently placed in non-descript interiors or simple outdoor spaces, pushed to the foreground and occupying the majority of the picture plane. The intimacy created by these "close-up" views of conversant figures (a development partly dictated in Rosa's later years by his failing eyesight[276]), together with the frequent use of emphatic gestures, has the effect of making the viewer a participant in the discussion. Rosa's use of emphatic gestures and expressions assumes an audience well versed in the nuances of gesture on the part of his viewer. In this sense, Rosa's paintings function as "conversation pieces", a "collective performative act of displaying one's social and physical graces"[277] and – even more importantly for Rosa – one's moral-philosophical erudition.

The *Figurine* etchings of 1656-8 [Figs. 90-95] are a particularly intriguing case of Rosa's use of a "conversant" form of rhetorical gesture. Alternatively arranged in pairs or small groups, or presented as isolated individuals, these figures seem to have been devised with the express purpose of demonstrating not only the artist's virtuosity in rendering human anatomy (Rosa's abilities in this domain are more successful in his graphic work than in his paintings) but also his skill in depicting a range of physical *moti*. The *Figurine* often gesture toward an unseen subject "beyond" the confines of the image, extending their dialogue (or monologue) into the viewer's space. This has the effect of challenging the viewer to interpret the enigmatic subject of discussion, but of involving

---

Diogenes Casting Away the Bowl [Fig. 61], the *Democritus and Protagoras* (or the *Calling of Protagoras to Philosophy*) (1664, Hermitage, St. Petersburg) [Fig. 122], the *Lo Spavento* (1640's, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 26], a number of the *Figurine* etchings of 1656-8 [Figs. 90-95], and numerous landscape paintings in which small groups of figures are engaged in lively discussions, like the *Bandits on a Rocky Coast* (1656, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) [Fig. 88].

[276] His poor eyesight began to cause him problems from about 1665 onward. See for example letter 311 (1665).

[277] Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, 119.

the viewer himself in the action in the image itself. The majority of Rosa's *Figurine* are soldiers, a detail that led Peter Tomory to interpret the prints as a critique of the "inactive" and militaristic soldiers who occupied *seicento* Naples.[278] Other scholars have interpreted the prints as a repertoire of "poses" to be culled by the artist in devising compositions.[279] This "cataloguing" impulse is apparent in Rosa's own comment on the prints in a letter of 1656 to Ricciardi, where he refers to them as "*25 Figurine d'aqqua forte*" gathered together in a small "*libretto*",[280] intended, perhaps, to be presented and circulated like the pattern books traditionally consulted by artists as part of their practical training. (In this sense, too, Rosa presented his prints in a format that offered them as models to be admired and emulated by other artists.) The close association of these figures with a display rhetorical skill may also be inherent in Rosa's choice of subject matter. In the early seventeenth century, the soldier was regarded as a veritable "rhetorical device" who, as Foucault maintains,

> "could be recognized from afar … [who] bore signs: the natural signs of his strength and courage, the marks, too, of his pride; his body was the blazon of his strength and valour; and although it is true that he had to learn the profession of arms little by little – generally in actual fighting – movements like marching and attitudes like the bearing of the head belonged for the most part to a bodily rhetoric of honour..."[281]

The mathematician and physicist Christiaan Huygens (1629-95) considered the soldier to be "unequalled both in the handling of arms and in the limberness of his body," a judgment that

---

[278] Tomory, "Battles, war and soldiers," 256-67.

[279] A similar idea may inform Rosa's production of "*testaccie*" which he sent from Rome to his friends in Florence during the early 1650's. See Borelli, letter 48. On Tiepolo's practice of assembling "*teste di fantasia*" in albums in a kind of "catalogue" of his "favorite 'extras'" to be used as models or shown to buyers as a "demonstration of his creative fecundity", see Christiansen, "Tiepolo, Theater, and the Notion of Theatricality", 687.

[280] Borelli, letter 203.

[281] Ladelle McWhorter, "Rites of Passing: Foucault, power and same-sex commitment ceremonies," in *Thinking Through Rituals*, ed. Kevin Schilbrack (London: Routledge, 2004), 76, citing Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 135. Baldassare Castiglione's ideal *cavaliere* had achieved his intrinsic virtue through the successful control of his body and its gestures. In his *La Vera Militar Disciplina antica e moderna* (1604), the Sienese captain Imperiale Cinuzzi described the ideal soldier in terms that convey his symbolic import as a model of eloquence – the figure of the "*professionista-artigiano*" of early-modern war-craft who exhibited "the natural signs of vigour and courage, the marks of his daring [*fierezza*]." Cinuzzi, *La vera militar discipline*, cited in Galasso ed, *Mentalità comportamenti e istituzioni tra Rinascimento e decadenza 1550-1700*, 58. The early-modern concept of noble, courtly civility was founded in large part upon the earlier rules of knightly conduct, with an additional increased emphasis placed on self-constraint and self-mastery. See Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, 216.

inspired Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629) to choose the soldier as the subject in his well-known set of engravings, the *Wapenhandelinghe* of 1607.[282] A similar vision of the *cavaliere* as an effectual "*eloquentia corporis*" is conveyed in Rosa's *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* and the debated *Self-Portrait as a Soldier*, along with the emotionally-charged contortions of the soldiers in his many battle scenes.

III.6. Concluding Thoughts

Rosa's fascination with gesture and expression, and the primacy he gives to these features in his work, reflects not only a desire to participate in more pervasive currents of *seicento* art but a personal conviction about those communicative devices as instruments of a distinctly social ideal. The centrality of reading, writing and speaking to Rosa's professional practice reveal the integrally social basis of his desired identity. The next chapter situates the significance of the textual and oral dimension of Rosa's self-fashioning, encapsulated in the rituals of letter-writing, poetry and conversation, in the context of a portrait he made for Ricciardi. Here, silence and speaking are celebrated as strategies for sustaining true friendship and promoting the individual *personae* comprised in its practice.

---

[282] These prints, in turn, influenced the emergent genre of military drill books and were likely among the Northern prints that inspired Rosa's etchings. The first manual illustrating training drills and their corresponding movements of soldiers appeared in Amsterdam in 1607. Galasso, *Mentalità comportamenti e istituzioni*, 58. On De Gheyn's prints, see Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, 94. On the rhetorical nature of the soldier in prints, see Christa Grössinger, *Humour and Folly in Secular and Profane Prints of Northern Europe, 1430-1540* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2002), 152-5. Grössinger outlines the popularity of the theme of the soldier among German and Swiss printmakers of the first half of the sixteenth century. These prints were intended in part to be regarded as "patterns", depicting figures of soldiers from both front and back and in a variety of poses.

Chapter IV
A Portrait for Giovan Battista Ricciardi: The Friend as a Second Self

A young man stands at the edge of a table, his figure silhouetted against a dark and cloud-streaked night sky faintly lit by an emerging crescent moon. Lost in thought, he gazes down at the skull in his hands, its polished surface gleaming in the moonlight. Cradling his silent companion with one hand, he writes an inscription in Greek across the cranium: ἡνί ποί ποτέ – "It is here that we come to our end, sooner or later".[1] His long, dark, wavy hair is crowned with a wreath of cypress leaves, and his neatly groomed beard and moustache and refined but sober clothing suggest a modest sophistication. The skull rests on the supple binding of a book, one of its pages marked with a piece of paper. Behind, on the table, there is another larger tome propped open and upright. Between the two books is a crumpled page with a hand-written and signed dedication: "*Salvator Rosa dipinse nell'Eremo e dono a Gio Batt Ricciardi suo Amico*."[2] This is the touching *Portrait of a Poet-Philosopher* (Metropolitan Museum, New York) [Fig. 64] that Rosa painted for his best friend, Giovan Battista Ricciardi.[3] Usually interpreted as a self-referential image, the portrait offers a persistently enigmatic vision of Rosa's moral-philosophical persona. As a testament to the unique bond Rosa shared with his friend, the painting is richly allusive of the value Rosa granted to friendship and its contribution to his personal identity. Here, the melancholic humor essential to Rosa's creative *personae* as poet and artist is presented directly in relation to friendship as the strategy for its mastery. As a particularly illuminating case-study for my thesis, it warrants a more extended analysis than it has previously received.[4]

---

[1] The source of this phrase has not yet been discovered. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 69. The inscription has been loosely translated by Roworth as: "Behold, whither, when". Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 21-22; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 258; Daprà, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 104, cat. 5. Fumagalli translates it in Italian as "*Ecco qui dove* [*finiremo*] *prima o poi*". Fumagalli, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa*, 68.

[2] "Salvator Rosa painted this in a solitary place and gave it to his friend Giovan Battista Ricciardi".

[3] The portrait will hereafter be referred to as the "Met portrait" for the sake of brevity.

[4] Wendy Roworth has offered the most salient discussion of Rosa's portrait to date, and it is upon her analysis of the painting, the details of which I outline below, that my own interpretation attempts to expand. See Roworth,

IV.1. Rosa and Ricciardi: An Introduction

Rosa's friendship with Ricciardi, a poet, playwright and eventual Reader in moral philosophy at the University of Pisa, was arguably the most important and long-lasting of all his close male relationships. Over half of Rosa's extant epistolary correspondence is addressed to Ricciardi, and these affectionate and often passionate letters, which continue right up until Rosa's death in 1673, offer ample evidence of the degree of their companionship.[5] They also reveal a covetous relationship: Ricciardi often expressed his jealousy at the friendships Rosa shared with other colleagues, and the artist finds himself continually compelled to affirm his devotion. Rosa met Ricciardi in Florence, presumably shortly after Rosa arrived in the city in 1640. Their shared love of ancient philosophy, literature and moral satire made them fast friends. Ricciardi is listed by Baldinucci as a member of the *Percossi*, and he was an active participant in their theatrical productions and poetry recitals.[6] He was close with many of Rosa's other friends, including the Maffei brothers, and spent time with Rosa and his own family at the Maffei properties and his own villa of Strozzavolpe in the environs of Volterra. Rosa's letters, which record a constant exchange of books and a trade in ideas, show that Ricciardi's knowledge of and expertise in literature and language made him an indispensible resource for Rosa's pictorial and textual production and for his philosophical self-image. It is this identity, and the recognition of its formulation in friendship, that the Met portrait commemorates.

IV.2. The Question of Identity

Rosa's portrait is currently identified in the Metropolitan Museum as a self-portrait, despite the ongoing debate concerning its status as such. Is the figure in the portrait Rosa or Ricciardi?

"The Consolations of Friendship"; and *idem*, "Salvator Rosa's Self-Portraits: Some Problems of Identity and Meaning," *The Seventeenth Century* IV (1989): 117-48.

[5] These letters have been probed by scholars for factual information about Rosa's life and contemporary events and personages, although that content has not been considered in relation to the friendships the letters document.

[6] Baldinucci notes that Ricciardi played the more "serious" roles in the comedies staged by the *Percossi* in Florence and at their villa sojourns in Volterra. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 452, 461.

This discussion has centered in large part upon certain physiognomic discrepancies between this figure and those in other, more certain self-images. Instead of seeking a singular identity, however, my own interpretation of the painting privileges the work's status as a gift – an index of friendship and the process of exchange in which that relation is comprised. In effect, the painting should be seen as a *Freundschaftsbild* or friendship painting that, like many contemporary images of its kind, offers the viewer a unitary vision of amity. In my interpretation, Rosa's portrait need not be placed strictly into the category of "portrait" or "self-portrait" for its full import to be appreciated. I hope to show that the identity it represents may be understood through an alternative approach.

Roworth makes a convincing argument for the painting as a self-portrait, although she has previously expressed uncertainty on the issue.[7] Her identification is based both on a physiognomic comparison with other secure self-portraits of Rosa, and an interpretation of its iconography in connection with events in Rosa's personal life. The canvas has certain compositional, iconographic and physiognomic similarities to other, more certain self-portraits of the artist, many of which share the same three-quarter pose, coiffure and facial hair, and evince a preoccupation with role-playing: the small "witness" self-portrait in the Medici *Battle Scene*[8] [Figs. 9a and 9b], the *Self-Portrait as*

---

[7] Roworth, "Salvator Rosa's Self-Portraits," 118; *idem*, "The Consolations of Friendship". Both Fumagalli and Stolzenburg support Roworth's interpretation of the Met painting as a self-portrait. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 68; Stolzenburg ed., *Salvator Rosa. Genie der Zeichnung*, 140-1. Roworth published the work as a self-portrait in 1978 (*Pictor Succensor*) and then accepted it, with hesitation, as a portrait of Ricciardi in 1985 ("Baroque Portraiture in Italy", *Burlington Magazine* 127 (1985): 406).

[8] On the *Self-portrait as an Artist*, see chapter two, 111, note 186 above. The self-portrait in the *Battle Scene*, visible on the far left-hand side, was identified as such by Baldinucci and the 1687 Medici inventory of paintings in the Palazzo Pitti. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448-9; for the inventory, see Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 96, doc. CLXXVII. The word "SARO'," painted on the shield Rosa holds, has been interpreted as a play on his name and the first-person future tense of the verb "to be", as if to say "I will be there", and to emphasize his authority as artist and witness to the scene depicted. Both Oertel and Salerno considered it to emphasize either Rosa's quest for fame or an expression of his attitude to war, which he denounces in his satire *La Guerra*: that is, "I, Salvator Rosa, who am standing to the side of the fray, will survive". Oertel, "Die Vergänglichkeit der Künst. Ein Vanitas-Stilleben von Salvator Rosa," *Müncher Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst* XIV (1963): 108, 112 note 12; Salerno, "Il dissenso nella pittura," 44. Scott considered that it meant either "sopravvivrò", "sarò qui", or "io ci sarò", and was thus as a self-recommendation to the Medici as a court painter, implying his intention to work for and glorify the future prince Cosimo III. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 40-1. Stolzenburg read it simply as "io sopravvivrò". Stolzenburg ed., *Salvator Rosa. Genie der Zeichnung*, 12, 30 note 33. Fumagalli interpreted it as Rosa's desire to express his own knowledge of having made a work through which he would be remembered. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 154. Oliver Tostmann considered that Rosa may have been inspired

an Artist [Fig. 16], the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15], the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10], and the Siena and Detroit *Self-Portraits as a Soldier* [Figs. 12 and 13]. Another "witness" self-portrait appears in the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* [Figs. 1a and 1b], and a further possible instance has been identified in the *Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew* (date uncertain, Harrach collection, Rohrau) [Figs. 2a and 2b], although it is not entirely convincing as a self-image.[9] Two more self-referential images have been identified in *The Philosophers' Grove* [Figs. 23a and b] (the probability of which is suggested by a related drawing[10] [Fig. 23c]), and, possibly, a figure in the large *Seaport* (*Marina del Porto*) executed for Cardinal Gian' Carlo de' Medici in 1641 [Figs. 8a and 8b].[11] The long dark hair, the moustache and beard, and the slightly protruding eyes of the figure in the Met portrait seem largely in keeping with Rosa's face in these other works.

There are also certain physical discrepancies between the Met figure and Rosa's self-portraits. Scott, for example, has considered that the generally "more delicate" nature of the figure's facial features in comparison to Rosa's more certain self-portraits suggest a possible identification as Ricciardi, although he concedes that "the hooked nose, colouring and general

---

by Giuseppe Cesari's fresco of the *Battaglia fra Romani e Veienti e Fidenati* (Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome), who included a self-portrait with a shield displaying the artist's stemma. Tostmann, "Battaglien. Studien zur Schalchtenmalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts in Italien" (PhD dissertation, Frei Universität, Berlin, 2007), 123-147, cited in Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità, 70. Ebert-Schifferer also noted the resonance of the *concetto* with the story of Phidias, who put his self-portrait on the shield of Minerva when he was forbidden to put his signature on it, and thereby making an implicit reference to his own "victory" over his envious rivals. Ebert-Schifferer, *ibid*, 71; also see K. Patz, "Sub Rosa. Verschwiegene Beredsamkeit im Londoner Selbstporträt von Salvator Rosa," in *Diletto e Maraviglia. Ausdruck und Wirkung in der Kunst der Renaissance bis zum Barock*, ed. C. Göttler et al. (Emsdetten, 1999), 64-5.

[9] Viviana Farina, "Precisazioni sulla giovinezza napoletana di Salvator Rosa" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference, 2009). The *St. Bartholomew* has been variously dated (primarily on stylistic grounds) to the 1630's, 1650, or after 1660. For the debate, see *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, cat. 72; Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 86; and Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 494.

[10] This drawing, identified by Mahoney as a possible "idea for a self-portrait" because of the figure's prominent nose and his rather conspicuous placement within an oval frame, and dated on stylistic grounds to the 1640's (Mahoney, *Drawings*, no. 20.32) seems to my eyes very similar to the figure in the *Philosopher's Grove*, although in the drawing he is depicted wearing the draped costume of the ancient philosopher type. The likelihood that this figure was intended as a self-portrait is also suggested by the sharp contrast of its more naturalistic features (which resemble Rosa's own) to the caricature-like and overly-pronounced features of his companion "Diogenes".

[11] Di Montauto has proposed that the figure in the water with dark, dripping-wet hair and with his arms thrown wide open, has a face painted with such intensity as if to suggest it may be a self-portrait. Di Montauto, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 152, cat. 6.

appearance" of the figure do "resemble those of Rosa himself in his unquestioned portraits as an artist or actor." Scott also pointed to the significant problem presented by the angle of the figure, which makes an accurate comparison with Rosa's self-portraits difficult.[12] Physical resemblance alone is not enough on which to base identification as a self-portrait, particularly in view of the popularity of the particular hairstyle and facial hair of the figure in question. Scholars in favour of reading the figure as a portrait of Ricciardi emphasize a number of noteworthy physiognomic dissimilarities to Rosa's self-images, and cite early documents that describe the painting explicitly as a portrait of Rosa's friend. Certain aspects of the figure's comportment and activity – in particular the choice to show the young man writing in Greek (a language that Rosa would did not know how to read or write himself[13]) – are also offered in evidence for interpreting the young man as Ricciardi. But the lack of any extant portraits of Ricciardi himself only frustrates any attempt to make a secure identification in his favour.[14]

---

[12] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 69. He went so far as to consult with a police physiognomist at the National Gallery in London, who doubted that the face of the figure Met portrait was the same as that in Rosa's London *Self-portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10] or in other more securely identified self-portraits. Scott, *ibid*, 61. Meroni proposed that the London painting was itself a portrait of Ricciardi. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 7.

[13] In a letter to Ricciardi of 1651, Rosa mentioned his inability to read Greek: "Ier sera diedi i quattrini al Signor Brunetti per il Sest'Empireco, il quale mi dice haverlo trovato qual voi lo desiderate; ond'io, che di fatte grecagini me intendo poco, lascierò fare a lui." Borelli, letter 117. The "Sest'Empireco" is likely the *Adversus mathematicos* of Sesto Empirico, the Skeptic philosopher of the third century AD, which contains notes on ancient authors. Considering Rosa's inability to read or write in Greek, it is perhaps unlikely that he would have chosen to depict himself writing the language and to present such a self-representation to a friend who was aware of Rosa's linguistic limitations. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 69. Ricciardi's inventory of April 22 1687 lists "trecento sessanta pezzi di libri fra grandi e piccolo, latini greci e volgari, tutti di belle lettere" in the library. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 93, doc. CLXXVI. That Rosa chose to include a Greek inscription conveys an even greater impression of erudition and education than had he chosen a Latin one, as Greek was a language known to fewer of the *literati* of the period. For this suggestion I am indebted to Sebastian Shütze at Queen's University, Kingston.

[14] Ricciardi's friend, the painter Piero Dandini (1646-1712), reputedly executed a portrait of Ricciardi, although it has not yet been discovered. I am grateful to Philip Sohm for bringing this portrait to my attention. Both Baldinucci and Giovanni Targioni Tozzetti mention the portrait. For both sources, see Sandro Bellesi, "Una vita inedita di Pier Dandini," *Rivista d'arte* XLIII (1992): 89-188; Tozzetti, Notizie della Vita di Pier Dandini Pittore Fiorentino, Scolare di Vincenzio Dandini suo zio, Nato nel 1646. Morto el 1712. Raccolte dal Dott. G. T. T. BNCF MS Targioni Tozzetti 240 (Striscia 323); also see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 282. Ricciardi was among the friends who frequented a poetic/artistic *conversazione* hosted at Pier Dandini's house, to which Rosa's friend Paolo Minucci also belonged. Tozzetti included in his vita a "spirited letter", dated June 8 1679, from Ricciardi to Dandini (the autograph copy of which has not been found), which refers to the artist's paintings. Bellesi, *ibid*, 146-7. The letter clearly indicates the affectionate friendship between Ricciardi and Dandini. Tozzetti records that Dandini kept a copy of his portrait of Ricciardi in his own house as a "sign of friendship": "In Casa dei S.S.ri Ricciardi da Badia ne sono moltissimi, fatti fare dal Famoso Poeta Giovan Battista Ricciardi Professor Pubblico di

The scholarly debate concerning the identity of the sitter in the portrait began with Luigi Salerno, who first concluded that the painting was a self-portrait of Rosa, but later changed his mind and decided that it could, possibly, be a portrait of Ricciardi.[15] Subsequent scholars have divided themselves into the two camps,[16] their continued uncertainty reflected in two of the most recent publications of the painting which identify it as a portrait of Ricciardi.[17] Scott's argument for the identity of the figure as Ricciardi summarizes the main evidence for this identification. He notes that the inventory of Ricciardi's belongings, written at the time of his death, included "a large painting of a philosopher writing on a skull".[18] (The inventory's identification of the figure as a "philosopher," rather than a "portrait of Ricciardi," is an important distinction that I will return to below.) Scott also cites as evidence the reference made by Giovanni Cinelli Calvoli (1625-1706), in his (as-yet unpublished) history of Tuscan literature, to a portrait given by Rosa to his friend "of Ricciardi in philosopher's garb contemplating a skull", including a direct quotation of the inscription in the painting.[19] Roworth, who considers the portrait a self-portrait of Rosa, argues that

---

Filosofia Morale nell'Università di Pisa, tra quali è maraviglioso il di lui Ritratto, una replica del quale soleva Piero tenere nelle sue stanze, per segno di sua amicizia, e adesso si conserva in Casa mia." Bellesi notes that the two paintings have not yet been identified. Bellesi, *ibid*, 171, and note 230.

[15] Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 50; Salerno, *L'opera completa*, 27.

[16] Roworth outlines the history of the debate concerning the question of identity. See Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship". Limentani expressed uncertainty about the identity of the figure, but was in favor of reading it as a self-portrait. Roworth, *ibid*, 104; from her own correspondence with Limentani. Wallace, Mahoney and Festa considered the work a self-portrait, while Langdon has contemplated both options. Wallace, *The Figure Paintings of Salvator Rosa*, 13; Mahoney, *Drawings*, 103; Festa, "Una redazione inedita del 'Tireno' di Salvator Rosa," *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* 97 (1979): 192; Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei," 3; Langdon, in *Salvator Rosa*, ed. Kitson, 26-27. Meroni concluded that the painting was definitely a portrait of Ricciardi, an identification also forwarded by Federico Zeri and accepted by John Spike and Clovis Whitfield, among others. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 7-8; *idem*, "Salvator Rosa: autoritratti e ritratti di amici," 65; Burton B. Frederickson and Federico Zeri, *Census of Pre-Nineteenth-Century Paintings in North American Public Collections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 177; Spike, *Baroque Portraiture in Italy: Works from North American Collections*. Exhibition catalogue (Hartford, Connecticut; Sarasota, Florida, 1985), 158, no. 58; Whitfield, in *Painting in Naples*, ed. Whitfield and Martineau, 237.

[17] Sandro Bellesi and Brigitte Daprà have both recently identified the painting as a portrait of Ricciardi. Bellesi, in *Luce e ombra nella pittura italiana tra Rinascimento e Barocco: da Tiziano a Bernini*, ed. Vittorio Sgarbi (Milan: Skira, 2005), 116; Daprà, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 104, cat. 5.

[18] For Ricciardi's inventory of 1687, see Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 93-95.

[19] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 69. G. C. Calvoli, "La Toscana letterata ovvero Storia degli scrittori fiorentini". BNCF MS Magl. IX 67, 132: "Del qual Rosa fu sempre cordialissimo, e [sacio?] veratiss.º amico, e da esso riceve in dano molte pitture di pregio fra le quali, e bellissima quella ov'è Ricciardi in'abito filosofico ritratto in atto di

Cinelli – writing perhaps from memory rather than actual knowledge of the painting in question – inadvertently conflated two separate paintings listed in Ricciardi's inventory into a single work.[20] Scott, on the other hand, considers that, because Cinelli knew both Rosa and Ricciardi personally, his identification is consequently more trustworthy.[21] If the painting was made in the late 1640's, as Scott suggests, then the age of the sitter (who appears to be possibly in his late twenties or early thirties) would be equally appropriate for either Rosa or Ricciardi.[22] Scott also feels that two of the preparatory drawings for the portrait [Figs. 76 and 77], which depict quite a young-looking figure, are evidence that the portrait represents Ricciardi, who was Rosa's junior by eight years.[23] As I hope to show, however, the presence in the portrait of certain features associable with the poetic or philosophical "type" do not in and of themselves point to a singular identification with Ricciardi – they are equally (and this "equality" is key) pertinent to Rosa himself.

An identification of the figure as a self-portrait is further complicated by the fact that it shuns one of the most common characteristics of self-portraiture, the outward gaze, a feature that

---

contemplare un teschio in mano, nel cui quadro son queste parole scritto: Salvator Rosa dipinse nell'Eremo e donò a Gio: Batta. Ricciardi suo amico ..."

[20] As Roworth notes, "Among the paintings [in Ricciardi's inventory] by Rosa was 'un quadro grande con cornice di albero bianche dipintovi un filosofo che scrive sopra una testa di morto'. Meroni correctly made the connection between this painting and the portrait of the man writing on a skull in the Metropolitan Museum. However, the text did not specify the identity other than 'a philosopher', and elsewhere in the same inventory is 'a portrait of Giovanni Battista Ricciardi'; these are two distinct paintings. Assuming the inventory was made by someone connected with the Ricciardi household, it is likely he would have recognized Ricciardi. Thus, while the inventory establishes Ricciardi's ownership of the painting in question, it does not document him as its subject." Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 105. Roworth also notes a passage in Angelo Fabroni's *Historia Academiae III* (132) which claims that "Ricciardi's 'amico unico', Salvator Rosa, gave Ricciardi 'a painting of his own likeness' ('*Ut vero gratissìmus erga Ricciardium cognoseeretur, amico unico (sic illum apellabat) suarn effigiem, aliasque tabulas dono dedit* …') an ambiguous phrase that does not clarify to whom it might refer, the artist or his friend." Roworth also points to Limentani's identification of a passage in Francesco Inghirami's *Storia della Toscana* (Fiesole, 1844) XIV, 176, "which states that among the most beautiful pictures by Rosa given to Ricciardi was one in which he had portrayed 'il Ricciardi in abito filosofico, in atto di contemplare un teschio umano.' This may refer to the portrait of Ricciardi in the inventory cited above, but it is likely that such statements relied on earlier sources who confused the paintings and identities." Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 106, note 15.

[21] *Della biblioteca volante di Gio. Cinelli Calvoli ... Scanzia XIV* (Venice, Girolamo Albrizzi, 1699), 91. Cinelli recounts having met Rosa in Florence and Pisa in Ricciardi's house. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 104.

[22] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 69.

[23] Ricciardi was born in Pisa on November 22 1623. Festa, "Aspetti della Vita e dell'arte di Salvator Rosa," 113, n. 46. That Rosa may have felt some anxiety about this difference in age is suggested by a letter to Ricciardi of 1668, in which Rosa appears to lie about his age, claiming to be forty-six when he is actually fifty-three. Borelli, letter 346.

Rosa exploits in the most securely attributed self-portraits in the Palazzo Pitti *Battle Scene*, the Uffizi *Self-Portrait as an Artist*, the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* and the Detroit *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* [Fig. 12].[24] This peculiarity, however, is not enough to deny the status of the sitter as a self-portrait since there are numerous contemporary examples of self-portraits in which the sitter does not stare directly out of the image – often self-images that have an allegorical intent.[25] Moreover, the feature of the "downward stare" employed by Rosa in his portrait is a purposeful choice borrowed from the iconography of the melancholic temperament, and thus indicative of an essential aspect of his personal identity.[26] If the "outward stare" that indicates the use of a mirror-reflection is taken as an indication of self-portrayal, then it is worth noting that in one of the final preparatory drawings for the portrait [Fig. 78] (in which the composition is almost identical to that of the finished product) the figure's head is tilted upward rather than downward, perhaps an indication that Rosa was working from his own reflection in the mirror.

IV.3. The Question of Dating

Although Rosa includes a telling dedication in his canvas [Fig. 70], he leaves out the date. On the basis of its iconography, or its stylistic similarities with other works, the Met portrait has been dated by scholars alternatively to the 1640's, to sometime between 1656 and 1657, or to 1659.[27] The age of the sitter, who – interpreted as a physiognomic self-portrait – appears too young

---

[24] The majority of Rosa's autonomous self-portraits make use of the more typical outward stare: the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* (Corridoio Vasariano, Florence), the "witness" self-portraits in the Viterbo *Incredulity of St. Thomas*, the Pitti *Battle Scene*, the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello*, the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, and the two versions of the *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* (Siena and Detroit). The only exception is the other, debated *Self-Portrait as a Soldier*, in which the figure is shown in profile, also in the Palazzo Chigi-Saracini, Siena.

[25] See for example Pieter Van Laer's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1626-30, Uffizi, Florence), Samuel van Hoogstraten's *Self-Portrait at the Age of Seventeen, with Still-Life* (1644, Museum Boymans-Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), Artemisia Gentileschi's allegorical *Self-Portrait as the Allegory of Painting* (c. 1635-7, Royal Collection) or Vermeer's *The Art of Painting* (1666-7, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna)

[26] The pensive "downward stare" was employed by other *seicento* artists in self-portrayal, as in Van Hoogstraten's *Self-Portrait at the Age of Seventeen*.

[27] Scott suggests that the Met portrait has iconographic affinities with both the *Philosopher contemplating a Skull* (Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford) [Fig. 44] and the *Democritus and Heraclitus* [Fig. 38], which he argues were painted in Florence. Festa argues it was painted at Strozzavolpe in 1659. Festa, "Una redazione

for a date of 1656, which would make Rosa forty-one. The stylistic qualities of a set of apparent preparatory and related drawings for the portrait suggested to Mahoney a date to the mid-1650's [Figs. 74-79].[28] However, another signed drawing [Fig. 80] dated by Mahoney to the early 1640's which depicts a figure in three-quarter view, turned to the left and posed in a manner very to the young man in the final portrait, may suggest an earlier date. Salerno first suggested the painting be dated to 1659, since it "reveals a more mature aspect of the artist" and because the dedication suggests it was painted in one of the villas in Tuscany that Rosa likely revisited when he returned to the area that year.[29] He later re-assigned it to June of 1640.[30]

Roworth takes her chronological cue from the dedication and its intriguing claim to have been painted "*nell'Eremo*" [Fig. 70], a phrase that has been interpreted to mean "in a retreat," "in a hermitage," or "in a solitary place."[31] Generally defined as a place of voluntary isolation, meditation and contemplation integral to the philosophical and spiritual vocation of hermits and anchorites, "*eremo*" (or variants like "*ermo*") was used by Rosa's contemporaries to signal alternatively a solitary place or state of being.[32] Rosa's friend Carlo Dati, for example, used it to refer to the requisite space and experience of isolation in study.[33] In his letter to Diego Gera,

---

inedita," 192; *idem*, "Salvator Rosa filosofo," *Criterio* (1985): 58. Wallace dates it to c. 1650 and Langdon to the early 1650's. Wallace, *Salvator Rosa in America*, 13; Langdon, in *Salvator Rosa*, ed. Kitson, 22.

[28] Mahoney, *Drawings*, 471-7, group 49. This date would correspond with stylistic features of the preparatory drawings for the portrait, which in their use of pen and wash resemble sketches for the *Umana Fragilitas* of c. 1655-9. Mahoney, *ibid*, 471. Mahoney arranged the drawings in approximately chronological order according to their increasing similarity to the final composition of the painting.

[29] Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 50.

[30] Salerno suggests here that the painting was made at Monterufoli. Salerno, "Salvator Rosa at the Hayward Gallery," *Burlington Magazine* (1973): 827; *idem*, *L'opera completa*, 86, no. 27.

[31] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 103.

[32] "*Eremo*," from the Latin "*eremus*" or the Greek "ερημος" or "ἐρήμος", is in its adjectival form "solitary" or "deserted". It is "a solitary place, where one or more persons retire to live a religious life ... the term refers in this more general sense above all to remote places." In its modern usage, it refers to an "enclosure with separate cells that in the camaldolese congregation is reserved for the "hermits", and *par excellence* the one in Camaldoli founded by S. Romualdo around 1012" which Dante refers to as an "*Ermo*". It can also be a ruined building, constructed in an isolated place, or a room where one can retire in solitude and meditation. In a more metaphoric sense, it is a "tranquil, solitary" state, "a place apart from the inhabited world". Battaglia, *Grande Dizionario*.

[33] Carlo Dati wrote on November 4 1663 to Antonio Magliabecchi, "Bisogna dire addio alla conversazione, e ristringermi nell'eremo del mio studio, o della villa, e forse del letto," expressing a desire for solitude motivated in large part by his poor health at the time. Dati, *Lettere*, 162.

Antonio Abati used "*heremo*" to describe the solitude sought by Pittura with the desired company of friends.[34] Scholars have debated whether Rosa used the term in reference to a real place – such the Maffei villas of Barbaiano and Monterufoli (where he and Ricciardi stayed on numerous occasions in the 1640's) or Ricciardi's own villa at Strozzavolpe – or in a more abstract, metaphorical sense. Roworth first considered that Rosa's portrait was made during the summer in Monterufoli either "just before Rosa left for Rome, or shortly after his arrival there," noting in particular the painting's stylistic and iconographic similarity to other works of the late 1640's and early 1650's (such as the *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62]).[35] She then argued for a date of c. 1656, based on a more "metaphorical" interpretation of the phrase "*nell'Eremo*" as a reference to Rosa's "solitary" experience in Rome" and the fraught circumstances of the artist's life in the mid-1650's.[36] In evidence of this metaphorical interpretation, she cited Ricciardi's use of the phrase "*erma palestra*" (meaning "solitary training ground") in the *canzone* he gave to Rosa. In the *seicento*, Roworth noted, the word "*palestra*" was used to refer to "a place where the individual learns virtue – perhaps in competition with others – through grappling with one's passions in order to gain control". More importantly, the phrase was also used in the period to describe the city of Rome itself,[37] suggesting, then, that Rosa used the term to signal his distance from Ricciardi in

---

[34] Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 149-155: "Così la mia loquace Pittura, che pur sdegnata delle Città, va fuggitiva, e s'appressa a vivere poco meno, che solitaria in un Heremo, potesse, Sig. Diego mio, riposarsi un giorno in compagnia della sua germana Virtù."
[35] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 259 and note 57. See for example letter 49. Rosa had been at the villa in the summer of 1647 and in 1650, from August to October, and was in Pisa in the month of November. A date to this period, or perhaps the early 1650's is plausible in view of Rosa's frequent hyperbolic expressions of affection in his letters at this time; the portrait may have been part of an attempt to dismiss Ricciardi's suspicions and jealousy regarding Rosa's friendship. Langdon also suggested Rosa painted the portrait at Monterufoli. Langdon, in *Salvator Rosa*, ed. Kitson, 26.
[36] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 119. Roworth's argument was derived from Mahoney's earlier contention that term "*eremo*" referred "figuratively" to the Rosa's lonely situation in Rome "where Rosa missed Ricciardi's companionship", and that it was likely Rome itself. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 471. Also see Roworth, "Salvator Rosa's Self-Portraits," 137. At this time Rosa lost his son, brother, and friend Giulio Maffei, he received accusations of plagiarism and the threat of excommunication, and composed "his bitterest personal satires" the *Invidia* and the *Tirreno*. Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 119.
[37] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 119, citing G. B. Pacichèlli, *Memorie di aiaggi per l'Europa cristiana* (Naples, 1685), V: 364. Rome was described in the mid-seventeenth century as "*la palestra nella*

Rome. Scott considered the "*nell'Eremo*" to refer instead to a specific location, giving the work a date that would correspond with a stay at any of the villas in either the 1640's or in 1659. De Rinaldis proposed that it referred to the "*eremo*" of Camaldoli, where Rosa stayed at the villa of his friend Raffaello Landini in the summer of 1645.[38]

Roworth interprets the enigmatic phrase "*nell'Eremo*" in connection with its broader *seicento* usage, but I argue instead that it should be understood directly in relation to Rosa's own unique use of the term elsewhere. In a letter to Ricciardi of 1663, Rosa uses the word "*eremi*" to refer *not* to that undesirable feeling of complete isolation, but to a joyful brand of social solitude or retreat among friends, in keeping with that vein of Stoic thought that envisions friendship as a blissful state of secluded communion. Rosa writes to Ricciardi upon his return to Rome from the villa of Strozzavolpe: "My life, except for the occupations of the paint-brush, is almost entirely consumed in taking walks, mostly thinking of dreams of travel, future hopes of retreats [*eremi*] and solitudes, assuring you that it is, to me, a significant pain to recall past pleasures in this manner ...".[39] If this letter can be taken in evidence, it suggests that the term in the Met portrait referred to the painting's manufacture in a specific place of friendship – probably Strozzavolpe – which would give the portrait a date to 1659 or, less likely on stylistic grounds, to 1661 or 1663.[40] The "*Eremo*"

---

quale meglio che altrove si apprende la forma da frenar le passioni" (the grappling ground where it is better than anywhere else to learn to restrain the passions)."

[38] De Rinaldis, *Lettere Inedite*, 73, n. 3. The notice of Rosa's visit to Camaldoli comes from a letter by Belmonte Belmonti to Ascanio della Penna. Ricci, "Salvator Rosa a Pisa e nel Casentino," *Rassegna d'Arte* xxi (1921): 68; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 202. Oertel likewise considered that the "*eremo*" in Rosa's portrait indicated its manufacture in Vallombrosa, sometime between 1642 and 1648, when he spent time at the villa of his friend Landini. Oertel, "Die Vergänglichkeit der Künst," 108. Arguing for a date around 1648, when Rosa and Ricciardi were both at Monterufoli, Scott also pointed to the close compositional affinity between the portrait and Rosa's *Philosopher Contemplating a Skull* [Fig. 44], which Rosa probably painted for the Maffei at this time. Scott, *ibid*, 69.

[39] Borelli, letter 292: "La mia vita, fuor dell'occasioni del pennello, la consumo quasi sempre in passeggiare, meditando il più delle volte castelli in aria di viaggi, foture speranze d'eremi e di solitudini assicurandovi che m'è di non ordinaria pena il ramentarmi de' passati piaceri in questo genere."

[40] Festa suggested that the portrait was painted in 1661. Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei," 3. Rosa was also at Strozzavolpe in the 1640's, although the strong evidence in support of its connection with Ricciardi's *canzone*, likely written in 1651 or 1652, suggests Rosa's portrait was made after this date. Mahoney considered that Salerno's suggestion that Rosa could have made the portrait during his visit to Ricciardi in 1659 may be a possibility. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 471; Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 123. I think the latter

in the inscription is in this sense akin to the solitude experienced among a select group of friends (or shared with one friend in particular). The capital "*E*" Rosa gives the term may thus connote not merely the metaphorical significance of the concept but the proper name of an actual place (a possible nickname for Strozzavolpe?). Rosa's specification that the portrait was painted "*nel*" *Eremo*, moreover, suggests it was made in that very place of solitary friendship, real or imagined, and that Rosa and Ricciardi were together at the time.[41] While Roworth's reading of the term "*eremo*" in Rosa's painting seeks to align it with the desolate qualities of the image, my own interpretation considers it as one of number of iconographic and compositional features in the painting through which Rosa intended to convey a more complex concept that (in keeping with the more pervasive dual nature of melancholia and the iconography of the *vanitas* tradition that it inspired) combined an overtly pessimistic message with an optimistic one that offered its antidote.[42] As one of these elements, Rosa and Ricciardi's "*Eremo*" represents not only the ideal realm of the

---

of the two scenarios is more likely: Rosa painted for Ricciardi in one of the later visits to Strozzavolpe, and his use of the term *eremo* refers to Strozzavolpe itself and not Rome.

[41] Roworth herself countered Mahoney's proposal for a date to the 1650's, noting that this was a period when Rosa and Ricciardi were not known to have been together. Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 103.

[42] In support of this more positive interpretation of Rosa's use of the term, I also draw the reader's attention to a pair of *seicento* poems that suggest an even more specific and highly relevant resonance of the word "*eremo*" for Rosa and his academic friends. Orazio Ricasoli Ruccellai's poem "*Lascia la corte per la villa*" (which I discuss in chapter two, 108) is, in another manuscript version, entitled *Solitudine dalla Corte detestando gl'abusi del Secolo* – a title that conveys sentiments wholly in keeping with Rosa's own on the subject of the court and the vices of contemporary society). In the poem, Ruccellai's use of the term "*erma*" in reference to the "forest retreat," as opposed to the city and court, offers a useful comparison with Rosa's usage of its cognate "*eremo*" in his portrait's inscription. This alternative version of the poem, from BNCF MS II IV 253, 219r, Stanza 13, repeats that of the version I cite in chapter two, with a few minor variations: "Tolto al grave tenor d'eterni affanni / Meno vivo in solitaria Erma foresta. / Scrivai l'ingolio pur d'atra tempesta / Ch'agitò il viver mio nè più begl'anni." In another poem entitled *La Corte*, by an unidentified *seicento* author, the word "*eremo*" is employed in a sarcastic reference to the Court itself as a form of "retreat" (*eremo*) that is, in its spiritual nature, ironically more like purgatory where one is forced to "purchase favour", and "do penitence for the errors of Christ". ASF Mediceo del Principato, MS 6424: "E' un eremo la Corte, ove é costretto / L'uom fra gli stenti a far di grazie acquisto; / Ove il digiun fra i meriti e il più accetto / Perchè con la vigilia è sempre misto. / E' un eremo ove l'uom semplice, e schietto / Fa penitenza degli erro del Cristo / Ove senza colpirsi il dorso, e il petto / Serve per Disciplina esser mal visto / E' un eremo ove l'uomo entra per sorte / Onor l'alletta, ambizion l'intriga, / E la vergogna al fin ve lo tien forte / Ma nell'Eremo il Santo è spesso in briga / Col Diavol suo nemico, e nella Corte / Un diavolo coll'altro si gastiga." As a term closely linked to Rosa's and his friend's anti-court (and pro-academy) position, the term "*eremo*" in the Met portrait may indicate a date for the painting to either Rosa's Florentine period or one of his many Volterran interludes.

philosopher but the physical space of unity – the antithesis of distance and separation – in which that identity is to be made and practiced.

Leaving aside the problem of the term "*Eremo*", Roworth's case for dating the work to about 1656 remains convincing on the basis of its iconographic resonance with the grim misfortune Rosa suffered that year, and with the consolatory *canzone*, "*Sotto rigida stella*," that Ricciardi dedicated to Rosa in an attempt to sympathize with and alleviate his sufferings.[43] Rosa had been forced to send his partner Lucrezia and son Rosalvo to Naples in an effort to flee judgment from the Church for their illegitimate relationship (Lucrezia was still married to another man); in the summer Rosa lost both his son and his brother Giuseppe to the plague, and in the autumn he also lost Giulio Maffei.[44] Ricciardi's poem is also a key to understanding the portrait and its intention as an embodiment of the reciprocation and unity expressed in friendship.[45] In a letter to his friend in July 1652, Rosa mentions a *canzone* that Ricciardi wrote for him, although he indicates that he does not yet have it in his hands.[46] Scholars have presumed that this is the "*Sotto rigida stella*" and have therefore dated it to this year, but Rosa makes no mention of the title of the poem itself.[47] In an

[43] Appendix II.1. Roworth's argument for dating the painting in connection with the poem is based on the poem's iconographic and thematic resonance with Rosa's *Umana Fragilitas* (and a set of preparatory drawings for that painting, dated to the mid-1650's) which also share the same melancholic imagery and specific features of the Met portrait, such as "an emphasis on the act of writing". Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 116-118.
[44] See Borelli, letters 200 and 201.
[45] Roworth has also suggested the influence of Ricciardi's *canzone* of on Rosa's "Genius" etching, where "Rosa portrayed the three aspects which Ricciardi had singled out [in his poem] – Painting, Poetry in the form of Satire, and Moral Philosophy, the embodiment of Rosa's manner." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 92.
[46] Borelli, letter 137: "La canzone, se me la manderete, mi sarà cara, perché è parto del vostro ingegno. Ma per dirvela con schiettezza, in sentir Cascina vien voglia di cacare non essendo soggetto questo da cantar fra i Volunii Bandinelli e Salvator Rosa." Borelli notes that Rosa's resentment must have been due to the fact that the *canzone* Ricciardi wrote for Pietro Cascina (*Epitalamio per le nozze del Sig. Cav.*[re]*: Cascina*, BNCF MS II IV 253, 151r-161v) had been published, while the one dedicated to him – and another one dedicated to Volunnio Bandinelli (BNCF MS Cod. Pal. 263) – remained unpublished.
[47] The date of the poem is uncertain. Roworth argues that it likely predates Rosa's Met portrait: "Scholars have assumed that Ricciardi's poem was written in 1652 on the basis of information contained in a letter Rosa wrote on July 6 1652, in which he mentioned an unidentified canzone Ricciardi had sent him." Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 117. Salerno and Wallace accepted the date of 1652. Festa believes it was composed in 1656 and that the one of 1652 was actually written for Ricciardi's friend Pietro Cascina, Gran Priore dei cavalieri di Santo Stefano in Pisa, on the occasion of his marriage. Festa, "Una redazione inedita," 194. Other evidence suggests Ricciardi composed it in 1656, a date that would also precede the *Umana Fragilitas* "to which it is connected circumstantially and iconographically." In the postscript of a letter dated August 12, 1656, in which Rosa

earlier letter of May 1651, Rosa refers to a certain "*Canzone dell'Amicitia*" (or "Poem on Friendship") which may also be considered a reference to Ricciardi's *canzone*.[48] This earlier passage was not noted by Roworth in her discussion, and if it is a reference to the same poem, it may indicate Rosa's awareness of it at a slightly earlier date. In a letter of 1656, Rosa refers to Ricciardi's *canzone* explicitly in the context of lamenting his son's death.[49] The first, certain mention that Rosa makes of the *canzone*, however, is in a letter of 1659, where he quotes directly from it.[50] Rosa referred to the poem again in two letters of 1661, and once more in 1666,[51] suggesting the enduring significance it held for him as an expression of his personal suffering and his friend's commiseration in it.

IV.4. Symbolic Self-Portraiture: The Self Performed in Paint

Attempts to identify the individual person represented in Rosa's portrait on the basis of physiognomic identification are inevitably misguided because of the way in which Rosa conceived of portraiture and self-portraiture. Rosa's portraits belong to a more pervasive type of image that blurred the line between personification and naturalistic representation (*ritrarre*), in which emblematic figures could easily be individualized to portray identifiable persons, or individuals slipped easily into symbolic roles.[52] While Roworth sees the melancholic iconography of the portrait as chronological evidence, in my own interpretation it reflects not merely a particular incident or moment in time but an essential and ever-present facet of his identity as a painter-

---

lamented his son's death and described himself as the most unfortunate man alive, he added: 'La Sua canzone è degno parte del vostro ingegno'. Borelli, letter 199; see Roworth, *ibid*, 117.

[48] Borelli, letter 100: "Mi son tutto rallegrato all'aviso che m'havete dato, ch'havete composto intorno alla Canzone dell'Amicitia, Per amor di Cristo, Ricciardi, lavorate adesso che siamo sani e vivi."

[49] Borelli, letter 199. See note 47 above.

[50] Borelli, letter 230: "Vi giuro che non veggo l'hora, ogni mese mi sembra un secolo, e sono così stufo di questa Babilonia, che partirei domani, se i vostri malanni lo permettessero, essendomi affatto smenchionato di quell'amico a cui voi dedicaste *Piango le mie miserie.*" The last line is taken from v. 1 of Ricciardi's *Sotto rigida stella*.

[51] Borelli, letters 242, 254 and 320. He may also make reference to the poem in an earlier letter of 1665 (letter 311) where the metaphor of a "shield against fate" recalls a similar motif in Ricciardi's poem.

[52] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 311.

philosopher or painter-poet – an identity, moreover, that by the *seicento* had become a highly self-conscious "character" for the artist to adopt and perform.[53] The "emblematic" nature of Rosa's portrait derives in large part from the visual sources on which it draws – especially Albrecht Dürer's 1514 engraving of *Melencolia I* [Fig. 149], the first image to offer a synthetic iconography of melancholy as an allegory.[54] Like many of Rosa's other self-images, the portrait for Ricciardi represents a "type" embraced by Rosa. As a gift for Ricciardi and a representation of Ricciardi's own profession, however, it is also a persona to be assumed and reiterated by Ricciardi himself.

Rosa's self-portraits are instruments of performance. They convey a vision of identity as a manipulable entity, staged in the service of representing ideal types and *personae* that he (and his friends) wished to embody.[55] External markers of identity are modified in order to convey an "idea" (or "ideal") of inner qualities and characteristics, allowing the sitter to make himself into the instrument of his own moral-philosophical message. In other words, Rosa's self-images present an image of "self" in terms of an abstract ideal, based upon (but not strictly reproductive of) the idiosyncratic or naturalistic features of unique individuality. As Salerno noted, Rosa devised an "allegorical" brand of portraiture, popular among classicist artists of the *seicento*, that was based on his own image and those of his acquaintances, and that was distinct from the "official" type taken up by his contemporaries.[56] In one of the few biographical anecdotes of Rosa's activity as a

[53] On the evolution of the "learned painter" or "painter-poet", as part of the early-modern artist's quest to be positioned among the liberal arts, see Lee, "Ut pictura poesis". The recommendation that the artist be "learned" in the fields of poetry and philosophy (among the other liberal arts) and is traceable to the ancient commentaries on the "*doctus poeta*" by the pseudo-Aristotle, Cicero, Quintillian and others, and was taken up again (in variying degrees of emphasis and interpretation) by the likes of Leonardo, Alberti, Lodovico Dolce, Giovan Paolo Lomazzo and their *seicento* followers, in the writings of which it becomes a standard trope.
[54] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 304. Dürer's print was fundamentally conceived as an allegory, personification or emblem, that is "*the image of* an abstract and impersonal notion symbolized in a human figure".
[55] Sybille Ebert-Schifferer has likewise interpreted Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi – like Rosa's other self-images – as a portrait "in guise". Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68.
[56] Salerno, "Immobilismo politico e accademia," *Storia dell'arte italiana* 6: I (1981): 469. Pietro Testa, for example, also took up an "allegorical" mode of self-representation. Cropper ed., *Pietro Testa*, 230. As Daprà has noted, Rosa is not to be placed in the professional category of "portraitist" occupied by many of his *seicento* colleagues. Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 58. Rosa did make some "*testaccie*" or portrait-heads in the early years of his second phase in Rome, examples of which may be represented by Figs. 55-58. Baldinucci also refers

"portraitist", an emphasis is placed on the artist's preference for altering features – indeed, even changing identities entirely – over striving for an accurate naturalism: when Rosa finally concedes to make a portrait for the ugly old inn-keeper Anna Gaetano, she is presented with a caricature of a hideous old man with a long beard.[57] If we read Rosa's portraits and self-portraits as "performance pieces," then identifying the figure in the Met portrait requires a change of interpretative trajectory. Rather than attempting to decipher his physiognomic identity as one or the other friend, we can turn instead to the character or allegorical ideal he represents: the melancholic poet-philosopher.[58] With

---

to a number of "*testaccie*" among the paintings Rosa made for Cordini, noting that they were done in the manner of "*pittori antichi*". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 564. For the *testaccie* that Rosa sent from Rome in 1651 to Luigi Lanfreducci and Pietro Pandolfini in Florence, see Borelli, letters 84, 86 and 92. Earlier, in 1650, Rosa sent Ricciardi two heads that De Rinaldis suggested might have been personifications of vices (letter 48) Other possible examples include the so-called *Diogenes* (Christie's; see Mahoney, *Drawings*, 364, fig. 31.12A), and the *Portrait of a Man* (New York, Thaw collection (*Salvator Rosa. Tra Mito e Magia*, 64, fig. 9). Rosa made a number of the drawings of heads that Ricciardi added to his collection. Mahoney, *ibid*, group 31. The *Portrait of Lucrezia* (c. 1656?, Palazzo Barberini, Rome) [Fig. 86] is one of the few extant portraits of other persons by the artist, and one that makes no apparent attempt at allegorization. The majority of Rosa's surviving autonomous figurative portrait paintings, however, have Rosa himself as their subject – indicative perhaps of an indifference or disinclination toward the commemoration or immortalization of others, with the exception of close friends. Daprà seems to agree with this hypothesis. See Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 58-9. Among the possible portraits of friends are the so-called *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* [Fig. 13] which Meroni proposed as a portrait of Agostino Chigi, and the *Portrait of a Man* [Fig. 57], which Meroni interpreted as a possible portrait of Giulio Maffei, partly on the basis of Rosa's descriptions of Giulio's large nose and in connection with a drawing that seems to represent the same figure. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 7-8. The *Portrait of Mr. Altham as a Hermit* (Bankes Collection, Kingston Lacy), formerly attributed to Rosa and included by Salerno in his catalogue of Rosa's paintings with a date to 1665, is now considered a self-portrait by Altham in the style of Rosa. Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 123, no. 38; Mahon, *Italian Art and Britain*, 20ff, no. 15; Montagu, "Edward Altham as a Hermit," in *England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J. B. Trapp*, ed. E. Chaney and P. Mack (Woodbridge, 1990), 271-282; and Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 22. A set of drawings, datable on stylistic grounds to c. 1666-70, indicate that Rosa may also have planned a set of portraits or self-portraits later in his career. Stolzenburg, *Salvator Rosa. Genie der Zeichnung*, 276-277, cat. 248-254; Mahoney, *Drawings*, group 82. Like Rosa's self-portraits, the "*testaccie*" appear to be "based" upon the real features of individual persons – either Rosa or his friends – and are better described as "*teste di fantasia*" than naturalistic portraits. Mahoney, *Drawings*, nos. 31.1-12. Michael Kitson referred to the Mahon portrait [Fig. 56] as a "*testa di fantasia*" based on Rosa's own facial features. Finaldi and Kitson ed., *Discovering the Italian Baroque. The Denis Mahon Collection* (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: National Gallery Publications, 1997), 144, cat. 67. A number of drawings by Rosa datable to the 1640's also offer portrait-like representations, but the features of these faces lack the idiosyncratic characteristics of truly individualized faces, or they repeat certain traits common among many of Rosa's historical personages, and thus appear to be more generic "types" for insertion into narrative subjects. Mahoney, *Drawings*, nos. 20.12-20.15, 25.10, and 26.8. The same idealization may be present in Rosa's portraits of Lucrezia, where the sitter is intended to embody an artistic or philosophical ideal: the allegories of *Music* and *Poetry* [Figs. 18 and 19], and the *Lucrezia as Poetry* [Fig. 11].

[57] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 480-481. Baldinucci also tells the tale of a similar prank Rosa pulled on one of his painter friends: in response to his "insolent" request for paintings, Rosa made – instead of a portrait of the client and his friends – four stooges, "who appeared more like beasts than men". Baldinucci, *ibid*, 483.

[58] On the iconographic tradition of the poet-philosopher, see Roland Kanz, *Dichter und Denker im Porträt. Spurengänge zur deutschen Porträtkultur des 18. Jahruhunderts* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1993).

this shift of focus, the need to establish an individual identity becomes essentially redundant: in his "role," the figure in the painting is a suitable representative of Rosa *and* Ricciardi.

Scholars have previously noted the "allegorical", "idealized" or "exaggerated" nature of Rosa's self-portraits, although they have expressed it in different ways.[59] Rosa's self-images are akin to the "allusive" brand of portraiture that Mark Roskill identifies as emerging in Van Dyck's production at the English court in the 1630's – a type of portraiture that, in contrast to the "codified symbolism" of traditional sixteenth-century portraiture, presents a more "suggestive" and "self-consciously directed quality to the gesture and gaze," and employs only a limited number of props as signals of character or profession.[60] Rosa's self-portraits also function in what Roskill describes as a process of "synecdoche": individually, they convey discrete and essential aspects of his

[59] Roworth argued that some of Rosa's self-images are best interpreted as "exaggerated," "idealized," or "allegorical" self-representations. Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 109-113. She suggests that the figure in the Met portrait may be a somewhat "exaggerated" or "idealized" self-representation of Rosa in his early forties. This aspect of idealization also features in other self-portraits by the artist in the 1640's, including the self-portrait in the Medici *Battle Scene* and the Uffizi *Self-portrait as an Artist*. She interpreted the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, too, as an "exaggerated self-idealization" in which the artist has altered elements of his own appearance – refining his "thick-featured, swarthy Neapolitan" features into "a more refined, ascetic type" – in order to convey his image as an "incensed painter-philosopher". Roworth, *ibid*, 113, 143. Salomon similarly considers Rosa's Met portrait as an "allegory": a "juxtaposition with other images of Rosa confirms that this is an allegorical painting and the features of the man are loosely based on Rosa's own." Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 494. Wallace interprets Rosa's mode of self-portrayal as an essentially symbolic form of representation, identifying another two of the artist's self-images – the etching of *The "Genius" of Salvator Rosa* (c. 1660-64) [Fig. 99] and the frontispiece for the *Figurine* series of etchings [Fig. 90a] – as "idealized allegorical self-portraits". On the "*Genius*", see Wallace, "The Genius of Salvator Rosa," *Art Bulletin* 47 (1965): 471-480, and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 69ff. On the *Figurine*, see Wallace, *Etchings*, 85.

[60] Roskill, "Van Dyck at the English Court: The Relations of Portraiture and Allegory", *Critical Inquiry* 14: 1 (1987): 199. Roskill identifies two types of allegorical portraiture: "masque" portraits and "allusive" portraits: the first depicts the sitter "as if taking part in a contemporary masque, or allegorically-oriented stage performance" and employs "specific emblematic references or devices" in order to convey character; the second offers a more "general and diffused kind of allusion to a way of life and type of character, enforced by telling touches and details of an exemplifying kind." Roskill, *ibid*, 186-7. Rosa's interest in this brand of portraiture – defined by "a simple and essential language of the most private and intimate *affetti* of the person depicted" – may have been inspired, at least in part, by the opposition it posed to the official portraiture favoured by the Medici court, represented above all by the Flemish Medici court-portraitist Justus Sustermans (1597-1681). Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 61; see Mina Gregori, "Qualche riflessione sul ritratto fiorentino," in *L'Anima e il Volto*: *ritratto e fisiognomica da Leonardo a Bacon*, ed. Flavio Caroli (Milan: Electa, 1998), 535-538. But he may have been inspired by aspects of that earlier tradition – not its ideals of beauty or Mannerist brand of stylization – but its more general appeal to an "ideal" form of figural representation, as well as the diverse repertoire of embodied "roles" or types that it offered. See John Shearman, *Mannerism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967), esp. 38, 53; Cropper, *Pontormo. Portrait of a Halberdier* (Los Angeles: Getty Museum, 1997), 87-89 and *passim*. The allegorical mode of portraiture was also popular among many of Rosa's Florentine colleagues, including Cesare Dandini, Francesco Furini and Lorenzo Lippi. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence," 191-2.

character; collectively, they form a composite, multifaceted identity – well-suited to Rosa's aspiration to be recognized as a complex and multi-talented *virtuoso*.[61] They express a vision of the self as a malleable and compound construct, capable of being fashioned into various forms and divided into multiple components – a performative conception of selfhood that was particularly vital to Rosa during his early years, when most of his extant self-portraits were made: Rosa as painter and satirist, as in the case of the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* [Fig. 16]), Rosa as the Stoic moral-philosopher, in the case of the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10], Rosa as an actor, in the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15], or Rosa as a soldier (or actor-as-soldier), in the *Battle Scene* [Fig. 9b] and the two *Self-Portraits as a Soldier* [Figs. 12 and 13], for example. Interpreting Rosa's self-images as "roles" or "performances" offers a more theoretically appropriate category for understanding both their physiognomic variance and their symbolic nature, which are both explained by a conscious decision on his part to shape his appearance in the service of adopting a persona.[62] As allegories, they also participate in the more pervasive didactic, moral-philosophical agenda that informs the rest of Rosa's pictorial and textual *oeuvre*, and his adherence to the classicist ideal.[63]

---

[61] Roskill, "Van Dyck at the English Court," 197.

[62] On the inherent "dramatism" of allegory, which seems to "act out" its message and beckon the viewer's interpretation, see Agoston, "Giotto, de Man and the Allegorical Impulse in Michelangelo", in *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, ed. Baskins, 28.

[63] On the didactic function of allegory, see Fletcher, *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*, 121. On metaphor and rhetoric as modes of knowledge, see Paul De Man, "The Epistemology of Metaphor", *Critical Inquiry* 5: 1 (1978): 13-30; and David N. Livingstone and Richard T. Harrison, "Meaning Through Metaphor: Analogy As Epistemology", in *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 71: 1 (1981): 95 -107. Rosa's interest in allegory is in keeping with the broader early-modern love of "inter-referentiality" and enigma, and its vision of allegory as a "privileged instrument of humanistic knowledge". Murray Krieger, "Poetic Presence and Illusion: Renaissance Theory and the Duplicity of Metaphor," *Critical Inquiry* 5: 4 (1979): 600; Lisa Rosenthal, "Venus's Milk and the Temptations of Allegory in Otto Van Veen's 'Allegory of Temptation'," in *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, ed. Baskins, 222; Brittan, *Poetry, Symbol and Allegory*, 42. It also expresses Rosa's impulse toward the decidedly linguistic and rhetorical form of expression in which he excels, and his propensity toward devising novel and unique iconography. The figurative inclination of allegory made it a natural mode for self-portraiture, and Rosa's self-images indeed function as personifications of his ideals. See Bloomfield ed., *Allegory, Myth and Symbol* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 26. In keeping with his more general interest in classicist art theory, and his aspiration for inclusion in its ranks, Rosa likely subscribed to the classicist ideal of portraiture in which the idea takes precedence over all else. Lomazzo recommended in his *Trattato* (Milan, 1585) that idealization and emphasis of certain facial features be pursued as a vehicle for

Some of Rosa's self-portraits are performative in a literal sense, participating as they do in the long-standing tradition of the portrait "in-guise", a genre mastered most famously by Rembrandt.[64] These images are performative in their conception of identity as a socially-dependent and reputational entity, a phenomenon outlined in the context of early-modern portraiture by Michael Fried, Harry Berger Jr., Patricia Simons, Richard Brilliant, and Elizabeth Cropper, among others, who locate the identities produced in portraiture within a requisite dimension of audience conception and reception.[65] In the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello*, for example, Rosa shows himself in the dress of an actor portraying a character, an identity that was socially ratified by both the theatrical audience (here duplicated by the viewer of the painting) and the fellow actors of Rosa's private academy. Also performative – but in a rather different way – are the two, earlier witness self-portraits in the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* and the Palazzo Pitti *Battle Scene* which both express a "self" dependent upon the court.[66] The self-referential figure in the *Philosophers' Grove*,

---

asserting the essence and true inner character of the sitter – physiognomy was to be selected and fashioned in the service of conveying an ideal identity. He endorsed *ritratto intellettuale* (over *ritratto naturale*), in which artist's "idea" (*concetto*) of the person depicted took precedence over the finitudes of their actual appearance. Freedman, "The Concept of Portraiture in Art Theory of the Cinquecento," *Zeitschrift für Äesthetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 32 (1987): 77-8; see Barocchi, *Scritti d'arte del cinquecento*, I: 975-976, 2741-2742, 2748; Lomazzo, *Trattato dell' arte della pittura, scultura et architetettura*, 430-8. In Rosa's portraits, the physical characteristics of actual persons are secondary to the philosophical concepts and ideals they endeavour to act out.

[64] Rembrandt's self-images are informed by a more general theatrical approach to painting: his method of teaching history painting, and of acquiring naturalism, involved students "performing" as characters from the text to be painted, an idea that Montanari considers may also have informed Bernini's self-images and their repetition by students in his own academy of painting. Alpers, *Rembrandt's Enterprise. The Studio and the Market* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Montanari, *Bernini Pittore*, 40-41.

[65] See Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality. Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); *idem* "Thoughts on Caravaggio", *Critical Inquiry* 24: 1 (1997): 13-56; Berger, "Fictions of the Pose: Facing the Gaze of Early-Modern Portraiture", *Representations* 46 (1994): 89-90; *idem*, *Fictions of the pose: Rembrandt against the Italian Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000); Simons, "Portraiture, Portrayal, and Idealization," 264; *idem*, "Homosociality and erotics in Italian Renaissance Portraiture," 31; Brilliant, *Portraiture*, 128; Cropper, *Pontormo. Portrait of a Halberdier*, 1, 81. These scholars' theories stem in large part from the social historian Erving Goffman's analysis of daily life as a dramatic experience. Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 1959.

[66] The two witness self-portraits in the *Battle* and the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* present a "self" that is at once independent and self-assured and submissive toward the social context of the court for its very existence and enactment. In the *Battle*, the young soldier-artist ducks down behind his shield, safe from the chaotic scuffle that surrounds him; he is positioned directly below and behind the commander of the Christian troops (perhaps a "prophetic portrait" of the newly born prince Cosimo III). In this sense, the inscription "SARO'" conveys Rosa's "survival" in terms of his courtly dependency – particularly at this stage in his career. The self-portrait in the *St.*

engaged in conversation with "academic" friends [see Figs. 12a-c], likewise reveals an explicit concern with reputation and identity as reflected in the eyes of one's contemporaries – here, in the "free" social setting of intellectual community.[67] In these and other images, Rosa becomes an actor within his own work as much as its creator.

The preparatory drawings for the Met portrait also suggest the allegorical intention of the final image. In certain of these sketches, particularly the earliest in the set [Figs. 74-79], the figure's face is more of a "type" – inspired by Rosa's (if not Ricciardi's) own features – than a highly individualized visage.[68] The allegorical nature of the portrait is also suggested by a clearly related drawing [Fig. 79] that repeats almost identically the composition of the final canvas: a figure seen in three-quarter view writes on a skull perched atop a parapet, with head bent in melancholic demeanor; here, however, the young man in the other drawings has been replaced with a young woman, whose gender clearly signals Rosa's allegorical intent.[69]

Ricciardi's inventory also suggests the painting's early conception as an allegory. In addition to the "large painting of a philosopher writing on a skull," there is also a "portrait of Sig. Dottore Giovan Battista without a frame," an identification that suggests a distinction was made (either by Ricciardi's family or the notary) between portraits and characters or types.[70] On other occasions the notary differentiates unambiguously between "*ritratti*" (portraits) and the many

---

Thomas shows the artist eager to assert his presence and talents at an early stage of his career, but fully cognizant of his reliance upon Brancaccio and his circle of dependents for making contacts with other potential clients.

[67] The London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, with its conspicuously erudite inscription, also expresses Rosa's anxiety "to represent himself as worthy of [the] company" of his new group of learned Florentine friends. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa in Florence," 190; also see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 249-251.

[68] Mahoney, *Drawings*, 471-6. It is worth noting here Mahoney's own vacillation between identifying these drawings as "studies for a self-portrait" or as generic "figures".

[69] On the requisite female gender of allegorical personification, see James J. Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 173. Rosa adheres to the tradition of female personification in many of his images, as in the allegories of *Music* and *Poetry*, the *Peace Burning the Arms of War*, the *Justice*, the two allegories of *Fortune*, and various representations of *Pittura*.

[70] "Un quadro grande con cornice di albero bianche dipintovi un filosofo che scrive sopra una testa di morto". Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 95, inventory, 180. "Il ritratto del Sig. D.re Gio. Batta senza cornice". Meroni, *ibid*, 93, inventory, 179.

"*teste*" or "heads" of philosophers, saints and unidentified figures.[71] If the Met portrait was considered a physiognomic portrait of Ricciardi himself then it is hard to imagine it would not have been identified as such[72] – particularly if there was another "portrait" of Ricciardi in the same collection. The classification of the painting in the inventory as a "philosopher" writing on a skull suggests it was probably described as such by Ricciardi himself.

Humorology and Physiognomy: A Portrait of the "Melancholic" Poet-Philosopher

Humorological and physiognomic theory played important roles in Rosa's allegorical self-images, where he fashioned his natural facial features in order to enhance aspects of his character. An ancient tenet of the doctrine of humorology states that, while the individual is governed by one primary temperament which is determined both astrologically on the date of birth as well as diagnosed by physiological traits that predominate in the organs, he or she is also comprised of the other three temperaments in various quantities, and that these other constituents rise and fall as the result of various causes.[73] Thus, the melancholic can at times experience the rise of his choleric, phlegmatic, or sanguine proclivities. Rosa's epistolary comments reveal his faith in this doctrine. In his letters, the frequent reference to his "bilious" nature emerges as an intrinsic component of his identity and his practice, capable of spurring him to irate bouts of anger (thus submitting to his "choleric" proclivities toward rage) and also capable of plunging him into moments of ponderous "phlegmatic" contemplation (in which his natural "melancholia" predominates) that are alternatively creative and destructive. The "choleric" inclination of the bilious complexion is featured in Rosa's London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* and (perhaps) the Siena *Self-portrait as a Soldier*, in which Rosa's choleric humor overtakes his natural melancholia and manifests itself as

---

[71] Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 95, inventory, 180
[72] Roworth made the same observation. Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 105.
[73] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 9.

the source of quick-tempered irritability and perceptive ingenuity,[74] while its "phlegmatic" proclivity may be detected in the Met portrait, where the melancholic is overcome with a calm, meditative mood.

The melancholic humor predominates in Rosa's comments.[75] On certain occasions, he discusses his melancholia directly in connection with "disease" – that is, as the cause of physiological and mental suffering – an idea fully in keeping with one ancient line of thinking.[76] He emphasizes in particular his "hypochondria", a term that Rosa also employs in reference to Ricciardi's melancholic proclivities – an important instance of their affinity.[77] On other occasions, however, Rosa touts his melancholic temperament as an intrinsic and positive feature of his creativity. His creative practice offers occasional relief from his afflictions.[78] The mental and physical detriments of melancholia are also *required* by his "bilious" spirit in order to create: the same "abundance" of bile that Rosa laments as the source of his physical affliction is also the source of his fiery, vitriolic righteousness and inventive freedom: his mind is "all bile, all spirit, all fire!", bringing him "to say diabolical things" in his satirical poetry.[79] Rosa's comment on this last matter suggests that he regards his bilious, predominantly melancholic humor as a potentially

---

[74] Galen argued that yellow bile produced "quick-tempered" men and made the soul "more irritable", producing "keen perceptions and wit." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 61-63. The choleric temperament was also historically associated with acuteness and ingeniousness. *Ibid*, 62. In these images Rosa may have been inspired by the late-medieval typology of the four temperaments in which the "choleric man" is depicted as an armed warrior drawing his sword with a grimaced facial expression. *Ibid*, 295.

[75] Among a number of Rosa's statements regarding his "melancholic" humor is a comment in a letter to Ricciardi in 1654, where Rosa praises their friend Giulio Maffei for being, like himself, "one of those men of the age of Saturn". Borelli, letter 174: "poiché questo veramente si può chiamare un di quegl'huomini del secol di Saturno".

[76] After Pseudo-Soranus, melancholia was coloured by its association with "disease," that is the negative traits of being crafty, avaricious, despondent, misanthropic and timid. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 65.

[77] For Rosa's references to his melancholic "hypochondria", or other ill-effects of the humor, see Borelli, letters 132, 158, 221, 276 and 285. For his references to Ricciardi's own melancholia, see letters 119, 132 and 245. The melancholic was considered distinctively phobic, eccentric and obsessive. Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 50. Importantly, Rosa's final illness, recounted by Rosa's friend Francesco Baldovini in 1693 and published by Baldinucci in his biography of Rosa, was described as "dropsy", an illness closely associated (along with hypochondria) with melancholia by the tenth-century ACE Arabic astrologer Alcabitius (al-Qabisi) (d. 967). Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 467-8; Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 131.

[78] Borelli, letter 288: "Ho fatti due altri rami grandi … A suo tempo ve l'invierò. E questi sono i miei trattenimenti, essendo divenuto di maniera malinconica, che ne ho pietà me medesimo."

[79] Borelli, letter 178: "Ma torniamo a noi. Da sì fatte indegnità argomentate come possa stare l'animo d'un vostro amico tutto bile, tutto spirito, tutto fuoco!" Also letter 174, in the following note below.

unwieldy and even irrational source of inspiration that required mastery in order to be wielded with a positive outcome: informing Ricciardi about his satire *L'Invidia*, Rosa proclaims his ability to "restrain" his "bilious" proclivity, which – when given too much free reign – could possibly land him in hot water.[80] But Rosa also considered himself capable of "phlegmatic" calm: despite Ricciardi's inexplicable inability to return his letters, Rosa says he will nonetheless keep calm ("*haver flemma*") "in spite of my nature, which does not lack the bile to know how to lament it [*dolere*]".[81]

Rosa also looked to the established physiognomic code in the service of producing not truth in physiognomy but performance *through* physiognomic truth. His interest in physiognomy and its less serious cousin, caricature, is clear from a series of drawings that are clearly inspired by a curiosity about Leonardo's work in both fields, as well as by the vocabulary of emphatic gestures and facial expressions that populate Rosa's pictorial *oeuvre*.[82] His interest in the science of

---

[80] Borelli, letter 174: "Vi do nuova come di già ho dato fine alla mia ultima satira dell'Invidia la quale son sicuro che vi darà nel humore, havendo forse trattato questa materia con più amenità di quello che vi potete imaginare, e forse più soda dell'altre quattro; a suo tempo ne sentirete lo scoppio, assicurandovi che i miei nemici questa volta haveranno carestia di parole tutto che mi sia contenuto straordinariamente nella parte dell'agricomico e mitigata la bile che mi portava a dir cose diaboliche; tant'è l'huomo da bene non può né sa far le vendetta nella maniera che fa il tristo."

[81] Borelli, letter 287: "Io non so più che cosa mi debba credere circa questo vostro così ostinato tacere, il quale incomincia a passare il segno della rimessione. Vi prometto d'haver flemma ad onta della mia natura, alla quale non manca bile da sapersi dolere." Rosa elsewhere uses "*flemma*" to refer to a requisite stolidity and calm. See Borelli, letters 26, 53, 119.

[82] Mahoney, *Drawings*, nos. 10.9, 20.12, and 17.4 (attributed). The recent book of drawings attributed to Rosa (Perelli, Bragaglia and Grossi eds, *Salvator Rosa. L'uomo, l'artista, l'antesignano*), which contains a number of Leonardo-like physiognomic sketches, has been questioned by Stolzenburg who considers the drawings to date to the nineteenth century. Stolzenburg, "Anmerkungen zu einem neuen Oeuvre-Katalog der Zeichnungen Salvator Rosas" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference, 2009); also see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 43, note 37, who suggests that Rosa may have owned the book of sketches, even if he did not make them himself. Baldinucci describes a book of eighty drawings by Rosa, owned by the marquis Donato Maria Guadagni, that contained, among other things, "teste fatte di caricature, o come noi sogliamo dire, di colpi caricati." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 480. Baldinucci also refers to the caricatures ("painted satires") that Rosa made of his friends. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 483. Among Rosa's caricatures there is an amusing drawing of his friend Reginaldo Sgambati [Fig. 42], a drawing dedicated to Niccolò Simonelli [Fig. 3a] and a sketch of *Three small male figures crawling up the nose of a bearded man* [Fig. 45], which is tempting to link with Rosa's mocking comments concerning the large size of Giulio Maffei's nose. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 203-4, no. 10.9; also nos. 25.15, 28.6 and 36.6; see Borelli, letters 34, 43, 57, 58, 70, 82, 97 and 138. The elusive painting of *Invidia* that Rosa refers to in his letters of the early 1650's (see Borelli, letters 174, 179, 182, and Rosa, *L'Invidia*, vv. 499-507) may, Roworth suggests, have been intended as "some kind of satiric cartoon or painting to silence his ene-

physiognomy may have been partly inspired by the teachings of the Stoics who drew a close connection between external appearance and inner character, a primary concern in both the study of physiognomy and rhetoric.[83] Seneca the Younger, one of Rosa's favourites, had discussed the issue at length in his letters and essays.[84] (His name was initially included in the Met portrait – a point I will return to later.) In formulating his painted "selves", Rosa likely found inspiration in the recommendations of physiognomic treatises or commentaries on the *affetti* that aligned certain facial proportions, expressions and gestures with characters and temperaments.[85] The *Della fisonomia dell'uomo* (1586) by Rosa's fellow Neapolitan Giambattista della Porta was the pre-eminent text on the subject in the *seicento* and it found a particular popularity among Neapolitan artists.[86] Della Porta's book assembled much of the earlier and ancient literature on the subject, combining the insights of astrology, humorology and nascent physiological medicine in order to promote physiognomy as a science based in natural principles.[87] The physical variance detectable in Rosa's self-images may result from an incorporation of Della Porta's observations on physiognomy and humorology which Rosa adopted in the service of producing a self-representative but idealized "character". Other artists had previously altered their appearance in subtle or dramatic ways in order to convey a specific self-conception.[88] Like his contemporaries, Rosa was interested

---

mies." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 167-172. A painting has recently been connected with this lost (and perhaps never actually executed) work. See *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 132, cat. 21.
[83] Elizabeth C. Evans, "A Stoic Aspect of Senecan Drama: Portraiture", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* LXXXI (1950): 169.
[84] Seneca, *Epistles*, 95. 65-69; Evans, "A Stoic Aspect of Senecan Drama," 171-2.
[85] Various scholars have noted Rosa's interest in Della Porta's physiognomic theory. See Horak, in *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 138, cat 25; Delphine Fitz Darby, "Ribera and the Wise Men," *Art Bulletin* 44: 4 (1962): 304; Rak, "Cade il mondo," 89; Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 54; and Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 43.
[86] Luca Giordano's self-portraits, for example, also show an interest in Della Porta's writings on physiognomy. Giuseppe Galasso, in *Luca Giordano: 1634-1705*, 88, cat. 7.
[87] Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, chapter XIII, 86. He stressed in particular the Platonic notion of a correspondence between animals and humans. Della Porta looked primarily to Aristotle's *Physiognomy*, Polemon's *Physiognomy*, and the writings of the ancient Roman physician Galen, among others. For a survey of the ancient and early-modern texts on physiognomy, see Simon Swain ed., *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul. Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
[88] Albrecht Dürer, for example (a shining example of Greenblatt's "manipulable, artful" self-fashioners) was capable of "styl[ing] himself as lover or as Italian gentleman" or "as Christ and as Adam, celebrating all the while

in the potentialities of psychological insight offered by physiognomic variation, and in exploring how those rules might be shaped in the service of conveying an ideal persona.

Passeri offers a picture of the "real" Rosa, noting in particular the artist's swarthy complexion, dark and lively eyes, and thick black hair curling down to his shoulders.[89] These features are corroborated for the most part by the only contemporary portrait of the artist, executed by Giovanni Battista Bonacina in 1662 [Fig. 131], which Ricciardi praised as "engraved by divinity" but which Rosa found unsatisfactory.[90] The engraving shows the same slightly protruding eyes, pursed lips (the upper lip protruding slightly over the bottom), large hooked nose, sharply

---

his own capacity to mold himself in whatever manner he chooses". Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art*, 67. Michelangelo, too, altered the features of his face and body to varying degrees in order to "embody" the biblical personages of St. Bartholomew and Nicodemus. See Marcia Hall, "Michelangelo's Last Judgment: Resurrection of the Body and Predestination," *Art Bulletin* 58: 1 (1976): 85-92; Jane Kristof, "Michelangelo as Nicodemus: The Florence Pieta," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 20: 2 (1989): 163-182; and Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," 86-113. And Rembrandt, the paragon of painted self-modification, produced more self-portraits "in guise" than any other artist, altering the appearance of his own face with the contortions of facial expression and the variations of light and shadow in order to convey a particular persona, temperament, or attitude. See Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*; and Berger, *Fictions of the Pose.* Many early-modern artists preoccupied with self-portrayal have done the same: the self-portraits of Anthony Van Dyck, Gianlorenzo Bernini, and Luca Giordano, for example, show the broader appeal of physical modification in the practice in self-portraiture. On Van Dyck's self-portraits, see Brown et al., *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*, 94 (cat. 1), 164 (cat. 31), 244 (cat. 66), and 298 (cat. 88); Gustav Glück, "Self-Portraits by Van Dyck and Jordaens Self-Portraits by Van Dyck and Jordaens," *Burlington Magazine* 65: 380 (1934): 195-201; and R. R. Wark, "A Note on Van Dyck's 'Self-Portrait with a Sunflower'," *Burlington Magazine* 98: 635 (1956): 53-54. Bernini subtly varies his physiognomy and expression to suit particular temperaments and characters: his various self-portraits have been described by Tomaso Montanari as "ferocious" (leonine), "melancholic," and "speaking". Montanari, *Bernini Pittore*, 94, cats. 1-6. Giordano portrays himself as an alchemist, a philosopher, an artist, a gentleman or courtier, and a nobleman, and presents a visage that alternates between pensive melancholia and haughty self-confidence. See *Luca Giordano: 1634-1705*. Exhibition catalogue (Naples: Electa, 2001), 73 and cats. 6, 7, 22, 50, 61a, 61b, 103, and 104; also see Oreste Ferrari and Giuesppe Scavizzi, *Luca Giordano. Opera Completa* (Naples: Electa, 1992), I and II, 14, 82, 144, 175, 248, 253, 255, 266, 285, 303, 308, 322, 331, 332, 342, 350, 356, 394, 395, 400, 405, 477, 524, 572, 633, 706, and 740. Giordano's Macclesfield *Self-portrait* (c. 1650-53) [Fig. 151] is particularly noteworthy: here he is shown as a philosopher-astrologer holding a horoscope diagram with the phrase: "meglio è morir con li amici, che viver fra li inimici".

[89] Passeri, *Vite*, 436-7: "Salvatore fu di presenza curiosa, perche essendo di statura mediocre, mostrava nell'abilità della vita qualche sveltezza, e leggiadria, assai bruno di colore nel viso, ma di una brunezza Africana, che non era dispiacevole; gli occhi suoi erano turchini, ma vivaci a gran segno, di capelli negri e folti, i quali gli scendevano sopra le spalle ondeggianti; vestiva galante, ma non alla cortigiana, senza gale, e superfluità."

[90] Borelli, letter 280: "In quanto alle lodi del ritratto, e che v'habbia ispirato in dire ch'è intagliato per divinità: questa non è l'opinione né mia, né degl'altri che di questo mestiere s'intendono. Ond'io concludo che voi non havete ancor veduto come si fanno i ritratti a bollino in questo nostro secolo, e però vi compatisco. Il Bonascina intagliatore d'esso non è in Roma; subito ritornato, farò far la cosa delle lettere, e manderò l'altro che mi chiedete. Del suo modo d'operare, ho sentiti i medesimi ragguagli, ma non ho visto per mancamento di mia poca curiosità; procurerò di vederlo quanto prima." Rosa's displeasure may have expressed more a contempt for Bonacina's talents and the threat he posed as the author of his identity, rather than any actual deficiency in Bonacina's verisimilitude.

angled eyebrows, sloped forehead, prominent cheekbones, groomed moustache, and long, dark curly hair that recur – in varying form – in many of Rosa's self-portraits. In these images, Rosa altered and emphasized certain of his own physical characteristics with subtle variations in order to convey the different facets of his identity (in particular the role of the inspired, incensed and melancholic poet-philosopher) according to Della Porta's code.

Michael Mahoney has argued that, in studying his own face in the mirror, Rosa "probably absorbed his own features into his general repertoire of facial types" and that the "large-nosed, broad-browed, and wide-eyed faces" that populate his pictorial works "should not be construed as a consistent, or perhaps even conscious, attempt at self-portraiture."[91] I argue, however, that these specific features were cultivated and exaggerated by Rosa in order to promote the ideal of the melancholic poet-philosopher through his own resemblance to Della Porta's "melancholic" man. The hooked or aquiline nose, for example, that appears to have been a naturally-occurring feature of Rosa's appearance (as indicated in Bonacina's portrait) is a frequent characteristic in his self-portraits where it may have been exaggerated or highlighted in order to emphasize the association Della Porta made between a "hooked and aquiline nose" and a "magnanimous and regal spirit."[92] [Fig. 150] The forehead and brow also feature prominently in Rosa's paintings, reflective perhaps of their particular significance in physiognomic theory.[93] Charles Le Brun noted in his *Traité des Passions* (1696) that the "brow is the part of the face from which the passions can be best known … which permit an understanding of both nature and the agitation [of the spirit]." Eyebrows lowered

---

[91] Mahoney, *Drawings*, 360.

[92] Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 258-61. Magnanimity is an important characteristic of the autonomous identity Rosa desired to project, a subject that I explore in greater detail in chapter five.

[93] An entire branch of physiognomy, known as metoposcopy, was devoted to the reading of the lines and marks of the forehead. See for example Girolamo Cardano's *Metoposcopia* (Paris, 1658), and Ciro Spontoni's *La metoposcopia, overo comensuratione delle linee della fronte* (Venice, 1626). For a list of publications on the subject, see Alberto Arecchi ed., *Girolamo Cardano. Metoposcopia. Manuale per la lettura della fronte* (Milan: Mimesis, 2003), 7-10. Other related fields included chiromancy (palm-reading), on which Della Porta also wrote a book: *Della Chriofisonomia del Signor Gio. Battista della Porta Napolitano, libro primo*, *Tradotto da un Manoscritto Latino dal Sig. Pompeo Sarnelli, Dottor dell'una e l'altra Legge*, in Della Porta, *De Ea Naturalis Physiognomoniae Parte Quae Ad Manum Lineas Spectat Libri duo*, ed. Oreste Trabucco (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2003).

toward the middle indicate "distress."[94] In Rosa's witness self-portrait in the Pitti *Battle Scene*, the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, and the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello*, the figure's eyebrows appear almost conjoined,[95] a feature that Della Porta considered a sign of the melancholic man.[96] Rosa's eyebrows are prominent and dark, a sign of firmness and constancy according to Della Porta, but never thick, a feature associated with a propensity toward vice, poor character, and with traits ranging from betrayal and treachery to arrogance, pridefulness and dissimulation.[97] In the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, the two versions of the *Self-Portrait as a Soldier*, and the allegorical portrait of *Lucrezia as Poetry* [Fig. 11], the figure's brow is sharply furrowed. For Della Porta, eyebrows arched toward the nose signaled an austere and acerbic personality, while the furrowed brow was associated with nobility.[98] Both Aristotle and the twelfth-century philosopher Avveroes had explicitly linked the "*faccia rugosa*" (the "furrowed" or "wrinkled" face) with the melancholy man, explaining it as a result of his physiological "dryness".[99] For Della Porta, to lower the brow was also to signal annoyance, an interpretation fully in keeping with Rosa's desire to convey the sharp and infuriated satirical spirit of his self-conceived identity as a painter-philosopher. Indeed, Volpi has interpreted the facial expression in Rosa's London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* in connection with a line in his satire *Il Tirreno*: "I jest with the Thyrsus, and threaten with the eyebrow".[100]

---

[94] Le Brun, *Traité des Passions*, as cited in Flavio Caroli, *Storia della Fisognomica. Arte e psicologia da Leonardo a Freud* (Milan: Electa, 2004), 100-102. The *Traité* was based on academic lectures from 1667 onward.
[95] In the self-portrait in the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* and the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* the eyebrows are more clearly separated.
[96] Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 234.
[97] *Ibid*, 239, 235. On the connection between *superbia* (pride), *audacia* (audacity) and the identities of early-modern artists or poets, see Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," 91.
[98] Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 229-31.
[99] *Ibid*, 295.
[100] *Il Tirreno*, v. 108: "Scherzai col Tirso, e minaccai col ciglio"; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 35, 44 note 70. The slight squint of the eyes in Rosa's *Self-portrait*, which may result only from the frown of the brow, could also have been inspired by Della Porta's observation that "Eyes that close directly, are moist and of good size, are gleaming, and with smooth lids" signal a shy person "of good counsel, studious, erudite, and of a very caring nature". (Della Porta, *ibid,* 597)

Other features of Rosa's self-images can perhaps be interpreted according to Della Porta's code. The slightly longer proportions of the facial features in some of Rosa's self-images – especially those of the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, the Met portrait for Ricciardi, and the Detroit version of the *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* – may originate in Della Porta's claim that longer faces express abusive and violent personalities.[101] The broad cheeks evident in a number of Rosa's self-images, particularly prominent in the *Self-Portrait as a Soldier*, are associated by Della Porta with loquaciousness and irritability,[102] two important features of Rosa's satirical persona. The penetrating stare that characterizes the paired London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* and the Hartford *Lucrezia as Poetry*, and which also appears in the Siena and Detroit *Self-Portraits as a Soldier*, was associated by Della Porta with a troubled or agitated state of mind.[103] The extremely short, thick, stiff and slightly darker hair of the figures in the two *Self-Portraits as a Soldier*, which contrasts dramatically with the longer, softer, wavier hair seen in Rosa's other self-images, reflects Della Porta's appraisal of tough, thick hair as a sign of strength and his assessment of dark hair as a sign of astuteness, a violent spirit and, again, melancholia.[104] The thin-lipped frown of the philosopher in Rosa's London *Self-Portrait* may also refer to more than just the counsel of silence professed in the painting's inscription: according to Della Porta, a large mouth with thin lips that turn down at the corners demonstrates "strength of spirit, magnanimity and nobility" since they recall leonine features.[105] The downturned frown of the figure's mouth in Rosa's painting also seems to take a cue from Della Porta's association between smiling and effusiveness: "those

[101] Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 294.
[102] *Ibid*, 299.
[103] *Ibid*, 582.
[104] *Ibid*, 645, 668-9.
[105] *Ibid*, 303. Noting the symbolic significance of closed lips in connection with silence, Della Porta also points to their association with intelligence and prudence – in opposition to the open mouth that represents loquaciousness, slow-wittedness, ignorance, cruelty and even impiousness. *Ibid*, 312-15.

without much to say," he says "do not smile often", and those who smile in moderation are perceived as stable, intelligent, and even friendly.[106]

Della Porta's descriptions of the melancholic's physical attributes (along with those of his ancient sources) frequently read almost like descriptions of Rosa himself: according to Archigenes of Apamea, for example, the melancholic had "dark skin, puffiness, bad odor, greed coupled with permanent leanness, depression, misanthropy, suicidal tendencies, true dreams, fears, visions, and abrupt transitions from hostility, pettiness and avarice, to sociability and generosity."[107] Leaving aside the "bad odor" and any seriously considered "suicidal tendencies" (although Rosa was often prone to dramatic statements that verge on this inclination),[108] the rest of these characteristics seem uncannily familiar. Rosa was naturally swarthy with protruding eyes, had a conflicted sense of avarice and charity and a particular talent for holding grudges, and was even by his own admission subject to visions: "the most beastly impulses come into my head," he wrote to Ricciardi in 1652

[106] *Ibid*, 338. The "loquacious man", by contrast, is described as handsome, hairy-chested, continuously shouting, with large and straight ears, a straight nose that is large in the middle, with long cheeks, a long beard, a hoarse throat, and delicate and twisted hands with long fingers, and a face the colour of an apple. He has a swollen chest and breathes like someone who has been running." *Ibid*, 907. Certain of Della Porta's descriptions of "types" of persons may also have appealed to Rosa in devising his characters. The London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* for example has the "austere face, clouded forehead, long eyebrows, gleaming eyes, and long nose" of the "Daring man" ("*l'uomo audace*"), who is likened to the bull. *Ibid*, 805. Della Porta's "Melancholic man" also shares a set of physical and behavioural characteristics with Rosa's self-images: those most prone to melancholia were "thin, dark, hairy and large-veined," with bulging eyes and large lips, inclined toward irritability, sedition and envy, but also timidity, stinginess and astute intelligence. *Ibid*, 76. Della Porta explains that the melancholic's skin is dark in colour, because "the melancholic humor runs through the skin," and hairy from "an abundance of excrement." Indeed, the slight protrusion of the eyes that recurs in Rosa's self-portraits, in variation, was physiologically associated by Galen with the melancholic temperament. *Ibid*, 532. The "Melancholic" was also a "friend of silence" (the most salient feature of Rosa's London *Self-Portrait*), a "man of few words, because of his cold temperament". Della Porta is citing from Giovanni da Milano's twelfth-century *Regimen sanitatis*. Silence is also an attribute of Ripa's personification of *Malinoconia*. Ripa, *Iconologia*, 261-2. According to Della Porta, the "melancholic" also preferred to be alone and sleeps little as a result of the "horrible dreams" spurred by his humoral nature. Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 76-77. Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl have also described the particular sensitivity of the melancholic to dreams, hallucinations and visual images: the melancholic was more prone to memory – "more able to remember things, bringing mental pictures or images to the mind that were more compelling for him than in other people" (an idea that Rosa also plays up in his letters with his frequent references to "dreams" and the vividness of his imagination; see Borelli, letters 213, 226, 286), and his propensity toward an enhanced power of visual imagination gave him "true" or prophetic dreams (according to the Eudemian Ethics) which allowed him to see into the future. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 35-36.

[107] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 47; Archigenes, *Aretaeus*, III, 5, 1 and 7.

[108] Rosa often makes melodramatic allusions to death in professing his love to Ricciardi: eg. "solo la morte mi potrà torre il modo da confessarmi eternamente vostro amico, vostro oblighato". Borelli, letter 30.

"if I am not engaged in books or canvases"[109] – activities, moreover, that Rosa's contemporaries regarded as antidotes to the negative effects of melancholia.

As with his other self-representations, the figure in Rosa's Met portrait shares many fundamental characteristics with Bonacina's portrait and Passeri's physical description of the artist: the long aquiline nose, slightly bulging eyes, high cheekbones, moustache and short beard, and the shoulder-length, dark brown, wavy hair. It is possible that Ricciardi shared many of Rosa's features – and we know from Rosa's letters that Ricciardi also identified himself as a melancholic.[110] What seems more likely, though, is that Rosa took inspiration from his own visage, exaggerating or nuancing those characteristics in subtly varying ways in order to convey an ideal persona. Less dramatic in its contortion than the aggressive *Self-Portrait as a Soldier* or the striking *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, the expression of the figure in the Met portrait seems almost an image of the melancholic poet-philosopher *par excellence*: his aquiline nose and elegant attire signal his nobility, his shadowed face,[111] slightly protruding eyes and dark hair point to his physiological melancholia, while his closed lips, downcast eyes, and poetic activity refer to his intelligent and contemplative demeanor. (The motif of the "bent head", too, has an ancient association with melancholia.[112]) Easily allied with Rosa's own natural appearance, this "ideal" melancholic also offered Ricciardi an equally accessible "mask" of melancholia as he would have worn it. In this

---

[109] Borelli, letter 146.
[110] See 255, note 77 above. An interpretation of the figure in Rosa's portrait as a "type" or "persona" is not incompatible with a reading of the portrait as a physiognomic portrait of Ricciardi, should the fortuitous occasion arise for such a comparison to be made.
[111] The "dark" or "swarthy" skin that the ancients identified as a characteristic of the melancholic is given its most forceful visual interpretation in Dürer's *Melencolia I*, where the "dark face" is re-interpreted as a "shadowed countenance" – a motif that later became the most salient signifier of the melancholic in the pictorial tradition. For the debate concerning Dürer's intention for the "dark face", see Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 290.
[112] "Depression" (or "looking at the ground") was a gesture derived from Galenic theory which established the "bent head" as a feature of melancholia. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 50, 59. The motif of the "leaden, downward cast" of the head – often combined with the "head-on-hand" – has an ancient pedigree, traceable to images of mourners on ancient Egyptian sarcophagi. In the iconography of Saturn it came to refer not only to grief but also fatigue, meditation or creative thought. In the later iconographic tradition it signaled "complete absorption" and the duality (positive and destructive) of that experience. Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 286-230.

sense, the figure in the portrait is at once a self-portrait of Rosa and a portrait of a character, whose potential embodiment was equally prized, and primed for performance, by both Rosa and his friend.

Poetic Melancholia: A Visual Source for Rosa's Portrait

Rosa's portrait represents a *seicento* brand of "poetic" melancholy in which the melancholic experiences a "double-edged feeling" that results from his access to higher knowledge and increased self-awareness: one "in which the soul enjoys its own loneliness, but by this very pleasure becomes again more conscious of solitude."[113] This "bipolarity" of the melancholic is the definitive feature of Rosa's portrait: he is both depressed and inspired, capable of the extremities of sadness but also bouts of great happiness, both self-creative and self-destructive, and simultaneously subject to and transcendent over mortality.[114] This "poetic" melancholy finds its most profound iconographic reference in the figure's "depressed" downward stare. In combination with the swarthy, shadowed face (more subtle in the Met portrait than in other examples[115]), the downward stare reveals "both the obscure doom and the obscure source of creative genius."[116] It also signals the melancholic's particular susceptibility to longing and lamentation, an idea to which Rosa alludes in his dedicatory inscription to Ricciardi.[117] The idea of "poetic" melancholy resulted in part from the "elevation of melancholy to the rank of an intellectual force," but was even more

[113] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 231. From this connection came the idea that all self-aware men were necessarily melancholic, aware of both weakness and creative power. (*ibid*, 232, 247) Salerno identified the figure in Rosa's painting, based on his attire, specifically as a poet rather than a philosopher. Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 123. I would argue, however, that Rosa would not have made such a sharp distinction.
[114] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 50, 234-5. It was a commonplace that different physiological changes influenced melancholic to swing from one mood to another, for example from loquacious and quick-temperedness to a state of silence and calm. *Ibid*, 83. The pseudo-Aristotle argued in the *Problemata* XXX, I that melancholics are "variable". *Ibid*, 28.
[115] The conceit of the "shadowed face" is more dramatic, for example, in Annibale Carracci's *Self-Portrait on an Easel* (c. 1604, Hermitage, St. Petersburg), Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait as a Young Man* (1628, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), or Carlo Dolci's *Self-Portrait* (1674, Uffizi, Florence).
[116] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 349. As Della Porta noted, the melancholic was distinguished above for possessing "by his very nature" a "singular genius". Della Porta, *Della Fisonomia*, 79.
[117] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 109, 237. The melancholic, prone to a desire for union and an experience of frustrated love, finds that "reality and fantasy, fulfillment and renunciation, love and loneliness, desire and death bear so close a likeness". *Ibid*, 109, 237.

profoundly impacted by the early-modern humanist vision of the primacy of the self, which located the creative force of melancholia in the auto-agency of the practitioner or sufferer himself.[118] For Rosa, then, melancholia and its assertion was inextricably tied to and necessitated by his claims for freedom, and with those, the challenge and danger of having to choose which direction to take. With the development of "poetic" melancholia (which interpreted melancholy as a subjective emotional condition) it became a "jealously guarded privilege" of the intellectual elite that bonded them together under a kind of "selective affinity"[119] – an exclusive club of melancholics, as it were, the appeal of which is apparent among Rosa and his friends. In this sense, "poetic" melancholia was by Rosa's time conceived as a "fashionable persona" that could be both adopted and performed.[120]

Rosa found a pictorial source for his conception of poetic melancholia in two related iconographic traditions, one deriving from Dürer's *Melencolia I* [Fig. 149] and the other from Ribera's half-length images of philosophers and hermit saints.[121] In particular, Rosa's Met portrait owes a debt to Ribera's etching of *The Poet* of c. 1620-21/1630's [Fig. 153], considered to be the

---

[118] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 241-7.

[119] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 261. This idea owes its origins to Marsilio Ficino.

[120] *Ibid*, 247, 251. Giovanni Battista Armenini commented disparagingly on a phenomenon of "affecting" genius among contemporary artists: "è entrato un maledetto abuso ne gli animi delle genti volgari e, forsi anco di savii, a i quali par come naturale che non possa esser pittor molto eccellente, che non sia macchiato di qualche brutto e nefando vizio e che, appresso, non sia accompagnato da un umor capriccioso e fantastic per molte biz[z]arie di cervello; et il peggio è che molti sciocchi di quest'arte si vanno nutricando in simil errore con una affettata e malinconica biz[z]aria, senza trarne profitto alcuno, tenendosi perciò esser molto singulari. Ma quanto simili opinion siano erronee e lontane dalla verità, si può far giudicio per l'opposito, con gli esempi de' già proposti eccellenti." Armenini, *De' veri precetti della pittura*, ed. Marina Gorreri (Turin: G. Einaudi, 1988), Book 3, chapter XV, 233 = Armenini, *On The True Precepts of the Art of Painting*, ed. and trans. Edward J. Olszewski (New York: Burt Franklin & Co., 1977), 274.

[121] On Rosa and Dürer, see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 40. On Ribera, see Darby, "Ribera and the Wise Men".
These traditions are also linked to the *seicento* visual tradition that blended sixteenth-century representations of "subjective and poetic" melancholy (such as Cesare Ripa's "Malinconia" [Fig. 208]) with the iconography of *vanitas*. Important examples in this tradition include Domenico Feti's *Melancholy* (c. 1622, Louvre, Paris) [Fig. 186] and Giovan Benedetto Castiglione's etching of *Melancholy* (c. 1645-46) [Fig. 187] with its inscription "*Ubi inletabilitas ibi virtus*" ("where there is grief, there is virtue").

first image to combined the subjects of poetry and melancholy into a single iconographic form.[122] Rosa's interest in Ribera's image is apparent in his drawing of a *Young poet with a crown of leaves, seated beneath a tree writing*.[123] [Fig. 83] Dated by Mahoney to the 1640's (and therefore likely to precede the Met portrait as an idea for an allegorical representation of the poet-philosopher) Rosa's drawing is a conceptual link between Ribera's etching and the Met portrait itself.[124] The setting is almost identical, with its large rock (a throwback to the large octahedron in the background of Dürer's print) and single tree trunk both represented on the right side of the image, and the figures in each share a generic physiognomy and laurel-crown (at least, it is assumed to be laurel – perhaps Rosa introduced his cypress leaves here, for it is hard to make out their exact type). However Rosa makes some important changes that introduce ideas present in the Met portrait. While Ribera's figure is an older sage type swathed in the toga of the ancient philosopher, Rosa's is a younger man in contemporary dress. He also introduces his own variant on the melancholic pose, replacing Ribera's motif of the "head-in-hand" with the contemplative and downward-inclined head and a more subtle rendering of the partially-shadowed face. In addition, Rosa has included the books and pen of the poet, positioning the figure's left hand on a book that, in the Met portrait, will be

---

[122] Stechow, "A Note on 'The Poet' by Ribera," *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* XIV: 2 (1957): 67-72. Stechow suggested that the poet represented by Ribera might be Petrarch, which Jonathan Brown also considers "plausible." In her unpublished Masters thesis, Columbia Univ. 1972, Selma Ho "noted the derivation of the pose from *Heraclitus* in Raphael's School of Athens." Brown, *Jusepe De Ribera*, *Prints and Drawings* (Princeton: The Art Museum, Princeton University; Cambridge: The Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, 1973), 66, cat. 3. A further theory is that Ribera's *Poet* represents Virgil, the likelihood of which is suggested by the legend of his tomb: "A well-known legend had it that on top of [Virgil's] tomb grew a bay tree that continued to blossom over the centuries while its roots forced their way through the stone, causing fissures to appear." John T. Spike detected the direct influence of Ribera's etching of *The Poet* in Rosa's drawing of an *Allegory of Vanity* [Fig. 46a]. See Spike, "Saleroom Note: An Early Drawing by Salvator Rosa, Datable to 1639," *Burlington Magazine* 124: 950 (1982): 322-5. Dating Rosa's drawing seems to 1639, he intuited that Ribera's own etching must be "a mature work of the 1630's" and not c. 1620-21 "as is now commonly accepted." Spike, *ibid*, 322. For an alternative date for Rosa's drawing to 1650, see 289, note 188 below.

[123] Mahoney, *Drawings*, no. 25.1. Rosa's AGO drawing is similar to two other examples, dated by Mahoney to the 1640's, of crowned poets seated beneath trees. Mahoney, *ibid*, nos. 24.9 and 24.10. Works by other artists of the first half of the seventeenth century also show a similar debt to this tradition; particularly worthy of note is Pier Francesco Mola's *Poet* (date uncertain, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 152]. See Kahn-Rossi ed., *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*, 200-201, cat. I. 40.

[124] Mahoney, *Drawings*, 301. Rosa may have intended the drawing as "an idea for a self-portrait," although it is "iconographically and stylistically … distinct" from the group of studies for the Met portrait itself.

substituted with a skull. Inspired by Ribera's iconography, Rosa's work of the 1640's and 1650's shows he was experimenting with and devising his own brand of allegorical imagery comprised of poets, hermits, philosophers and saints.[125]

IV.5. "*La metà di me sono io e l'altra meta è il mio Amico*": A New Reading of Rosa's Portrait for Ricciardi as Self and Friend

Rosa's friends were quick to point out the similarities between the artist and his best friend. Rosa noted to Ricciardi in 1652 that their mutual friend Padre Bonaventura Cavallo had apparently perceived in Ricciardi "a most similar action" to Rosa's "in exaggerating and expressing things", a sign that indicated to Rosa that he was "in" Ricciardi's heart.[126] In 1641 Rosa expressed his own belief in this parity when he referred himself and Ricciardi jointly as "Tittatoria" – a play on the Neapolitan versions of "Giovan Battista" and "Salvator" – in a letter to Giulio Maffei, expressing their joint thanks for the game Giulio had sent him.[127] The ideal underlying this sentiment is

[125] For example, the *Portrait of a Poet* (*Allegory of Study* or *Seated Philosopher with a Book*) (1640's(?), John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota, Florida) [Fig. 35], which owes iconographic and compositional debts to the sixteenth-century tradition of images of *letterati* and scholars in interiors, as in Titian's *Self-Portrait* (c.1550-1562, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemaldegalerie, Berlin) and G. B. Moroni's so-called "*Titian's Schoolmaster*" (c.1575, National Gallery, Washington) (see Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 62, 65 note 32); the *La Menzogna*, identified by Ozzola as an "ancient poet" rather than as a philosopher (Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 93 and *passim*); the *Pan and Pindar* (Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia) [Fig. 126]; an allegorical drawing of a *Poet Seated Beneath a Tree with a Putto* [Fig. 84]; and a drawing of a *Seated Poet with a Book* [Fig. 85]. There is also a portrait of a laurel-crowned "poet", recently dubiously attributed to Rosa as a self-portrait. [Fig. 55] Its highly gestural quality seems uncharacteristic of Rosa and suggests the hand of a copyist or imitator. Salomon has questioned only the title of "Self-Portrait", suggesting it may be one of the "testaccie" Rosa painted in Rome. Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 495. Rosa's images resonate closely with a type that, by the mid-seventeenth century, had become a genre of painting unto itself: portrait-like depictions of philosophers and philosopher-saints in the act of contemplation or meditation, images that reflect the *seicento* fascination (in both artistic and literary circles) with the lives and writings of the ancient philosophers.

[126] Borelli, letter 135: "Giunse finalmente il Padre Cavalli … l'havermi più volte affermato d'haver scorto in voi una somigliantissima attione alla mia nell'esagerare et esprimere delle cose: segno (presso di me) che vi sono nel core".

[127] Borelli, letter 1: "Ricevei la cacciagione favoritami da Vostra Signoria e a quest'hora l'habbiamo pranzata in conversatione di tutta la Tittatoria alla vostra salute." Cesareo was the first to suggest this possibility. Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, II: 6, note 2. Rosa again refers to himself as "Tore" in a letter to Giulio of 1651. Borelli, letter 111. See Cesareo, *ibid*, II: 86-7.

succinctly expressed in one of the maxims from Rosa's collection of proverbs known as the *Teatro della Politica* (1669):[128] "One half of me is myself, and the other half is my Friend."[129]

The notion of the friend as a second self is one of the central tenets of amity that sustains philosophical practice, and it is was prevalent among *seicento* intellectual circles. This concept of "similitude" between self and friend is an especially important theme in the writings of Aristotle and Cicero, but it was also of particular interest to the Stoic philosophers – the favourites of Rosa and Ricciardi.[130] Seneca, whose name Rosa initially included in his portrait, wrote extensively on the subject of friendship and repeated the ancient dictum that "True friendship is, in fact, a union of souls."[131] Early-modern authors revived the concept in their own discourses on friendship, among them Baldassare Castiglione, Marsilio Ficino, Pietro Aretino, Michel de Montaigne, Francesco Pona, and Julius Lipsius.[132] The principle of *homonia* ("like-mindedness" or "concord"), a level of

---

[128] The manuscript is in the BiASA, Rome. It was published in full by Giorgio Baroni in 1991 (Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica*) and in part by Festa in 1971 (Festa, "Aforismi, massime e sentenze di Salvator Rosa"). Festa considered the manuscript to be autograph, offering as evidence Rosa's reference to a collection of maxims in a letter to Ricciardi: "Mi vado sminghionando di molte massime ch'avea nella testa..." Borelli, letter 369; Festa, *ibid*, 71.

[129] Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica*, 39, no. 310. "La metà di me sono io e l'altra meta è il mio Amico." The "amico" is given a capital "A" in order to indicate the he is only the best and truest kind. The *Teatro* contains various pithy axioms on the subject of friendship: for example, "I1 piú dolce e perfetto frutto della vita umana consiste nella amicizia e società scambievole" (Rosa, *ibid*, 10, no. 68) and "L'uomo ha piú bisogno di un bono amico che dell'acqua, del fuoco e del sole" (Rosa, *ibid*, 17, no. 134).

[130] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1171b17-1172a6, 1169b11-35; Cicero, *De Amicitia*, trans. J. F. Stout and W. F. Masom (London: W. B. Clive, University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1895), XXI – 80, 33, VI 22- VII 23, 11-12. It was a patently Stoic doctrine that the wise man loves his friend as much as himself. Lynch, *Philosophy and Friendship*, 56. Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, had described the friend as "Another I". Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, "Life of Zeno," xix.

[131] Seneca, *Epistles* 6, 2; *idem*, *De Benefictis,* 2, 21, 2; also see Clark and Motto, "Seneca, On Friendship," 91-98. "Even the Stoic 'sapiens,'… renowned for his self-sufficiency, must be a master in the art of making friends. And the wise and virtuous man – for only this type of man can truly participate in friendship according to ancient law – is well aware that no man is an island unto himself." Clark and Motto, *ibid*, 95.

[132] Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, 137-8; Ficino, *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love*, trans. Jayne Sears (Dallas: Spring Publications, Inc., 1985), 55; Pietro Aretino described Titian as "un altro me medesimo" in a letter to Don Lope di Soria of 1540. See M. C. Brouwer, "Pietro Aretino nella storiografia artistica recente (dopo il 1957) su Sansovino, Tintoretto e Tiziano" (tesi di laurea, Università di Utrecht, 2005); Pietro Aretino, *Lettere*, ed. Paolo Procaccioli (Rome: Salerno Editrice, 1997-2002), II: 167-170, lettera a Don Lope di Soria del febbraio 1540 e II, 269-270, lettera al Capitan Palazzo del 15 febbraio 1541; cited in Rosand, "Titian and the critical tradition," in *Titian: his world and his legacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 16-21 (I wish to thank Philip Sohm for bringing this passage to my attention); Michel de Montaigne, *Essays*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1993), 93, 97, 103. Montaigne writes "Amicus quid? Alter ego." ("What is the friend? Another self.") The seventeenth-century Venetian writer Francesco Pona, who also penned a book entitled *Le Leggi dell'amicitia Tratte dal Dialogo di Cicerone*, wrote in his *Panegirico … scritto all Ill.a*

closeness and reciprocity of interests and affection that brings about a blurring or conjoining of the identities of the two participants, is a central feature of "true" or "perfect" friendship.[133]

Rosa's repeated epistolary recourse to the trope of similitude in friendship suggests his consistent faith in it as an ideal that expresses an entirely sincere and profound sentiment.[134] Constantly searching for new ways to reassure his jealous, possessive, and emotionally fragile friend, Rosa's countless expressions of love and devotion, oaths of obligation and confessions of loyalty are peppered with appeals to the trope of unity in friendship. A particularly salient example appears in a letter to Ricciardi of 1661, where Rosa once again laments and reprimands his friend's suspicious accusations. He writes,

> "… I imagined that you would give in to this heresy to negate my Bible [his previous long letter], but this matters little to my credulity, which knows not to err in such matters; so, content yourself to believe that even you are fragile and are like other men. *I have always believed that the friend is another like myself [un altro me medesimo] by virtue of holy friendship*; what a marvel it is, then, that sometimes one's own matters are neglected, indeed the ones that are most important? You should have understood this fact, and I am astonished to hear you deny it."[135]

In a previous letter Rosa informed Ricciardi that his many avowals of friendship were not exaggerations but completely sincere, suggesting that his use of the trope of similitude conveyed a genuine and heartfelt conviction.[136]

Gloriose Signora Cecilia Dandola Barbarigo (178) that "Friendship in itself is nothing but a marriage of souls" (Miller, "Friendship and Conversation in Seventeenth-Century Venice," *The Journal of Modern History* 73: 1 (2001): 14-15). For the comments of the *seicento* Neo-Stoic Justus Lipsius, see Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics. Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 25.

[133] The ancient Greek word "*homonia*" refers to a "spirit of like-mindedness" and was often used in political and social contexts. Swain, *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul*, 134.

[134] See my discussion of Rosa's epistolary expression of sincerity in chapter three.

[135] Borelli, letter 246. Emphasis mine. "Già me l'imaginavo ch'eravate per dare in quest'eresia di ncgar la mia Bibia, ma questo poco importa alla mia ingenuità, qual sa di non peccare in sì fatte matterie; però contentatevi di credere che ancor voi havete le vostre fragilità, e le vostre eguaglianze agl'altri huomini. Ho sempre creduto che l'amico sia un altro me medesimo per virtù della santa amicitia; che meraviglia è dunque ch'alle volte si trascurino le proprie cose, anzi quelle che più premeno? Questa verità dovrebbe essere intesa da voi, e stupisco il sentir che la contrastiate."

[136] Borelli, letter 245. Here Rosa distinguishes between the use of commonplace sentiments in "polite" letters to acquaintances, and the sincere feeling of letters to close friends, in order to once again reassure Ricciardi of the genuineness of his affection. Similar statements abound in Rosa's correspondence. In an earlier letter to Ricciardi of May 1654, Rosa sought the consolation of his friend in a time of insecurity and wounded pride: "Hor se queste son cose di non affligere un animo risentito come il mio, lo lascio considerare a voi che sete un altro me stesso in virtù della sacrosanta amicitia." Borelli, letter 177. In 1652 Rosa swore to Ricciardi by the "sacrament of

In this context it is meaningful that Rosa chose to depict a poet, rather than a painter, in his portrait for Ricciardi. This was a deliberate decision, intended to celebrate the profession that bonded the two friends most profoundly and to permit a mutual self-identification on Ricciardi's part: which is to say that, even if Ricciardi regarded Rosa's portrait primarily as a self-portrait of the artist, he would at the same time have seen in it a reflection of his own profession. By presenting Ricciardi with a self-image as a writer, rather than a painter, Rosa made a conscious and meaningful decision to refer to the professional aspiration that they shared.[137]

The long-standing emphasis on the problem of the identity of the figure in Rosa's Met portrait can be set aside in light of the portrait's status as a *Freundschaftsbild* and, as such, a

---

friendship" that "il maggior travaglio ch'io habbia è il considerarmi lontano da voi, qual amo quanto me medesimo e stimo sopra tutti i buoni huomini che son stati al mondo". Letter 153. In 1650 Rosa complained of Ricciardi's "false friendship": "Adesso sì che mi chiamerò disgratiato da davero, perché la disgratia mia depende da voi qual'io stimava un altro me medesimo. Ma quanto mi sono ingannato con sì fatte imaginationi!" Rosa then calls on the "Court of Sincerity" to support his own claims of friendship and loyalty to Ricciardi. Letter 50. Rosa often proclaimed a mental and corporeal unity with Ricciardi, particularly in connection with a shared temperament and sense of hardship: "sento nell'anima i vostri travagli, i quali uniti assieme coi miei fanno una concordanza così lagrimevole" (letter 211); "mi sono al core le vostre aflezioni, come quelle che, per raggioni d'affetto e d'amicizia, deveno esser mie per metà" (letter 320). For similar statements see letters 188, 235, 240 and 387. In 1651, Rosa used the phrase "*nostro genio*," suggesting that his own spirit existed in unison with Ricciardi's. Letter 92. For other instances where Rosa conflates his "genio" – conceived essentially as "character" or "inclination," but also intrinsically related to creative ingenuity by Rosa via the melancholic nature of that very character – with Ricciardi's, see letters 128, 138, 141, 157 and 254. That Rosa regarded Ricciardi as a "stimulus" for his *genio* is also implied in his letters. See for example letter 235.

[137] On at least one occasion Rosa presented a close friend with an image of himself as a painter: he painted his Uffizi *Self-Portrait as an Artist* [Fig. 16] for the Maffei family, probably for Giulio himself. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462. It was later acquired by the Medici for inclusion in their collection of self-portraits. Rosa's choice to paint a *Freundschaftsbild* "as an artist" was in keeping with the early-modern tradition of artists depicting themselves in the role of their primary profession. But this is a significant point, for Rosa did not consider himself "primarily" a visual artist – rather, he was anxious to demonstrate that he was as much a poet as a painter, and that these *personae* comprised a more significant identity as moral philosopher and satirist. Roworth argues that Rosa actively pursued and cultivated a self-image as "satirist". See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*. In his self-portrait for the Maffei he holds an arrow in his left hand, presumably in order to allude to his identity as a satirist and poet (and a *Percosso*, for that matter). Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei," 3: "È rimasto invece, un autoritratto agli Uffizi di un uomo di poco più di trenta anni che ha in mano penna e freccia, simboli, si crede, del poeta satirico." Also see Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 59; Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68. Festa dated the painting to c. 1648-9, the period of his final Volterran sojourn before returning to Rome. Festa, *ibid*, 3. In one sense, Rosa's Met portrait belongs to the already long-established trend in self-portraiture in which the visual artist endeavours to emphasize the intellectual aspects of his or her craft: the pensive, melancholic overtones of the image, and the prominence given to erudition, reading, writing and philosophical study belong to a broader tradition of self-images of artists anxious to assert their intellectual status. The literature on the artist's assertion of his or her intellectual status in self-portraiture is vast. For an introduction to the strategy in the context of *quattrocento* and *cinquecento* self-portraits, see Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture.* For a useful survey of the early-modern discourse on melancholia in relation to self-portraiture, see Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*, chapter 1. But this strategy was commonplace by Rosa's time, and offers an insufficient interpretative model for a painting that operates on a more complex level.

document of a relationship. As an acknowledgment of the singular identity to which both men aspired, the figure in the painting was intended to resonate simultaneously as a self-portrait and a portrait – an idea of "multiplicity in unity" that participates in an aesthetic conception more pervasive in the *seicento*.[138] Rosa's painting is self-portrait, but it is also *more* than a self-portrait: a self-representation in which the self is understood as "in relation" or by its reflection in an "other". It is a tribute to Rosa's self-conception as moral poet-philosopher and to Ricciardi's contribution in the creation of that persona. The young poet-philosopher represents the motivation for the bond Rosa shares with Ricciardi and encapsulates their shared self-conception. He codifies a unity of self-conception and outlook, allowing the two friends to "come together", in both a literal and metaphorical sense: through the exchange of the painting as a gift, and through the opportunity of physical personification offered by the image itself.[139]

---

[138] That the portrait would have been regarded in this manner by its viewers is supported in part by a contemporary conception of viewing that acknowledged a "co-presence of different identities within one entity" known as *amphibolia*. Maria Loh explains this phenomenon, as defined by the *seicento* writer Matteo Peregrini: it is "an ability to see the 'double sense' [*senso doppio*]" or "to see multiplicity within unity and vice versa – ie. the whole above its individual parts as constitutive of the whole." This concept is "the basis of the 'monad' in Leibniz's philosophy, as Deleuze explained in *The Fold*, of the *bel composto*, as Baldinucci write about Bernini's art, and of the phrase 'Omnis in unum', with which Tesauro begins his treatise on witticisms [*acutezza*] and metaphors. In Baroque culture, this mode of hermeneutic vision appealed to a type of aesthetic experience based on sharp, associative, lateral thinking, which embraced the metaphor of the *double entendre*, which looked for the intertext and engaged with the intentional play with form." Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 229; Peregrini, *Delle Acutezze, che altrimenti spiriti, vivezze, e concetti volgarmente si appellano* (Genova: Gio. Maria Farroni, Nicolò Pesagni, & Pier Francesco Barbieri, 1639), 136: "Della Amfibolia"; Deleuze, *Le Pli. Leibniz et le Baroque* (Paris: Editions du Minuit, 1988), 173ff; Baldinucci, in Careri, *Bernini*, *Flights of Love, the Art of Devotion*, trans. L. Lappin (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1995), 1.

[139] Roworth's proposal that the figure "completes the bond through which Ricciardi may actually see his friend as he imagines him" acknowledges the "unifying" function of the portrait as a *Freundschaftsbild*. Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 121. But her argument does not pursue this line of reasoning to conclude, as I do, that the figure represents a "conflation of identities" with the principle of similitude or *homonia* at its core. As a poet-philosopher, moreover, the figure in the portrait symbolized the very concept of intellectual friendship that defined Rosa and Ricciardi's bond: *filosofia* has affection at its etymological root, "*philia*" ("love"), and its practice depends upon the bond of true friendship.

The Portrait as a Memorial to Friendship

Various iconographic elements of Rosa's painting signal its role as a memorial to friendship. It is essentially a *vanitas*, but it is a particularly complex example of this type.[140] Its intricacy lies in its combination of a pessimistic and optimistic vision of melancholia, regarded as both a fundamental component of Rosa's identity as poet-philosopher and an important feature of the friendship in which that identity was forged. The "memorial" that Rosa's portrait encodes was as much as a celebration as a lamentation. I will clarify this argument further as the chapter progresses, but I introduce it here in order to contextualize my interpretation of certain iconographic elements of Rosa's portrait as operating alternatively (and simultaneously) as symbols of both the productive and destructive nature of poetic melancholy – as representative of both an ailment and its cure.

The cypress leaves that crown the figure's head [Fig. 66], for example, are described by Roworth as a funereal symbol, which she reads as an explicitly mournful emblem in connection with Rosa's painful loss of his son and brother in 1656. But cypress is also associated with longevity and the immortality of the soul, and may just as easily refer to the mutual wish of Rosa and Ricciardi for the interminable preservation of their bond.[141] The crown of leaves first registers with the viewer as the sign of the poet and his immortal fame. But Rosa gave this symbol his own unique twist: like the crown worn by Dürer's *Melencolia* [Fig. 149], which announces the "*homo literatus*," "proclaims Melencolia's intellectual powers," and is intended as an "antidote" to melancholy, consisting of the leaves of two types of watery plants that counteracted its "earthy

---

[140] As Ebert-Schifferer notes, Rosa omitted *vanitas* painting from the list of "minor" genres of painting that he derided in his satire *La Pittura*, regarding it instead as expressive of his moral philosophical (Neo-Stoic) position. The key image in this regard is the *Democritus* [Fig. 62], where the *concetto* of the "vanitas still-life" as an attribute of the Stoic/ Cynic moral-philosophical ideal. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 77-78.

[141] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 117; Paul Legassé, ed. *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), entry for "Cypress".

dryness" (water parsley and watercress),[142] Rosa's wreath of cypress refers to both the cause of the protagonist's affliction and its possible defeat.[143] Rosa frequently alluded to the potential "immortality" of his friendship with Ricciardi, as in a letter of 1650: "My Ricciardi, you must put the idea into your head that, except for our friendship, all the others will come to some sort of end".[144]

Other symbols in the portrait point to an optimistic conception of melancholia forged in friendship. The ring worn by the young man on his left hand [Fig. 67], for example, is an emblem of the close union forged in male solidarity.[145] In the seventeenth century, male friendship was regarded in terms akin to the bond of love between members of the opposite sex, as is attested by the language used to express it in early modern texts.[146] Expressions of affection that may seem to the modern eye to be in keeping with the "formulas of heterosexual love" were intended to convey "an honorable, even glamorous tradition of heroic comradeship".[147] Like the crown of cypress, the

---

[142] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 325.
[143] In this context it is also worth noting Rosa's reference to cypress in his sonnet *La Strega*, where it is part of an occult ritual: "In quest'atra caverna/ Ove non giunse mai raggio di sole,/ Dalle Tartaree scuole/ Trarrò la Turba inferna:/ Farò ch'un nero spirto/ Arda un Cipresso un Mirto:/ E mentre a poco a poco/ Vi struggerò l'imago sua di cera,/ Farò che à ignoto foco/ Sua viva imago pera,/ E quand'arde la finta, arda la vera." Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, I: 132. In witchcraft, cypress is used in times of crisis, especially at the death of a friend or relative. It is thought to ease grief and lend protection; myrtle represents youth, love, luck and sensuality.
[144] Borelli, letter 49: "Ricciardi mio, bisogna che voi vi mettiate in testa che fuor che le nostre amicitie, tutte l'altre sono con qualche fine …". Rosa expressed the same sentiment to Giulio in 1651: "Giulio mio caro … il nostro amore non ha d'haver fine che con la vita, la quale il Cielo ci conservi lungo tempo." Borelli, letter 107. Rosa employed funereal symbolism elsewhere in the service of a more optimistic existential vision: as Roworth has pointed out, the funerary setting of Rosa's self-celebratory "*Genius*" etching suggests a vision of death as the "ultimate liberation" and the true beginning of both freedom and fame. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 89.
[145] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 70. In a letter to his friend Pierre Dupuy, Rubens demonstrated the value granted to the ring as a symbol of the bond of male friendship in the *seicento*: "[the Earl of Carlisle] has with him a diamond of great value to present, in the name of the King [Charles I of England], his master, to the Prince of Piedmont [Victor Amadeus, also son of the Duke of Savoy]. This ring is to serve as a gracious compliment, binding the two in eternal friendship, quite apart from their relationship by marriage." Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 268-269, letter 171, June 15 1628. Charles I and Amadeus were brothers-in-law, as both had married sisters of Louis XIII.
[146] On early-modern masculinity and the quasi-erotic language of male friendship, see George E. Haggerty. *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Stephanson, "'Epicœne Friendship': Understanding Male Friendship in the Early 18th Century, with Some Speculations about Pope," *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 38 (1997): 151-170; and Bray, *The Friend*.
[147] As David Halperin argues, the popular concept of mutuality and "merging of individual identities" in early-modern masculine discourse "precisely banish[es] any hint of subordination on the part of one friend to the other",

skull, refers to the possibility of conquering as much as surrendering to mortality, an idea that is further suggested by the commemorative function of writing and the immortalizing efficacy of the portrait itself.[148] The books on the table, too, represent the hopeful promise of friendship: the exchange of books was an essential activity among intellectual friends, and Rosa's letters record numerous instances of its practice within his circle.[149] The piece of paper on which the dedication is written [Fig. 70] is reminiscent of a letter, that most vital instrument of friendship.

The name "SENECA" that Rosa initially wrote on the spine of one of the books [Fig. 68] may also have been intended as a reference to friendship. A problem is raised, however, by the fact that the "SENECA" appears to have been erased by the artist.[150] The name, together with a small teardrop on the figure's right cheek [Fig. 69], was revealed when the painting was cleaned in the 1970's. (There also appears to be a second tear on the left cheek.) Keith Christiansen determined that Rosa painted out the name himself.[151] Wallace explained the erasure as a reflection of Rosa's realization that Seneca's writings did not best reflect the "quietist" mood of the portrait, while Roworth clarified it in connection with certain statements by Rosa in denial of the Stoic philosophy of "calm in the face of death": Rosa lamented the unfeasibility of Stoic fortitude in his satire *Il*

---

distancing that affection from erotic passion. Halperin, "How to do the History of Male Homosexuality," *GLQ* 6 (2000): 101.

[148] This sentiment is found in contemporary images like Jan van de Velde's engraving after Frans Hals's *Portrait of Jacobus Zaffius* (1630), where a figure sits at a table with one hand resting on a skull. The inscription below suggests the immortalizing efficacy of portraiture and its power to overcome the defeatist sentiment of *vanitas* represented by the skull: "Why is the likeness of Zaffius entrusted to fragile paper? / So that the Man may outlive his ashes …". Slive, *Dutch Painting, 1600-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 28-29, fig. 25.

[149] See Borelli, letters 6, 73, 115, 117, 118, 119, 233, 242, 277 and 310, for example. It is even tempting to see in the visible wear and tear of the books in Rosa's portrait a reference to their repeated usage, as if they are examples of the many tomes shared between Rosa and his friend. For this suggestion I am indebted to Kristin Campbell (PhD Candidate, Queen's University, Kingston), at the "Context and Meaning" conference, Queen's University, Kingston, January 26-27 2006. Seneca (whose name Rosa originally included in the portrait) discussed the practice of not only sharing books with friends, but marking certain pages for them to read. In Epistle VI, "On Sharing Knowledge". One of the books in Rosa's portrait has a bookmark poking out conspicuously from its edge, as if to allude to his and Ricciardi's practice of "marking pages" for each other.

[150] The faintly visible "SENECA" was first noted by Wallace. Wallace, *Etchings*, 43.

[151] Christiansen is adamant, on the basis of technical examination, that Rosa himself painted out the tear and Seneca's name. (Personal communication) Wallace noted that "[b]oth the lettering and the painting over are done in a manner that is completely typical of Rosa's hand." Wallace, *Etchings*, 43 note 11.

Tirreno and in a letter to Ricciardi of 1656.[152] Roworth argued that Rosa changed his mind when he found that Seneca's philosophy had become "inappropriate" for the emotional display in his portrait, encapsulated in the Greek inscription and the tears, utterly contrary to the "calm contemplation" that Seneca recommended in confronting distress.[153]

These interpretations of the painting, however, leave a few questions unanswered. Rosa's various comments on Stoicism throughout his letters and satires reveal a continual inconsistency of opinion concerning its merits, and any instances of derision of Stoic theory on his part should be regarded as points along an extended line of engagement. On many occasions Rosa expressed a sincere conviction in the tenets of Stoic thought.[154] If Rosa intended his painting to convey a strong denial of Stoic calm and reserve, he was certainly capable of offering a vivid pictorial expression of this attitude.[155] Moreover, if he intended the tears to signify submission to emotion (that is, an

---

[152] Wallace, *Etchings*, 43-44; *Il Tirreno*, vv. 156-162. Wallace cites Seneca's recommendation *against* solitude and his advocation of sociality, instead. "In an observation which could almost be taken as a criticism of the kind of ostentatious retirement proclaimed in Rosa's *Self-Portrait with a Skull* Seneca says that one should not go about with a placard on one's back labeled 'Philosopher and Quietist'." Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 103 and note 60. Rosa had lost his son and brother to the plague only a month prior and was not willing to accept the recommendations of calm and reserve endorsed by the ancient Stoics: "Le consolationi degli stoici non passano la [pena] e gli inventori di coteste metafisiche chi [l'havesse] potuti pratticare l'haveria trovati forse differ[enti] assai di quello che predicheno ne' loro scart[afacci]. Seneca che fa tanto schiamazzo della vita beata e della tranquillità dell'animo haveva 2 milioni ... L'intrepidezza della sua morte noi l'habbiamo veduta ma quando sia come ce la raccontano l'Istorie non è niente superiore a quella, che soccesse la settimana indietro d'un mio paesano condennato alla forca (morte assai più infame, che lo svenarsi), il quale andò con tanta intrepidezza, che fece atterire tutta la Compagnia de' Confortatori." Borelli, letter 201. Rosa's statement regarding Seneca's courage in his manner of death appears to be a direct response to Ricciardi's reference to Seneca's brave suicide in his *canzone*. Rosa was not alone in expressing skepticism over the merits or tenability of Stoicism: Rubens also voiced his frustration with Stoic philosophy – in a manner very similar to Rosa – when he lost his first wife, in a letter to his friend Pierre Dupuy of 1626. Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 135-6, letter 84. For Seneca's advice, see Epistle IV "On the Terrors of Death", *Moral Epistles*, vol. I.

[153] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 121; and *idem*, *Pictor Succensor*, 258-9.

[154] Stoicism offered Rosa the basis for the subjects of most of his later paintings as well as his satires and poetry. See Wallace, *The Figure Paintings of Salvator Rosa*, 78ff. In spite of his doubts concerning the applicability of certain Stoic doctrines to real-life experiences (particularly in moments of painful suffering), his conviction in Stoic ideals was fundamental to his identity as a satirist and moral philosopher, and its precepts are everywhere in evidence throughout his pictorial and textual *oeuvre*. Moments of a sincere faith in Stoicism appear in his letters: scoffing at his detractors in Rome in 1654, Rosa took courage in Stoic precepts: "mi son trattenuto di farlo, per resistere con la presenza a quanto hanno mai saputo caluniarmi, e, con una mascherata stoichezza, mi son fatto il più delle volte veder ridere da sì fatte imposture." Borelli, letter 177. In 1666 he apologized to Ricciardi for behavior unbecoming to a Stoic. Letter 328. In 1651, he identified himself as a "Stoic". Letter 101.

[155] One might compare, for example, Vincenzo Dandini's *Ritratto virile con teschio* (Douai, Musee de la Chartreuse), a likely self-portrait which is compositionally and iconographically close to, and chronologically contemporary with, Rosa's Met portrait. Dandini's interpretation of a Stoic theme, however, makes Rosa's seem

attitude contrary to Stoic precepts), then why did he subsequently decide to paint them out? The comportment of the figure – who, with his single, barely detectable tear, is far from "weeping" as Roworth suggests – can be said to give the very impression of the tranquil reserve and calm, introspective contemplation that Seneca recommended in the face of suffering and death. If Rosa was at this point in time so adamantly set against Seneca's theory, why would he have elected to include the name in the portrait in the first instance?

No scholar who has written about this painting has considered the significance of Seneca's writings on friendship or the extent of their importance to Rosa's work.[156] With this name Rosa referred not only to a philosopher especially favoured by himself and his friend, but to the ideas of friendship and beneficence he espoused. Seneca was well-known for his writing on friendship and his theories on the gift and shared property of friends.[157] Rosa may have included a reference to Seneca for his promotion of sociality over solitude, and the subsequent erasure of his name may reflect indecision as much as hot-headed denial. It could also reflect distaste on his part for another conflict of interest between Seneca's ideas and Rosa's intentions for the portrait: here it is worth noting that Seneca was inconsistent in his opinion of the notion of the friend as a "second self."[158] The Stoic vision of melancholia, which dismissed its creative components and regarded it strictly as

---

utterly calm and contemplative in comparison: a vision of Stoic warts-and-all verism, the young man, with a grimace on his face, holds the skull toward viewer with a confrontational gesture that shows a "lack of fear" of death. See Bellesi, "Tendenze e orientamenti naturalistici nella pittura fiorentina della prima metà del Seicento," in *Luce e ombra nella pittura italiana tra Rinascimento e Barocco: da Tiziano a Bernini*, ed. Vittorio Sgarbi (Milan: Skira, 2005), 116. In this sense, Rosa's painting appears to convey the very "calm composure" Seneca recommended.

[156] On Seneca, Stoicism and friendship, see Moses Hadas, *The Stoic Philosophy of Seneca* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1958); Clark and Motto, "Seneca, On Friendship," 91-98; and Paola Gagliardi, *Un legame per vivere*. *Sul concetto di amicitia nelle lettere di Seneca* (Galatina: Congedo Editore, 1991).

[157] Seneca, *Of Benefits*, in *Moral Essays*, vol. 3, esp. IV and XII. For the fragments of Seneca's *De Amicitia*, see F. Haase, *L. Annaei Senecae Opera Quae Supersunt* (Leipzig, 1897), 3: 435-36.

[158] Lynch, *Philosophy and Friendship*, 35. In a manner contrary to his previous assertions of the notion, he comments elsewhere that "friendship is essentially a social virtue, and is not confined to one object. Seneca then dismissed the idea of "friendship for one and only one" as a form of "self-love."

an illness, was also at odds with Rosa's conception and the complex *concetto* of his portrait.[159] It therefore seems just as plausible that Rosa chose to paint out the name when he discovered instances in Seneca's theory that contradicted these particular features of the painting's message. Another possible explanation for the erasure may be found in connection with the Greek inscription: Rosa may have decided to remove the name after writing the Greek phrase in order to eliminate any potential confusion by the viewer between the two otherwise unconnected ideas – the phrase is not taken from Seneca's writings, and Rosa was adamant about historical accuracy.[160]

What I would argue with greater conviction, however, is that Rosa's hesitation to include Seneca's name was not motivated by a distrust of Seneca, but rather by a philosophical anxiety that Rosa infused into the portrait itself. Rosa's letters show that, from behind the mask of the moral poet-philosopher, he was often troubled by the distance between philosophical ideals and lived reality.[161] Motivated initially by the same impulse of Stoic self-identification that permeates the

---

[159] The Stoics felt that "a wise man can never be overtaken by madness because the notions of wisdom and madness were mutually exclusive." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 43. In the *De Tranquilitate Animae*, Seneca describes melancholia as depression, resulting from an inability to live rationally. While the Pseudo-Aristotle considered "intellectual pre-eminence a direct consequence of natural melancholy, for the Stoics it had become merely a predisposition to pathological melancholy". Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 50.

[160] For Rosa's comments concerning historical accuracy, see Borelli, letters 330 and 370. Rosa may also have chosen to include Seneca's name in response to Ricciardi's *canzone*, the *Sotto rigida stella*, where Seneca appears in a list of ancient philosophers and heroes praised for their steadfast fortitude in the face of suffering. Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 141. Ricciardi's reference to Seneca emphasizes in particular his "ancient honour" in connection with his suicide and with the concept of "virile virtue": "Un Seneca svenato/ Vanta fra suoi trofei l'honore antico;/ Son cote i mali alla virtù virile,/ E chi sempre è felice è sempre vile."

[161] Rosa's recognition of the tenuous distinction between the lofty, remote qualities of philosophy and the realities of its everyday experience modifies the conception of Rosa's identity (both self-created and posthumous) as an assertive and self-assured proponent of *seicento* moral philosophy. Many of Rosa's epistolary statements suggest a confidence in both the tenets and practice of philosophy: in a letter to Ricciardi of 1658, for example, Rosa refers to the necessity of conducting one's philosophical precepts with more than simply a superficial conviction: "In quanto all'amico della podagra, me ne dispiace; ma non però mi giungono nuove sì fatte stravaganze, essendo oggi mai note anche à Bertoldini: questo è il tempo di condur la Filosofia più oltre della casacca, e che il male de' piedi persuadino molte verità alla testa." Borelli, letter 214. Bertoldino is the son of Bertoldo, the simpleton protagonist of Giulio Cesare Croce's (1550-1609) very popular *Le sottilissime astuzie di Bertoldo* of 1606. Rosa's reference to the "philosopher's coat" (*casacca*) may, perhaps, have been intended to call to mind the figure in the portrait that he had perhaps only just given Ricciardi. Rosa often uses the word *filosofia* to refer to very personal and utterly heartfelt beliefs – in particular, the principle of freedom from control. See Borelli, letters 101, 308. Rosa frequently sees fit to align himself with the precepts and practices of various philosophers: he "laughs" at his detractors like Democritus (Borelli, letter 176), he withdraws from the masses like Timon of Athens (letter 241), and his sufferings are akin to those of Socrates (letter 208). But there are also many occasions on which Rosa is dismissive of either the effectiveness or applicability of philosophical precepts. It is indicative of Rosa's

rest of his *oeuvre* (and, more than likely, by an interest in the broader Riberan tradition of images of philosophers holding titled books[162]) Rosa may have erased Seneca's name upon deciding that it was best not to forever bind his identity, or that of his friend, to one specific philosopher. Indeed, if Rosa intended the figure to be read as a self-referential allegorical type, he may have hoped to discourage the viewer from associating the poet-philosopher with Seneca himself. The tears themselves, which Rosa would also have associated with the philosopher Heraclitus and the pessimistic tenor of his melancholia (in contrast to the "laughing" Democritus), may have presented him with an equally problematic symbol in his search for the most appropriate pictorial representation of creative melancholy.

More than merely emblems of amity, the symbols of friendship that Rosa includes in his portrait are depicted in a way that draws attention to their function in social commerce: one of the books is propped open and upright, as if being consulted for the inscription the figure writes on the skull; another book has been marked with a piece of paper [Fig. 73], perhaps one of the many references suggested by his distant friend; the letter-like dedication, crumpled as if from repeated reading, is wedged between the books; and the gesture of writing in which the figure is engaged, his

---

frequent self-contradiction that he is able to recommend a more sincere conduct of philosophy for *others* in their time of suffering, yet quick to dismiss its merits during his own: in addition to the doubts he expressed over Seneca's "consolations" (see note 152 above), Rosa disparaged his own preoccupation with philosophical "maxims", considering them especially futile during a time of illness (letter 369); and mocked his own habit of finding self-gratification in Stoic principles (letter 296). His frequent references to the "philosopher's coat," or "boots", usually made in reference to a longing for solitude among friends in the villas of Volterra as an extension of his philosophical identity, suggest on the one hand a genuine faith in the ideal of community that the philosophical ideal represents and, on the other, an awareness of the artificiality and even highly performative nature of his philosophical aspirations (letters 1, 2, 15, 30, 32, 44, 54, 239).

[162] For example, Mattia Preti's *Portrait of a Poet Crowned with Laurel (Virgil?)*, where the figure holds a book with the title of his masterwork, "AENEIDOS" (or "AENEIDAS"), written along its edge. Petrucci ed., *Mola e il suo tempo*, 136, cat. 17. Preti's *Poet (Pindar?)* (Florence, Piacenti Art Gallery) also holds a book inscribed with the Greek letters of Pindar's name. See *Salvator Rosa. Tra Mito e Magia*, 262, cat. 95. Books with titles also feature in Ribera's *Saints Peter and Paul* (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Strasburg; see Spinosa, *Ribera* (Naples: Electa, 2003), 33 and cat. A25), his *Aesop* (private collection, New York; Spinosa, *ibid*, 76 and cat. A68), and his *Elijah* (1638, Certosa di S. Martino, Naples; see Whitfield and Martineau ed., *Painting in Naples*, 89, 230, cat. 125). The conceit also appears in portraits of unidentified figures, in order associate the sitter with the tenets of the text they hold, such as Angelo Caroselli's *Portrait of a Man with a Book by Tacitus* (Koelliker Collection, Milan). For the painting see *Caravaggio e L'Europa* (Milan: Skira, 2005), 191.

pen still in motion, gives the image that sense of immediacy toward which reciprocity aims – the collapsing of two individual absences into a shared "present," a moment suspended in time.

Rosa's Portrait as a *Freundschaftsbild*

Scholars have identified Rosa's portrait as *Freundschaftsbild* or "friendship painting," but have not given much consideration to the particular ways in which it functions as this type of image.[163] The friendship painting, which originated in *quattrocento* Florence and reached its apogee throughout Europe in the eighteenth century, typically took the form of a double or group portrait. It often contained a self-portrait of the artist.[164] As an inherently "relational" image, the *Freundschaftsbild* celebrates identity as a construct – a socially-dependent entity and a product of a relationship. Renaissance examples of the double-portrait type abound, many of which include self-portraits,[165] although the genre remained popular throughout the seventeenth century.[166] The

[163] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 118; Spike, *Baroque Portraiture*, 158, no. 58. Spike, however, identifies the figure in the painting as Ricciardi.
[164] Keller, "Entstehung und Blützeit des Freundschaftsbildes," in *Essays Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, ed. Douglas Fraser et al. (London: Phaidon, 1979), 162; Klaus Lankheit, *Das Freundschaftsbild der Romantik* (Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag Carl Winter, 1952); also see Otto von Simson's (albeit problematic) review of the same book: Von Simson, review of *Das Freundschaftsbild der Romantik* by Klaus Lankheit, *Art Bulletin* 36 (1954): 161-163.
[165] For example: Andrea Mantegna's (now lost) double-portrait of the humanists Janus Pannonius and Galeotto Marzio da Narni (c. 1455); Quentyn Metsys's diptych portrait of Erasmus and his friend Pieter Gillis (1517, now divided between the Royal Collection at Hampton Court and Longford Castle) [Fig. 155], commissioned by both men as gift for their mutual friend Thomas More; Raphael's double-portrait of his friends Andrea Navagero and Agostino Beazzano (c. 1516, Galleria Doria-Pamphilj, Rome) [Fig. 157], intended as a gift for their mutual friend Pietro Bembo; Raphael's enigmatic and well-known *Self-Portrait with a Friend* (c. 1518, Louvre, Paris) [Fig. 156]; Pontormo's portrait of *Two Friends* (1520's, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice) [Fig. 158a], in which two companions signal a letter with a passage from Cicero's *De Amicitia* (vi, 22) [Fig. 158b] that indicates not only the early-modern fascination with the ancient philosophy of friendship, but also the particular relevance of these texts for portraits of friends (see Elizabeth Pilliod, *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori. A Genealogy of Florentine Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 90; and Philippe Costamagna, *Pontormo* (Milan, 1994), 166-8, cat. 40); Hans Holbein's monumental portrait of Jean de Dinteville and Georges de Selve (*The Ambassadors*) (1533, National Gallery, London) [Fig. 159]; Maso da San Friano's *Double Portrait* (1556, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples), which likely depicts Ottavio Farnese receiving guidance in the study of architecture from Francesco De Marchi [Fig. 161] (G. Bertini convincingly identifies the younger man as Ottavio Farnese, Duke of Parma and Piacenza and the elder as Francesco De Marchi, a "noted military architect in the service of the duke during the war of Parma from 1551-2, his fidelity alluded to by the presence of the small dog under the table"; see Bertini, "Ottavio Farnese e Francesco de Marchi: una proposta di identificazione nel *Doppio Ritratto maschile* di Maso da San Friano," *Aurea Parma* LXVIII (1994): 149-155; and Maia Confalone, in *Tiziano e il Ritratto di Corte*, 262, cat. C47); and Sofonisba Anguissola's *Self-Portrait as a Portrait by Bernardino Campi* (c. 1559, Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena) [Fig. 162], an example of a particularly complex conceit on the subject of social self-fashioning (see Mary D. Garrard, "Here's Looking at Me: Sofonisba Anguissola and the Problem of

Freundschaftsbild could also consist of a single figure, often a self-portrait, given as a gift to a friend and consequently invested with the same spirit of community and sense of social-dependency to be found in double and group portraits.[167] As an image in which a single figure has the effect of representing the identities of two individuals simultaneously, Rosa's portrait condenses the same

---

the Woman Artist," *Renaissance Quarterly* 47: 3 (1994): 556-622, in which the painting and its apparent depiction of a self subjected to masculine authority is interpreted, instead, as a strategy of self-assertion; also see Meghan Jane Kalasky Musolff, "Sofonisba Anguissola's Double Portrait" (MA thesis, Michigan State University, 2003); and Frederika Jacobs, "Woman's Capacity to Create: The Unusual Case of Sofonisba Anguissola," *Renaissance Quarterly* 47: 1 (1994): 74-101). Woods-Marsden notes that the "double portraits are relatively rare in Italian art," although this should perhaps be qualified as "Italian art of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries" as they become increasingly popular toward the end of the latter century and into the seventeenth century. Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture*, 124.

[166] For example: Rubens' *Self-portrait with Mantuan Friends* (1602-3, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne) [Fig. 160] and his portrait of *Justus Lipsius and His Pupils* (1611-12, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 163] (the latter of which also contains a self-portrait); Rubens's self-portrait for Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc of 1628. See Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 292, 367, letters 180, 216. Rubens sent Peiresc a self-portrait painted by an assistant. See my reference to this painting again, below, in the context of the artist's economic practice, 406, note 327). Another example is furnished by Rembrandt's paired portraits of *Jacques de Gheyn III* and *Maurits Huygens* (1632, Dulwich College Gallery, London; Kunsthalle, Hamburg) [Fig. 165], which were to be reunited only at the death of one or the other friend (see: H. E. Van Gelder, "Marginalia bij Rembrandt I. De Pendant van Maurits Huygens," *Oud Holland* LX (1943): 33-34; E. K. Waterhouse, "An Exhibition of Paintings by Rembrandt arranged ... For the Edinburgh Festival Society," 5 (1950); and J. G. Van Gelder, "The Rembrandt Exhibition at Edinburgh," *Burlington Magazine* 92: 572 (1950): 327-329); Michelangelo Cerquozzi's group portrait of artist friends, the *Garden Party of a Circle of Roman Artists* (c. 1650, Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel) [Fig. 164] (Cerquozzi's painting appears to contain a portrait of Rosa's own friend, Niccolò Simonelli, in the "black-cloaked and hated figure on the left" (see Andrea Bayer, "A Note on Ribera's Drawing of Niccolò Simonelli," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Journal* 30 (1995): 73, citing Giuliano Briganti and Spezzaferro, in *Pier Francesco Mola*, 51, no. 16; on Cerquozzi's painting see Jurgen M. Lehmann, *Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Kassel. Italienische, franzosiche und spanische Gemalde des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts* (Graf Klenau, Verlags GmbH, Fridingen, 1980), 92-3; Bernard Schnackenburg, *Gemaldegalerie Alte Meister Gesamtkatalog* (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Gegründet, 1785, reprinted 1996), 80; and Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 136; and Van Dyck's touching *Portrait of Thomas Killigrew and an Unknown Man* (1638, Royal Collection) [Fig. 166], one of the many informal double-portraits of friends or relatives that the artist turned into a veritable genre of its own. On the painting, see Brown and Vlieghe eds., *Van Dyck. 1599-1641*. Exhibition catalogue (Royal Academy, London, 1999), 314-16, cat. 95. This last painting shares a close iconographic affinity with Rosa's Met portrait as an image of friendly consolation in a time of sadness and loss – Killigrew had recently lost his wife Cecilia Crofts, and his companion appears to comfort him in his suffering. The broken column in the background has been interpreted as a reference to Horace's dictum (*Odes*, III, 3, 8): *Impavidum ferient ruinae*, "Fearless among the ruins." Brown, in *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*, 314, cat. 95.

[167] Among the best known examples are the two self-portraits Nicolas Poussin made for his friends Jean Pointel and Paul Frèart de Chantelou (1649, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; 1650, Louvre, Paris) [Figs. 167 and 168], both of which are contemporaneous with Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi. Roworth also noted the similarity of the Met portrait to Poussin's self-portraits. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 259, note 57. In particular, Poussin's *Self-portrait* for Chantelou plays on the same trope of "presence and absence". See David Carrier, "Poussin's Self-Portraits," *Word and Image* 7: 2 (1991): 129. Carrier interprets the *Self-Portrait* for Chantelou as a veritable *summa* of the complex relationship he shared with his patron and friend: here, the composition appears to be aimed at striking a "balance … between narcissism and regard for another. Poussin is looking into a mirror; Poussin is looking out towards an image of his friend" as if to respond in visual terms to Chantelou's epistolary complaints of jealousy regarding the artist's friendship with Pointel, for whom he painted another self-portrait. Carrier, *ibid*, 135. On Chantelou's envy, see Jacques Thuillier, *Nicolas Poussin* (Paris, 1988), 245. Cropper and Dempsey also interpret the *Self-Portrait* as expressive of Poussin's conviction in the fundamental sociality of professional and personal life. See Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, esp. chapter 5.

mode of expression of solidarity encountered in the double-portrait *Freundschaftsbild* into a single-figure image where friendship itself is acknowledged as the generating force of identity. Rosa's decision not to paint a double portrait, but to depict a single figure that can be interpreted as either self-portrait or portrait allows him to pay homage to a friend and his influence while maintaining his own (important) sense of autonomy and self-determinacy.

It is informative to compare Rosa's portrait with an image like Van Dyck's *Self-Portrait with Endymion Porter* (c. 1635, Prado, Madrid) [Fig. 170]. Van Dyck, in many ways analogous to Rosa for his own ostracizingly-high self-regard and his anxiety to sustain both professional autonomy and the status and opportunities afforded by royal and aristocratic patronage, pursued a predominantly autonomous and performative brand of self-portrayal.[168] The Prado self-portrait is a rare instance of his self-depiction in the company of another person who he must, consequently, have deemed a "kindred spirit".[169] While Van Dyck's homage to the "relational" component of his personal identity consisted in a depiction of himself and his friend as two physically separate people, Rosa's version conflated self and friend into a single persona, a strategy that allowed him to convey the extreme intimacy of his friendship (by making the friend a second "self") while emphasizing at the same time the ideal of unique independence he constantly endeavoured to uphold.

Another revealing comparison is offered by the self-portraits of Rubens, an artist who also cultivated a profound image of self-importance but (significantly) achieved the level of professional autonomy, esteem and wealth that Rosa never quite accomplished. Rubens's self-representations

[168] Van Dyck's self-portraits collectively "present the image of a man of innately aristocratic refinement and display a broad range of [his] inner emotions." Natalya Gritsay, in Christina Corsiglia ed., *Rubens and His Age: Treasures from the Hermitage Museum, Russia*. Exhibition catalogue (Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario, 2001), 66, cat. 23.
[169] Judy Egerton, in *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*, 298, cat. 88. Despite the potential sincerity of their friendship, however, Porter's high standing within the English royal court made him an even more appealing companion for Van Dyck and his ambitions. In a manner similar to Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi, Van Dyck's portrait is a commemoration of a relation of utility as much as one of altruistic sentiment.

are socially-circumscribed in a manner quite different from Rosa's Met portrait. In his self-portraits, as in life, Rubens was more willing to acknowledge, and even to emphasize, the role played by external relationships in his self-formation. His self-images "give as much weight to those signifiers of societal position as to any expression of his own personality," and his portraits of others appear almost like a "diary of his personal attachments."[170] Unlike Rosa, Rubens's brand of allegorical self-portrayal in the form of a *Freundschaftsbild* consists in constructing a visual tribute to his friends as distinct individuals: in both his *Self-Portrait with Mantuan Friends* and his *Justus Lipsius and His Pupils* (*Four Philosophers*) [Figs. 160 and 163], Rubens pays "homage to those who shared his thinking," to Justus Lipsius in particular.[171] His brand of allegorical portrayal consists not so much in the visual manipulation of faces and bodies, but in the depiction of living and deceased friends in the same image, a technique that is iconographically distinct to (but performs a similar function as) the strategy used by Rosa's Met portrait in its intention to collapse the distances between friends, and make absence into presence. Rosa opts for an apparently (but deceptively) solo performance – an iconographic choice that results in a complex and oscillating visual experience for the painter and his friend who, in contemplating the figure in the painting, find in it both self and other, isolation and togetherness, singularity and commonality.[172]

[170] Susan Lawson, *Rubens* (London: Chaucer Press, 2006), 66, 72.
[171] On Rubens's two group portraits, and their iconographic strategies, see Lawson, *Rubens*, 72-77, and Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics*, 3ff and *passim*.
[172] Preceding and contemporary friendship paintings also explore this *concetto* of conflation, implicating the significance or even necessity of friendship for the artist's identity, although they do so in visually divergent ways. On the rise of the "communicative" or "sociable" portrait in the sixteenth century see John Shearman, *Only Connect…Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 135-7. Raphael's double portrait of Andrea Navagero and Agostino Beazzano [Fig. 157], for example, makes both the artist and the recipient of the painting (Pietro Bembo) implicit in the image itself: the two friends in the painting stare out at the viewer (ideally Raphael or Bembo) "as if he completed the circle of friendship by being seated as close to them as they are to each other." Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture*, 130. Van Dyck's *Self-portrait with Endymion Porter* [Fig. 170], likely intended as a gift for the latter, conveys a certain "unusual diffidence" in the artist's pose and expression, "as if he were acknowledging some debt to the friendship of the older man, or aware that this sort of self-intrusion is irregular, to be undertaken only in the cause of friendship." Egerton, in *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*, 298, cat. 88. As a gift for a prospective patron, Cosimo I de' Medici, Titian's portrait of his friend Pietro Aretino (1545, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) [Fig. 169] was in a very real sense intended as a promotional device for (and embodiment of) both the artist and his sitter. One of many paintings Titian made of his "friend and protector", this portrait was sent by Aretino to Florence in 1545, "with the goal of promoting both

The *Self-portrait with an Architect Friend* (1580's, Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg) [Fig. 175], previously attributed to Giovanni Battista Paggi and recently given to Bernardino Licinio, offers an example that more closely approximates the "merging" of self and friend in Rosa's Met portrait. More than simply a commentary on the *paragone* between the arts represented by the two figures,[173] this double portrait is a complex essay on the similitude and intellectual interdependency of friends. The painter himself (Paggi or Licinio) is present only in the form of a mirror reflection, his "real" body suggestively redoubled in the position of the viewer. His friend, whose profession as architect is signaled by the compass in his right hand, is seen from behind, his own reflection accompanying the painter's in the same mirror. The result is a dual reflection – a double-portrait of artist and friend in which two faces seem almost attached to the

---

himself and the artist to Cosimo I de' Medici". David Jaffè, in *Tiziano e il Ritratto di Corte*, 140, cat. 18. It is possible that Titian's well-known *Self-Portrait* in the Prado, Madrid [Fig. 182], was also intended to pay homage to his friend and his role in promoting his professional cause: it was perhaps made as a pendant to the *Portrait of Aretino*, "thanks to which the painter had discovered the propagandistic potentiality of portraiture." Jaffè, *ibid*, 156, cat. 26. Also see Woods-Marsden, "Toward a history of art patronage in the Renaissance: the case of Pietro Aretino," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24: 2 (1994): 297. Luca Cambiaso's *Self-Portrait Painting the Artist's Father* (c. 1570-1579, Museo di Palazzo Bianco, Genova) [Fig. 171] and Sofonisba Anguissola's *Self-Portrait as a Portrait by Bernardino Campi* [Fig. 162] present a vision of identity as the direct or indirect product of personal and professional relationships. On Cambiaso's self-portrait, see Piero Boccardo et al eds., *Luca Cambiaso: un maestro del Cinquecento europeo*. Exhibition catalogue (Genova and Austin. Cinisello Balsamo (Milan): Silvana, 2007); B. Suida Manning and W. Suida, *Luca Cambiaso: La vita e le opera* (Milan, 1958), 101, fig. 351; and C. Marcenaro, *Luca Cambiaso e la sua fortuna*. Exhibition catalogue (Genova, Palazzo dell'Accademia, 1956), n. 58. For Anguissola's *Self-Portrait*, see note 165 above. A *Self-portrait* recently attributed to Jacques Courtois (private collection) [Fig. 173], which shares certain stylistic and compositional qualities with Bernini's self-portraits (in particular his earliest *Self-Portrait as a Young Man* (c. 1623, Galleria Borghese, Rome) [Fig. 174]), pays tribute to Bernini himself as the young artist's mentor. This image, compared to another of Courtois's self-portraits (Besancon, Musee des Beaux-Arts), shows the strong influence of Bernini's style (and his own self-images). Montanari, *Bernini Pittore*, 48-49, figs. 45, 46. In Raphael's well-known *Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione* (1514-15, Louvre, Paris) [Fig. 172], for example – an eloquent expression of the "profound spiritual consonance between the artist and sitter" – the strong psychological pull of Castiglione's enticing gaze collapses the space between the picture and the realm of his artist-companion (and subsequent viewers). Pierluigi De Vecchi, in *Tiziano e il Ritratto di Corte*, 310, cat. C71. On the portrait, and its relation to Raphael's and Castiglione's friendship, also see Shearman, "Castiglione's Portrait of Raphael," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institute in Florenz* XXXVIII (1994): 69-97, in which Shearman describes a letter attributed to Castiglione as a textual "portrait" and reciprocation for Raphael's painted portrait.

[173] On the Würzburg double self-portrait see Kristina Herrmann-Fiore, "Due artisti allo Specchio: un doppio ritratto del Museo di Würzberg attributo a Giovanni Battista Paggi," *Storia dell'arte* 47 (1983): 29-39, esp. 35-6; Peter Lukehart, "G. B. Paggi," in *Dictionary of Art*, XXIII; Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture*, 130; and Severin Hansbauer, "Bernardino Licinios Kunstlerfreunde Vor Dem Spiegel," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 67 (2004): 263-78. Herrmann-Fiore suggests that the unidentified architect-sculptor friend in Paggi's painting "must have been a few years older than him," perhaps one of the friends mentioned by Baldinucci in his biography of the artist, such as the sculptor and architect Pietro Francavilla. Herrmann-Fiore, *ibid*, 39.

same, unseen body. Each friend acknowledges his mutual role in the process of social self-fashioning: the architect friend draws lines on the page with his compass while pointing with his other hand to the painter's reflection in the mirror, as if to suggest he is the "architect" of his friend's identity; the painter himself is engaged in painting the image of his friend, his brush touching the edge of the mirror which, in turn, represents his canvas. The popular conceit of "mirror reflection" that the artist transposes here from the genre of self-portraiture into that of the *Freundschaftsbild* (in order to infer both verism and the joint conceit of separation and unity), is an equally important strategy in Rosa's portrait. I will return to this shortly.

There are also examples of fully autonomous self-portraits that pay tribute in some way to friends, colleagues and patrons – their "autonomy" problematized, as in Rosa's Met portrait, by their implicitly social nature. In Van Dyck's *Self-Portrait with a Sunflower* (c. 1633, Collection of the Duke of Westminster) [Fig. 177], the prominently displayed gold chain that is often regarded as an explicitly sign of self-interest and status-seeking also pays homage to Titian as the "core of Van Dyck's artistic personality" and the artist with which he had the most "profound self-identification".[174] Titian was a frequent point of reference in artists' self-images. (Rosa, too, owed significant formal and iconographic debts to Titian, and even proclaimed parity with him – albeit with an intention to outdo him more than to pay him reverence.[175]) Rembrandt's *Self-portrait at the*

[174] Brown, in *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*, 19. Van Dyck also appears to pay homage to Rubens in his early *Self-Portrait* of 1613-14 (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna): Brown considers that it may consciously reproduce the same sense of "intensity and immediacy" to be found in Rubens's own early self-portrait (now lost) of which there is a copy in the Rubenshuis in Antwerp. Brown, *ibid*, 94, cat. 1. While the chain was in the early-modern period a clear signifier of noble status and recognition, it was also an emblem of *Pittura* and a symbol of the educational continuity of the art of painting (and the communal effort involved in elevating its status). Van Dyck's painting recalls Ripa's personification of *Pittura*, "a beautiful woman wearing a chain", symbolizing the didactic continuity of the art of painting. Egerton, in *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*, 244, cat. 66.

[175] Criticizing the "indecency" of Titian's followers in his satire on painting, Rosa elsewhere granted Titian his due when he proclaimed his own paintings to be worth the same as those by the Venetian master. Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 703-5: Rosa castigated Annibale Carracci and "i Tizziani" (the followers of Titian) for having "profaned the Christian palaces of princes with their raucous figures" ("con figure di chiassi han profanati / i palazzi de' prencipi cristiani"). Borelli, letter 144: "… sapendosi di già ch'io ho quasi voto di non far simili sorte di pitture, se non mi sono pagate al pari de' Raffaelli e de' Titiani." Rosa again mocked Titian in a letter of 1668. Borelli, letter 349. Baldinucci drew a connection between Rosa and Titian, praising Rosa's landscapes and his

Age of Thirty-Five (1640, National Gallery, London) [Fig. 178], which repeats the composition of Titian's own *Portrait of a Man with a Quilted Sleeve* (c. 1512, National Gallery, London) [Fig. 176],[176] is among the most well-known examples of this more literal brand of *imitatio tiziano*. Padovanino's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1625-30, Museo Civico, Padua) [Fig. 179] offers an even more profound, corporeal self-identification with the Venetian master. Here, as Maria Loh has argued, Padovanino appears to draw physiognomic analogies between himself and Titian in order to position himself as Titian's aesthetic heir.[177] While Rembrandt's and Padovanino's paintings concern a relationship of past and present (and are consequently laden with references to the grander social narrative of artistic heritage), the identity of the figure in Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi is the result of a temporally contemporaneous bond. Both types of image, however, pay homage to relationships as the source of creativity and identity.

Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi also finds a significant parallel in Anthonis Mor's *Self-Portrait* of 1558 (Uffizi, Florence) [Fig. 211], particularly according to Joanna Woodall's recent interpretation of the painting. Woodall describes Mor's portrait as an "intersubjective" image, in

---

ability to depict different times of day with glazes in a manner akin to the Venetian artist. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 343-4; see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 477. W. H. Schmidt suggested that the subject and composition of Rosa's *Prometheus* (mid-late 1640's?, Galleria Corsini, Rome) was inspired by Titian's painting in the Prado. Schmidt, "Drawings by Salvator Rosa in the Leipzig Stadtbibliothek," *Old Master Drawings* VI: 24 (1932): 61, pl. 55. Luigi Scaramuccia praised Rosa's Milanese paintings (including the large *Assumption of the Virgin* in the Brera), noting in particular the influence of Titian. Scaramuccia, *Le finezze dei pennelli italiani* [1674], 141, cited in Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 69. Rosa also owned copies of Titian's paintings: his inventory records "Due copie, una di Tiziano et l'altra di Paolo Veronese senza cornice". Inventory of Salvator Rosa, in Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 96-7.

[176] Rembrandt's painting repeats the composition of an etching of 1639 entitled "Self-Portrait Leaning on a Stone Sill" (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam). See Berger, *Fictions of the Pose*, fig. 101. Chapman has argued that Rembrandt's self-portraits in emulation of Titian and Raphael evince a "nostalgia for a lost [sixteenth-century] ideal of the artist and claim mastery of that ideal". Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*, 70. Titian's *Portrait of a Man with a Quilted Sleeve,* formerly considered a portrait of the poet Ludovico Ariosto, has also been considered a possible self-portrait of Titian himself. On the portrait, see Jaffé ed., *Titian*, 82-3, cat. 5. Simone Peterzano's *Self-Portrait* (Collezione Calvesi, Rome) bears an inscription identifying the artist as the "*alunno di Tiziano*". See Maria Teresa Fiorio, in *Tiziano e il Ritratto di Corte*, 298, cat. C65.

[177] Loh notes that the physiognomic features of the male bust in the background of the painting strongly echo those of Titian's self-portraits [Figs. 181 and 182]. The nose may also be Padovanino's own. "It is as if the two artists were one and the same person, representing two different ages of man: old age and maturity." The self-portrait is thus "a telling confession of Padovanino's relationship with Titian at that point in his career." Maria Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 172-175. See also, Loh, *Titian remade: repetition and the transformation of early modern Italian art* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007).

which both the artist and his sitter are implicit. In this case, the sitter is conceived first and foremost as a member of Mor's humanist circle of friends, above all his close friend Dominic Lampson (1532-1599), the author of the poem Mor includes in the painting itself. (Here too, there is a close resonance with the Met portrait as an ode to the mutual inspiration of poet and painter.)[178] Woodall suggests that Mor employed the ancient theory of friendship, in which the friend is both distinguished from and conflated with the self, in order to "resolve the difference between painting conceived as mimesis [the self-portrait figure] and textual reproduction [the poem]."[179] Mor's portrait, and the theory of painting that it represents, turns on the fundamental simultaneity of "representation" (the self as a distinct entity) and "mimesis" (the self as friend) in which the ideal of friendship consists.[180] This is the same concurrency of individuality and mutuality in friendship that I identify as a primary concern in Rosa's portrait, as I will demonstrate below.[181]

---

[178] Woodall, *Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority* (Zwolle, Netherlands: Waanders, 2006), 17-18, 43. "By incorporating the textual figure of his friend Lampson into his portrait, which claims to be the image of the consummate artist, Mor asserted an intimate union between the (portrait) painter and the humanist writer." Woodall's consideration that Lampson "as an alter ego established Mor's identity as a member of an intellectual and cultural elite" is also highly pertinent in connection with my own assertion of Ricciardi's role in the making of Rosa's intellectual identity. As in Rosa's portrait, with its Greek inscription, in Mor's self-portrait "the prominence and elevated position of the text in his work is indicative of the importance that the artist attached to this position." Woodall, *ibid*, 17.

[179] Woodall, *Anthonis Mor*, 9, 12. Mor was also inspired by Alberti's equation of the powers of painting and friendship in their ability to confer "presentness," (*ibid*, 17) an equally apposite concept for Rosa's Met portrait.

[180] "In Mor's *Self-portrait*, friendship's mirror-like capacity to unite apparently distinct positions is articulated in the juxtaposition of the fleshed-out face with the poetic text. The poem also participates in this process by rhetorically transforming Lampson, the transfixed beholder of the portrait and author of the text, via the metal mirror, into a speaking likeness of Mor, the artist and the subject of the painting." Woodall, *Anthonis Mor*, 17; see Elizabeth Grosz, *Jacques Lacan. A Feminist Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1990), 31-43.

[181] Another intriguing point of comparison for Rosa's Met portrait is offered by Luca Giordano's enigmatic *Self-Portrait* (c. 1664?, Matthiesen Gallery, London) [Fig. 180], a painting that Nicola Spinosa has proposed as a possible portrait of Rosa himself. Spinosa, in *Luca Giordano: 1634-1705*, cat. 61a. The figure's "somatic" qualities recall those that characterize Giordano's youthful self-portraits, although the nose, mouth and facial hair are more in keeping with Rosa's appearance than Giordano's. Spinosa makes the hypothetical – but intriguing – proposal that Giordano had become acquainted with Rosa in Rome after 1660, "when Rosa began to show signs of increasing exhaustion and illness that, by 1664, forced him to wear eyeglasses and produce simpler, smaller paintings". The age of the sitter, who appears to be in his forties, also seems to correspond well with Rosa who would have been forty-five in 1660. Spinosa, *ibid*, 180-1, cat. 50. Even if a more intimate relationship cannot be established between Giordano and Rosa (De' Dominici claims they were friends (*Vite*, 214)) the younger artist was nonetheless profoundly influenced by the older Neapolitan's work, and highly cognizant of his debts to him. If we regard Giordano's painting as performative (indeed, Giordano's self-images present, like Rosa's, a series of roles) can we surmise that Giordano intended to physically conflate his own features with those of the melancholic Neapolitan – to play the "role" of Rosa, so to speak? For Giordano's self-portraits, see notes 86 and 88, above.

In a sense, the genre of self-portraiture has always presented the artist as a social product. In its earliest manifestation, the witness self-portraits included in large-scale biblical scenes or other multi-figure images, the artist is shown explicitly "in relation" to a patron, to a religious personage or event, or to a group of friends.[182] The changes that take place in self-portraiture over the course of the early-modern period reflect the changing social status of the artist, and his decreasing professional obligation or indenture to powerful patrons and sponsors. The witness self-portrait gives way to the autonomous self-portrait, where the artist stakes a claim for his or her independence and individual creative *ingegno*. Once the artist had established a position of high social repute, he or she was free again to acknowledge the social context as sustenance for (rather than source of) his status.[183] The social context of friendship, in particular, offered this newly "independent" artist the social reinforcement he required for self-creation and self-maintenance, but couched it in the preferable, liberating terms of equality instead of the self-denying rituals of servitude. This is increasingly the case in the seventeenth-century, when images like Rubens's *Justus Lipsius and His Pupils* [Fig. 163] placed the artist in the egalitarian and social setting of intellectual friendship. For Rosa, too, whose self-conception as an artist can be seen as a culmination of early-modern developments, self-portraiture was an exercise in asserting this subjective valuation. While Rosa's earliest self-portraits adhere to the older tradition (that is, images of an artist dependent upon the graces of patronage for self-definition), the majority of his mature self-portraits are physically autonomous and profess a faith in independent agency. This impression, however, conceals a much more profound and essentially social brand of subjectivity:

---

[182] For example, Sandro Botticelli's self-portrait in the *Adoration of the Magi* (early 1470's, Uffizi, Florence); Benozzo Gozzoli's self-portrait in the fresco of the Medici chapel (1459, Palazzo Medici, Florence); Raphael's self-portrait, along with portraits of friends and professional colleagues, in the *School of Athens* (1510-11, Stanza della Segnatura, Vatican Palace); or Paolo Veronese's self-portrait and portraits of Titian and Tintoretto as the musicians in the foreground of his *Marriage at Cana* (1562-63, Musée du Louvre, Paris).

[183] Hence the inclusion of the gold chain in Titian's two well-known autonomous self-portraits [Figs. 181 and 182] are for the artist symbols of the acknowledgment of his own *inherent* eminence as much as they are appeals to the support of patronage that continues to sustain that reputation. See Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*, 50-51.

as performative images, they rely on the viewer for confirmation; and many of them – especially the portrait for Ricciardi, but also the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* he made for Girolamo Signoretti and the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* he gave to the Maffei – rely specifically on the reception of friends. Importantly, the process of self-fashioning produced in these particular images takes place not only within the confines of the paintings themselves, but in their status as gifts – objects whose physical exchange embodies the tenets of reciprocity and mutuality central to the egalitarian nature of true friendship.

The (Self-)Portrait as a Gift: A Homage to Friendship

Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi belongs to a set of self-referential images he made as gifts for friends, part of a more general trend in the period for producing and collecting portraits and self-portraits of friends.[184] It is possible that Ricciardi solicited the portrait from Rosa for his own collection of paintings, although there is no clear indication of this in the early sources. As a gift for Ricciardi, Rosa's portrait encapsulates the ideal of reciprocity that defines social bonds – a phenomenon whose primitive roots were first elucidated in Marcel Mauss's foundational anthropological study.[185] Seemingly "casual" and "spontaneous" in practice, early-modern gift-exchange was in essence part of a long-standing and deeply rooted history of obligation. If we accept Roworth's theory that Rosa intended his portrait as a reciprocation for the *canzone* Ricciardi

---

[184] Andrea Sacchi, Giambologna, Cassiano dal Pozzo, Galileo Galilei and Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc are among the many collectors of portraits of friends and patrons. On the subject of portrait collections, see Jean Goldman, "Aspects of Seicento Patronage: Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Amateur Tradition" (PhD dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1978). On Peiresc, see P. J. J. van Thiel, "La Collection de Portraits réunie par Peiresc à propos d'un portrait de Jean Barclay conservé à Amsterdam," *Gazette des Beaux Arts* 65 (1965): 341.

[185] Mauss, "Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques," originally published in *L'Année Sociologique*, second series, 1923-1924; see also *idem*, *The gift: the form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000). As John Cunnally writes, modern gift-exchange is a "formalized remnant of the primitive economy of in which all members of the group shared everything without restriction. In a more complex society consisting of separate clans or communities, the primeval unity is preserved in the form of moral and spiritual relationships established by gift-exchange. … The exchange of gifts is an ancient and universal method of establishing a sense of fellowship, especially if these gifts are meant to be circulated as a kind of common property." Cunnally, "Ancient Coins as Gifts," 135.

had written for him[186] (or, for that matter, any other "gift" he bestowed on Rosa, tangible or otherwise) then Rosa's portrait was given not only in response to that initial gift but in expectation of a later, subsequent return on Ricciardi's part: a tenet of gift-giving holds that the exchange must continue in perpetuity in order for the friendship to carry on; the "spirit" of the gift must be kept in continual motion in order for a friendship to continue.[187]

In addition to the Met portrait, Rosa's large *vanitas* painting of *Umana Fragilitas* (c. 1657-8, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge) [Fig. 97] together with a series of drawings [Figs. 46, 47 and 49][188] also appear to have been made directly in response to Ricciardi's poem. Although the painting was not given to Ricciardi himself, it is – like the Met portrait – fundamentally a self-referential allegory that pays homage to Ricciardi's contribution to Rosa's philosophical outlook and identity. In the painting, a young *putto* is guided by the ominous, winged, skeletal figure of Death to write the phrase "*Conceptio Culpa, Nasci Pena, Labor Vita, Necesse Mori*" ("Conception is sin, birth is pain, life is toil, death inevitable"), a variation on a line in Ricciardi's *canzone*.[189]

---

[186] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 118. Roworth noted, importantly, that the painting was "a special gift for a sympathetic friend, 'dono a suo amico', to commemorate their personal and intellectual relationship." She did not, however, consider how the portrait operated as such. The possibility that Rosa made the portrait directly in exchange for (and not just in response to) Ricciardi's *canzone*, is suggested by a number of comments in Rosa's letters that imply a series of exchanges of poetry and texts by Ricciardi for drawings, paintings and etchings by Rosa. See, for example, Borelli, letter 49. Indeed, Rosa's portrait and Ricciardi's *canzone* should be seen one of many instances in a more extensive series of exchanges among Rosa and his friends.

[187] Komter, *Social Solidarity and the Gift* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 58-9 and *passim*.

[188] Ebert-Schifferer discusses a group of drawings on the *vanitas* theme – three of which contain *putti* – that may be connected to the sentiment conveyed in Rosa's large *Umana Fragilitas* and Ricciardi's *canzone*: two allegories of *Vanity* (one formerly the Paul Frantz Marcou collection, recently sold on the Paris art market; and the other in the Teylers Museum, Haarlem) [Figs. 46b and 47], the *Allegory of Fate* (also Teylers Museum, Haarlem) [Fig. 49], and another *Allegory of Vanity* (Sotheby's, present location unknown) of two *putti* in front of a large stone with a skull and a cross, drawn on the back of a letter to Ricciardi of 1639 (the drawing was probably carried out in 1650) [Fig. 46a]. She suggests the Paris drawing [Fig. 46b], inscribed "Sol per servire il cieco mondo errante/ piangano il tempo infante", may have been made as a gift for a friend. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 74.

[189] Baldinucci was the first to note this connection (*Notizie*, 445); Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 28. The line in Ricciardi's poem reads, "Rosa, il nascere è pena,/ Il vivere è fatica,/ Et il morir necessità fatale". (Appendix II. I, vv. 145-7) For the early debate concerning whether or not Rosa's *Umana Fragilitas* was created after receiving Ricciardi's poem, or whether Ricciardi's poem was written in response to and in praise of Rosa's painting, see Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 110, no. xv, and Oertel, "Die Vergänglichkeit der Künst," 119, n. 36. Mahon and Wallace have proposed the most convincing argument that Ricciardi likely found the text himself – one that Francis Wormald found in a poem by the twelfth-century poet and composer Adam of St. Victor – included it in his own poem, and passed the idea along to Rosa. Mahon, *Italian Art in Britain*, 164f, no. 404; L.

This painting shares much with the Met portrait: an overarching theme of a *vanitas* or *memento mori*, the act of inscription, and a self-referential significance for Rosa himself, explicitly in the context of suffering, absence or outright loss.[190] By citing a line from Ricciardi's poem, Rosa expressed agreement with his friend's philosophy and acknowledged his consolatory efforts. Rosa frequently solicited Ricciardi for advice on philosophical or historical literature, iconography and subject-matter, language, and inscriptions to include in etchings,[191] and this occasion was perhaps no exception. Most significantly, the *Umana Fragilitas* conveys the value Rosa granted to Ricciardi's friendship and influence, but also of his willingness or desire to *acknowledge* that inspiration in his own work. As a collective, the *canzone*, the *Umana Fragilitas*, and the Met portrait comprise part of the larger cycle of affective and intellectual exchange at the heart of their bond, in which ideas and selves are constructed, contemplated and reiterated. Spurred by the *vanitas* sentiments of Ricciardi's *canzone*, Rosa infused two of his most highly self-referential images with an explicitly dialogic vision of mortality, a philosophy filtered through and reflected in that of his best friend.[192]

Gautier, *Oeuvres poétiques d'Adam de S. Victor*, I (1858), II (1959), XCI, 450. As I noted above, scholars have argued that Ricciardi's *canzone* is best dated to either 1651-2 or 1656, thus preceding both the Met portrait and the *Umana Fragilitas*. A date for the latter painting to after 1655 is supported by its iconographic elements, which seem to refer to the election of Pope Alexander VII in 1655: the *putto* burning tow, as Baldinucci noted, is associated with the papal coronation ceremony. The picture's apparent purchase by Fabio (or perhaps even more likely Flavio) Chigi also suggests this context. Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 28-29; Salerno, *ibid*, 110f, no. xv.

[190] Mahoney, *Drawings*, 465; Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 110ff. If the *Umana Fragilitas* is to be interpreted as autobiographical, then Rosa's inclusion of his signature on the blade of the knife at the base of the composition may allude not only to the "violent separation" of the loss of his son and brother, but perhaps even more specifically to his own sense of responsibility for his son's death, having sent the boy to the city himself.

[191] See for example a letter of 1651 in which Rosa asks Ricciardi for his advice concerning the subject for the allegory *Justice Departing from the Shepherds*, reminding him of the importance of maintaining his professional reputation for novelty. Borelli, letter 100.

[192] As Roworth put it, "Ricciardi had sent Rosa the *canzone* in an attempt to lift his spirits, and Rosa responded with these paintings, one … a pictorial rendering of Ricciardi's words and sentiments, the other a visual equivalent to Ricciardi's poetic image of his melancholy friend." Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 121. To this group of objects exchanged between the two friends can also be added the etching of the *Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus* [Fig. 113] that Rosa dedicated to Ricciardi as his "*amico unico*", an important image that I will discuss in greater detail in chapter five. The use of this phrase in the etching may have inspired Rosa's change of address (from "amico carissimo" or "amico vero" to "amico unico") in his letters to Ricciardi from 1668 onward. It is perhaps significant that, at this point in their correspondence, Rosa was losing his desire to constantly

The Gift as Self and Other

One of the most distinctive capacities of the gift is its ability to function as a surrogate for the giver and/or the recipient. In her study of contemporary Melanesian gift-giving culture, Marilyn Strathern observed that gifts frequently "subsume persons themselves", an idea equally applicable to the early-modern conception of the ritual.[193] Gifts, like children or the parts of the body, were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries regarded as an extension of the self in a very real and meaningful way.[194] As an object that participated in an exchange between two persons, the gift embodied not only the giver but contained an implicit reference to the recipient, as well, becoming in the process an embodiment of friendship itself. As a literal representation of identity and presence, the portrait as a gift was doubly endowed with the spirit of both sitter and recipient.[195] The close connection drawn between portraiture, surrogacy, and friendship in the early-modern mind is signaled by Leon Battista Alberti's well-known statement regarding the mimetic power of painting itself: "Painting contains a divine force which not only makes the absent present, as

---

reassure Ricciardi of his friendship; he may have intended the phrase as a succinct summation of previously elaborate reassurances.

[193] Strathern, *The Gender of the Gift. Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia* (Berkeley, LA & London: University of California Press, 1990), xi.

[194] Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics. Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 16, 59 and *passim*. Fumerton describes the gift in the context of Renaissance cultural aesthetics as a "medium of memory", an object invested with the essence of the giver that is intended to perpetuate that identity into posterity. The idea is expressed in a letter of 1636 by Rubens to Peiresc, in which the artist thanked his close friend for a number of favours, including the receipt of a drawing: "As a climax to this superabundance of favors, you have added the colored drawing I wanted so much, which I received through my brother-in-law, M. Picquery, with the copy of that ancient painting which was discovered in Rome in my youth … It came to me without a letter, but the superscription and the quality of the gift made me recognize the author, and to tell the truth, you could not have made me a present more acceptable, or one that conformed more to my taste and my desire." Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 405, letter 239, September 4 1636. Emphasis mine. Rubens implies that the characteristics of the gift itself – in this case, its superior quality – are to an extent interchangeable with or equivalent to the sender.

[195] Traditionally exchanged between couples, lovers or the soon-to-be-betrothed, portraits were intended both to give a face to a distant name and as an important sign of the bond of unity. Albrecht Dürer, for example, painted a *Self-Portrait* (Louvre, Paris) in 1493 as a gift of betrothal for his fiancée Agnes, depicting himself holding a sprig of sea holly or Eryngium, an aphrodisiac and symbol of love. Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art*, 30-31. Rubens' *Henry IV Receiving The Portrait of Maria de'Medici* (1621-5, Louvre, Paris) is another salient example: here the King is presented with a portrait of Maria as his betrothed, the idea of "presence" implicit in the giving of the portrait. See R. F. Millen and R. E. Wolf, *Heroic Deeds and Mystic Figures: A New Reading of Rubens' Life of Maria De' Medici* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

friendship is said to do, but moreover makes the dead seem almost alive."[196] As an index of both Rosa's and Ricciardi's identities as "poet-philosopher," the figure in the Met portrait was not only symbolic of the similitude of friends, but represented the possibility for "togetherness" that Alberti identified as the power of portraiture itself.

Making Absence into Presence: The Portrait-Gift as a Strategy of Spatial Reunion

Roworth considered that an essential component of Rosa's portrait consisted in its "self-conscious allusion to the *concetto* of presence and absence." The figure in the painting

> "appears unaware of the viewer, self-absorbed; he is not depicted as though looking into a mirror (as in most artists' self-portraits), and perhaps ironically – in view of his Stoic stance – he does not peer into the mirror of self-knowledge. Rather, we see him as if through Ricciardi's eyes, not only as described verbally by the poet, but actually, as if viewed by him."[197]

Indeed, the eyes of the young man in Rosa's portrait are turned downward, the pupils only just visible, his gaze directed toward the skull. As I noted above, scholars who interpret the portrait as an explicitly self-referential image have considered this "downward stare" a conspicuous deviation from the outward gaze that characterizes Rosa's other self-images. Roworth interprets this feature of Rosa's Met portrait as an allusion to the trope of presence and absence itself: in choosing not to depict the figure gazing directly out at the viewer, emphasis is placed on his own "solitary presence" and the "implied absence" of his distant friend. In her analysis, however, which argues for the figure as a self-portrait, only Rosa is "present" in the painting. But if the figure is interpreted as a character to be adopted – that is, an "analogue" for both Rosa and Ricciardi – then the absence of the usual outward stare is no longer at issue. I suggest that the downward gaze functions both as a physical trait of the melancholic and a compositional strategy by which to implicate both Rosa and his friend in the same image. In this reading, the idea of "presence and absence" remains applicable, but in a different way: now the downward gaze infers an *oscillation*

[196] Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. C. Grayson, 63.
[197] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 118-19.

between the states of presence and absence in the successive (or simultaneous) moment of unification elicited by the painting's exchange.

Roworth's consideration that the figure in Rosa's portrait served "as his surrogate" in order to "remind Ricciardi of their friendship" is equally sustained by an interpretation of the figure as a symbol of shared identity. The portrait was intended as both an acknowledgement of the distance between friends (alluded to by the dedicatory "letter", the interminable void of the background, and the *vanitas* iconography) and an attempt to bridge that distance. If true friendship was maintained through physical presence, as ancient theorists claimed, then the friendship portrait was required to have an exceptional surrogate agency.[198] (As I noted in chapter three, this was equally true for letters – indeed, Rosa's epistolary comments frequently insinuate the letter's unifying efficacy.[199])

Various features of the painting play on the notions of presence, absence and surrogacy. The Greek inscription, for example, which emblematizes Ricciardi's role as Rosa's iconographic advisor, is an index of Ricciardi's friendship and his "presence" in the painting.[200] The potential obscurity of its reference, perhaps intended as a secret to be shared between two friends, would

---

[198] For a discussion of presence and absence in relation to portraiture, and its surrogate efficacy, see Robert Maniura and Rupert Shepherd, *Presence. The Inherence of the Prototype within Images and Other Objects* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); and Oskar Batschmann, "Presence – Absence," in *Nicolas Poussin: Dialectics of Painting* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), 45-61.

[199] Rosa comments on the spatial dimension of friendship in his letters, and makes clear the importance of proximity (or of imitating that proximity) in order to maintain it. True friendship, he implies, can transcend great distances: "Salutatemi, et abbracciatemi il Signor Buonaiuti al quale me li ricordo quell'amico di sempre a dispetto della lontananza." Borelli, letter 59. In 1650 Rosa told Giulio he had passed along his greetings to their mutual friends in Monterufoli "ben che mi state tanto lontano", adding that the distance was only "col corpo, ché con l'animo le persone che da davero s'amano son sempre vicine e d'appresso." Letter 71. In 1651 he wrote to Giulio: "Ciullo mio, scrivimi sempre e comandami poiché sono tutto tuo, e, se ben la fortuna ci tien di lontano col corpo, l'animo mio però è sempre presso a voi, col quale v'abraccio." Letter 81. In letters to Ricciardi, distance is an occasional impediment to be overcome in maintaining friendship: "imaginatevi pure, amico, ch'io vivo infelice lontano da voi, e ch'è impossibile che sia per incontrar consolatione nessuna fuor che dalla vostra persona," he writes in 1652. Letter 146. Also see letters 134, 185, 212 and 217.

[200] Irrespective of who the sitter is meant to represent - either in the sense that he is represented by the figure in the act of writing, or by the skull which is written upon. For the various instances in which Rosa consults or thanks Ricciardi for his advice and help with devising ideas and subjects for his own work, see Borelli, letters 95, 100, 101, 108, 152, 178, 203, 216, 272, 277, 302, 331, 369, and 370.

have greatly appealed to Rosa's predilection for *novità* and *stravaganza*[201] and its potentially clandestine nature contributed a further degree of intimacy to the portrait.[202] The relatively large dimensions of Rosa's portrait also point to the *concetto* of presence: unlike the common, small portraits given as tokens, to be kept on one's person or tucked away in a private place, the Met portrait (whose protagonist is also consequently life-size) was probably intended to be hung in a fairly prominent position in Ricciardi's home (perhaps his villa at Strozzavolpe?). The size of the portrait also signals the import Rosa gave to the subject of the painting itself. In this sense, the painting becomes a quantitative (as well as qualitative) acknowledgement of both the significance of Ricciardi's presence in Rosa's life, and of the desire on Rosa's part to have an equally profound presence in Ricciardi's.

The skull, however, is the most profound and complex symbol of presence and absence in Rosa's portrait. By the mid-*seicento* it was a widespread emblem in *vanitas* portraiture, depicted with full cognizance that it linked both sitter and artist to a "collective" of other melancholic souls.[203] In one of the final preparatory sketches for the Met portrait [Fig. 77], Rosa included two symbolic sets of skulls and crossbones; one perched ominously behind the figure atop a large tomb-like structure, and the other decorating the parapet in front of him. In the final painting Rosa has left out these features, opting for a more visually economical but metaphorically complex brand of *vanitas*. A symbol of absence in its most extreme form, the skull in Rosa's portrait also operates as an index of presence, a dual function suggested by its iconography and formal qualities. As a

---

[201] See my discussion of these concepts in chapter five, 353ff and 417ff.
[202] Tarnya Cooper, "'Frail flesh, as in a glass': the portrait as an immortal presence in early modern England and Wales," in *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art*, ed. Mary Rogers (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 205. The inscription also belongs to the more pervasive formal strategy of including text in portraiture in order to clarify or augment the meaning of the image – a kind of "verbalization" that conferred a present-ness and liveliness upon the figure therein, and that could be "'replayed' at will" by the viewer (in this case, Ricciardi).
[203] Cooper, "'Frail flesh, as in a glass'," 197. For a discussion of the skull as a symbol of death, see Janson, "The Putto with the Death's Head," *Art Bulletin* 19 (1937), 423-32; and Liana De Girolami Cheney, ed., *The Symbolism of Vanitas in the Arts, Literature, and Music. Comparative and Historical Studies* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992).

symbol, the skull represents not only mortality and defeat but self-knowledge and moral-philosophical empowerment. A clue to the meaning of Rosa's skull in this sense may be found in Ricciardi's *canzone* and an analogous metaphor in Rosa's satire *Il Tirreno.* In Ricciardi's poem, the skull is an emblem of human fragility: against the whims of "severe fortune," he writes, any shield we use to protect ourselves becomes a "naked skull".[204] In Rosa's satire (likely contemporaneous with the Met portrait and Ricciardi's *canzone*), Ricciardi's "naked skull" reappears in the artist's claim that he will "give up satire to concentrate on his own moral conduct with '*un cranio spolpato*' [a fleshless skull] as master."[205] Here, the skull is not only an image of mortal transience or human vulnerability in the face of cruel fortune, but a powerfully didactic instrument from which knowledge (especially self-knowledge) can be gleaned. This is the same idea represented by the *concetto* in the Met portrait, where the skull is made into a "document" of an expressly existential brand of philosophical inquiry.

In this sense, then, the skull can be interpreted as an index not only for Ricciardi's absence (the distance that the portrait attempts to bridge) but also his efficacious presence as Rosa's intellectual guide. In formal terms, the skull in Rosa's portrait – with its highly polished surface [Fig. 65] and its face turned toward the figure – acts as an analogue for a mirror.[206] Thus, as the object of the figure's contemplation, the skull alludes to the process of "reflection" that takes place

[204] Appendix II.1, vv. 277-88.
[205] *Il Tirreno*, v. 585; Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 121. Roworth also made the connection between this line in Rosa's satire and Ricciardi's *canzone*. Roworth, *ibid*, 262. The trope appears again in a poem by Rosa, beginning "Lungo il lito famoso": "Suon funebre in chi rimbombe/ Chi vuol far l'alma perita/ Chi par scola have le tombe/ Impara a spender bene l'ore di vita./ Più forza ha un nudo teschio, un sasso, un' urna/ Gelida e taciturna/ Che la Grecia sapienza, l'Asia eloquenza./ Con tacite rapine il tempo fura/ La brevità degli anni i nomi e l'opre/ Poca terra alfin ricopre/ Quanto di merto e di fastoso ha il mondo/ E chi meno possiede è più giocondo." Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 79.
[206] The positioning of the skull facing the sitter appears in many figurative *vanitas* images of the first half of the seventeenth century, such as Domenico Feti's *Melancholy* (c. 1622, Louvre, Paris), Ribera's *Penitent St. Jerome* (1634, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid), or Hendrik Ter Brugghen's, *Melancholia* (or *The Penitent Mary Magdalene*) (1627-28, Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto). Rosa's use of this motif as a device of contemplation or "mirroring" is deliberate; alternatively, artists have positioned the skull on its side or facing the viewer in order to display their virtuosity in depicting the more challenging aspects of its form (as Rosa does in the *Vanitas of the Arts* (early 1650's?, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, Munich) [Fig. 63] and the *Singing Skull* he painted on a harpsichord lid for the Maffei (Collection of Major David Gordon, Haddo House, Aberdeenshire, UK) [Fig. 48] and in a related set of sketches [Fig. 50].

in true friendship. (The dual connotation of "reflection" as "contemplation" and "replication" was perhaps intended by Rosa's *concetto*.) This analogy is even more apparent in two of the preparatory drawings for the painting, particularly one of the earliest of the set [Fig. 76] where the figure lifts the skull close to his own face as if peering into it like a crystal ball.[207]

Like his contemporaries, Rosa drew a symbolic connection between the mirror and skull.[208] This connection is suggested most clearly in a preparatory drawing for Rosa's *Democritus and Heraclitus* (c. 1646, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) [Figs. 39a-c] where two small figures at the bottom of the composition each hold the objects in question, presenting them as a kind of iconographic dyad.[209] The mirror was a highly personal symbol for Rosa, integral to both his

---

[207] Here it is worth noting that, despite experimenting with an alternative outward stare [Fig. 78], Rosa opted instead to stick with the composition of the skull and figure facing one another. A similar conceit appears in another of Rosa's drawings, dated by Mahoney on stylistic grounds to the 1640's, which depicts a seated male figure staring at a skull in his hands [Fig. 80]. See Mahoney, *Drawings*, 292-3.

[208] The more pervasive conception of a symbolic affinity between the mirror and skull is apparent in various early-modern *vanitas* paintings. Two apposite examples are offered by Madeleine Boullogne's *Vanitas Still-Life* (late 17th c., Musée des Beaux-Arts, Mulhouse) [Fig. 185] and a *Vanitas* attributed to the Master of Candlelight (c. 1630-33, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Rome) [Fig. 184] – both of which belong to the Northern tradition that inspired Rosa's own conception of *memento mori* imagery. For the attribution to the Master of Candlelight, see *Caravaggio e l'Europa*, 139. Mary Garrard identifies the painting as the work of Trophime Bigot. Garrard, *Artemisia Gentileschi. The Image of the Female Hero in Italian Baroque Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 47, fig. 33. These paintings emphasize the analogous symbolic function of the mirror and skull: in Boullogne's painting, the skull is literally "reflected" in the mirror, while the female figure (perhaps Mary Magdalen?) in the Master of Candlelight's *Vanitas* holds the mirror in one hand and points to the skull with the other. The implication is that the skull shares not only the mirror's role as an instrument of self-examination and self-mastery but that it, too, has a "specular" agency – one that was both intro- and extro-spective in nature. For an educated viewer well versed (or, in Rosa's and Ricciardi's case, thoroughly immersed) in the complex and multi-layered resonances of both pictorial and poetic *vanitas* imagery, the skull in Rosa's portrait would naturally have called to mind its customary iconographic companion. Within the *vanitas* tradition, the skull and the mirror are employed as twin symbols of mortality and self-discovery; they were frequently invoked in images of the conversion of Mary Magdalen. See Garrard, *Artemisia Gentileschi. The Image of the Female Hero in Italian Baroque Art*, 47.

[209] A rare instance of dated drawings in Rosa's oeuvre, it bears the date "1646". Mahoney considers that the two lower figures in the image "have separate philosophical allusions" to the larger figures of Democritus and Heraclitus above, though he is uncertain how they relate to each other. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 287-9. Both philosophers, not incidentally, are among those with whom Rosa most frequently identified himself. Mahoney considers that the figure holding the skull reflects "Rosa's preoccupation with the transitory nature of human life" and the female figure holding a mirror is perhaps an allusion to moral philosophy as "the instrument of perfect self-knowledge", also the subject of Rosa's painting of *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31]. It seems likely that Rosa intended these figures to offer a conceptual tie between the two philosophers and their mutual experience of malcontent and advocation of self-examination. Unaware of the painted version, Mahoney considered that the drawing "may allude to Pythagorean philosophy … As Pythagoras held that the most beautiful solid figure was the sphere (Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 35) and that the earth itself was so shaped (*idem*, VIII, 48), the seated figure [of here might be seen to expatiate with his gesture upon the theme of sphericality." The "spherical" form of the skull in the small figure's hands may connect it to the larger globe in the drawing above. Stolzenburg considered

philosophical self-conception and its performative nature.[210] He included it in another preparatory drawing for his *"Genius"* etching as one of the attributes of the allegorical figure of "Equity" or "Moral Philosophy". Here he intended it as a symbol of "the self-knowledge necessary for attaining equability," tying it to the iconographic tradition of images that treat the mirror as an explicit symbol of philosophical self-knowledge.[211] A mirror also appears in Rosa's large painting of *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31] where it again forms an iconographic pair with the skull: a standing male figure gestures toward a large mirror resting on the ground, attracting the gaze of his female companion (seated in the "hand-in-head" pose of Dürer's "Melencolia") who rests one hand on a skull in her lap.[212]

In his painting Rosa chose to depict a skull – mirror-like in its highly polished appearance and its position, facing the figure in the painting – instead of the more predictable mirror as the object of his protagonist's scrutiny.[213] This allowed him to exploit the symbolic import of both objects at the same time:[214] as a symbol of mortality, the skull is a potent symbol of absence and loss, but as an effectual instrument of learning, and a writing surface, it becomes both a "teacher" and "document" that posits its own ever-present necessity and enduring immortality. In its primary iconographic role as a symbol of absence, the skull represents the distant other – the friend. (This

---

that the rectangular object held by the figure on the left might be a sheet of paper – a letter or drawing – if not a mirror. Stolzenburg, *Salvator Rosa. Genie der Zeichnung*, 104. The clearly visible frame on the object, however, together with the vertical lines that suggest a reflective surface and what appears to be a reflection of the figure's head, suggest that it is more likely a mirror.

[210] The mirror is "performative" in the sense that it duplicates the experience of self-reflection and self-ratification found in everyday, lived experience.

[211] Wallace, "The Genius of Salvator Rosa," 477-479, fig. 3. Roworth connected this allegorical figure specifically with Cynic philosophy, noting his attribute of the Cynic's staff. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 72, 82. Examples of other *seicento* images where the mirror is a symbol of self-knowledge or philosophical pedagogy include the *Philosopher with a Mirror* (c. 1629-31, location unknown) [Fig. 183] by a copyist of Ribera, and Mola's *Socrates Teaching Youths Self-Knowledge* (Museo Civico di Belle Arti, Villa Ciani, Lugano), where the philosopher holds a mirror up to his young students (see Kahn-Rossi ed, *Pier Francesco Mola*, 194-195, 199.

[212] On the influence of Dürer's print on Rosa's *Moral Philosophy* and *Umana Fragilitas*, see Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 27-28.

[213] In connection with this idea, Evonne Levy also indicated to me the pen's shadow, cast across the surface of the skull, which further suggests the ability of the skull's surface to capture or reproduce an image like a mirror.

[214] The use of the skull, moreover, permits Rosa to use the conceit of "writing" on its surface – an idea that would make less practicable sense with a mirror.

role is also suggested by the figure's diligent gaze which has the effect of making the skull into a proxy for the viewer himself – Rosa or Ricciardi – who, standing before the painting, would otherwise hold the figure's attention.[215]) In its secondary role as a mirror, the skull represents the figure's "self". Hence, in contemplating the specular skull in his hands, the young poet-philosopher is absorbed in a meditation on both self and friend, united in a single symbolic referent.[216] As a "role" to be performed by both Rosa and Ricciardi, the figure in the portrait functions as one friend and then the other, an embodiment that alternates according to the spatial and temporal parameters of the portrait. Implicit in this complex process is an acknowledgment of the fundamental role of friendship in self-knowledge – an idea frequently repeated in ancient theory.[217] The reflective experience taking place within the painting is also duplicated by the canvas itself, by virtue of its status as a "mirror" of reality. As Ricciardi stands before it on the wall, it becomes an instrument of "self-reflection" in both senses of the word: a representation that to be contemplated, and a reproduction of his own *genio* as poet-philosopher.[218] At the same time, the painting's authorship

---

[215] That the skull represented (for Rosa) a proxy for Ricciardi himself, perhaps, is suggested by the inscription on its surface – an allusion to Ricciardi's role as his guide and teacher in matters of moral philosophy. In this sense, too, the portrait operates as consolatory in its status as a visual embodiment of the sentiment of reassurance and recognition often expressed in Rosa's letters to Ricciardi. As a symbol of philosophical instruction, the mirror is an external source of knowledge about our own identity, and thus representative of the teacher (or the philosopher, who is ideally also the friend) who offers us self-insight. As a consequence, the mirror represents the external, social dimension of self-discovery and self-formation. The skull in Rosa's painting, as an index for the mirror, denotes Ricciardi's educative role, as philosopher and friend, in the creation of Rosa's own identity. The book that the skull rests on – if not Seneca's philosophy then perhaps another equally erudite text of philosophical thought – becomes a symbol of the literal poetic-philosophical "foundation" on which the exchange of selves and ideas takes place, a procedure that is further replicated in the act of inscribing in Greek on the skull itself.

[216] If the mirror represents self-knowledge, then the skull (as both "mirror" and "other") represents the process of self-fashioning (via similitude or reflection) that takes place in true friendship. In this sense, too, Rosa's figure contemplates not only his own "self" but his self *as other* – that is, a self as embodied in or represented by his friend.

[217] Aristotle writes that "self-worth and self-knowledge are enhanced through friendship. Aristotle, *Nich. Ethics*, 1171b17-1172a6. "Friends or *philoi* are integral to living a full and happy life, and the deep affinity between them allows them to act as what we might call 'mirrors' to one another." Lynch, *Philosophy and Friendship*, 103.

[218] Lynn Enterline suggests a more pessimistic early-modern vision of the mirror and its self-reflexive agency. In early-modern texts, "the literal sense of the mirror as an instrument that produces a likeness or copy …considerably complicates the mirror's didactic usefulness, rendering it as much a melancholic as a pedagogic tool … when the mirror becomes an instrument of reflection that produces an image like the viewer, it produces startling images for a kind of sorrow that impoverishes the self and for which there seems to be no compensation. … the mirror becomes a figure for the trouble with language that characterizes melancholia." Enterline, *The Tears of Narcissus*, 8.

by Rosa and the erudite nature of its subject matter keeps Rosa ever-present in Ricciardi's company, sustaining a dialogue between otherwise distant friends.

The Gift as *Paragone*: Equivalence and One-upmanship in the Exchange of an Image for Words

If Rosa's portrait is to be understood as "a pictorial response" or "visual equivalent" to Ricciardi's *canzone*,[219] then is it possible to see in its features a pictorial counterpart to the text? Is it an iconographic parallel for a poetic *consolatio*? Both Rosa's portrait and Ricciardi's poem participate in a broader humanist revival of interest in "the theory and practice of proffering consolation," on which countless letters, treatises and funerary orations were written – an interest, moreover, that was as much directed toward self-help as to the assistance of others, and occasionally combined the two motivations in one.[220] This is a significant point in connection with Rosa's portrait, which is itself expressly concerned with establishing an emotive equation between the self and the friend.

There are aspects of Rosa's portrait that align it with the philosophical discourse on consolation. Rosa's initial inclusion of Seneca's name may have been inspired, in part, by the philosopher's well-known contributions to the genres of *consolatio* and *epistola consolatoria* (the consolatory letter), advocating "the role of the practicing moral rhetoric, offering substantive advice to friends and acquaintances."[221] The tradition of poetry – implicit in the action of the portrait's protagonist and exemplified by Ricciardi's *canzone* – also made significant contributions to the

[219] Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 118.
[220] McClure, *Sorrow and Consolation in Italian Humanism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 3-4.
[221] *Ibid*, 7. Seneca's *Epistulae ad Lucilium* are among the most important examples of the consolatory letter, "filled as they are with counsel and solace". Seneca also wrote three treatises on consolation: the *De consolatio ad Marciam*, the *Ad Polybium* (both on the subject of bereavement), and the *Ad Helviam* (written for his mother on the subject of his own exile. The ancient epistolary art of *consolatio* or followed a particular pattern. It consisted of "a list of the most suitable things to say or write to anyone who had, by death or exile or impoverishment, suffered a grievous loss – together with a method of arrangement which would make the arguments attractive and persuasive." The *consolatio* was composed of an introduction, a *de crimine* (consisting of the *usitatum*, the *necessarium*, and the *leue*), the *de ultione* (made up of the *neglegenda*, the *certa ex conscientia*, and the *certa ex natura*). Essentially, it was a form of rhetoric intended to persuade the inflicted recipient "to conquer his grief and resume normal life." Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist*, 141.

tradition of *consolation*.[222] Petrarch, among others, touted the consolatory and cathartic function of poetry itself.[223] Philosophy, too, was considered to have calming and encouraging effects on the melancholic mind: the idea was propounded by the sixth-century ACE philosopher Boethius in his *Consolation of Philosophy*, popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and profoundly influenced by Stoic thought. Famed for his moral didacticism, Boethius (to whom Rosa compared himself) lamented the fickle nature of Fortune and promoted "the role of free will in the construction of man's destiny".[224] The poet-philosopher in Rosa's painting, then, unites two consolatory practices into a single, efficacious persona. The close iconographic resonance of Rosa's portrait with images of St. Jerome (a connection I will return to shortly) is also significant in this context, for the saint made important contributions to the discourse on consolation.[225] In his portrait for Ricciardi Rosa may have attempted to create not a pictorial parallel to Ricciardi's *canzone* with an assertion of the power of a poetic *art* (and an image of the poet, himself) as an effectual and cathartic instrument of consolation.

Importantly, within the ostensible parity prescribed by the ancient *topos* of true friendship there is also an ever-present anxiety over the need for each friend to demonstrate his or her

---

[222] McClure, *Sorrow and Consolation*, 8.
[223] *Ibid*, 20; see esp. Petrarch, *Familiares*, 1.9.
[224] Loh notes that Boethius was described in the *seicento* as having a reputation as "the greatest instructor ever". Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 190; see Boccalini, *Delli avvisi del Parnasso, overo compendio de' ragguagli* (Venice, Francesco Prati, 1619), 368: "Boetio, era il maggior Consulente che si trovasse".) On Boethius, see H. R. Patch, *The Tradition of Boethius. A Study of his Impotence in Medieval Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1935). Mattia Preti's painting of *Boethius Consoled by Philosophy* (c. 1680) reiterates the theme and presents a distinctively melancholic vision of the ancient philosopher, posed with his head resting in his hand. See John T. Spike, *Mattia Preti* (Florence: Centro Di, 1999), 228, no. 142. Boethius also refers to the ill fortune of Marcus Atilius Regulus in his *Consolation* – also the subject of the etching Rosa dedicated to Ricciardi in 1662 – although Boethius's view is fatalistic in tone rather than celebratory of Regulus's heroic constancy. See Erving R. Mix. *Marcus Atilius Regulus. Exemplum Historicum* (The Hague; Paris: Mouton & Co., 1970), 48. Rosa tellingly compared himself to Boethius in a letter to Ricciardi of 1654 (perhaps written around the time the Met portrait was painted), referring specifically to the consolatory effects of philosophy: "Di gratia, potendo fatemi degno delle solite gratie, confessandovi che solamente la vostra filosofia può consolare questo Boezio." Borelli, letter 176.
[225] McClure, *Sorrow and Consolation*, 11. Linking classical philosophy to Christian thought, Jerome was conflicted between his faith in the immortal power of resurrection (which admonishes mourning the dead) and his inability to curb his own natural submission to grief. See St. Jerome, *Ad Heliodrum consolatoria*, epistle 60.

uniqueness.[226] This need for differentiation is reflected in the implicit rivalry of gift-exchange, wherein the giver is obligated to outdo the receiver.[227] The production of a poetic painting as a response to a text also allowed Rosa to assert his unique mastery of *both* poetry and painting (a virtuosity that Ricciardi and other friends had themselves noted[228]) while simultaneously paying homage to his friend and to an essentially social aspect of his own identity. Thus Rosa manages to sustain a subtle but important position of distinction from Ricciardi without jeopardizing the overarching *concetto* of unity that informs the purpose of the portrait itself.

On one level, Rosa's portrait engages directly with Ricciardi's *canzone* as an advocation of the consolatory, therapeutic and cathartic practice of writing. Both epistolary and poetic forms of writing (which are featured in Rosa's portrait) were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries considered to have consolatory efficacy.[229] This agency was closely allied to the notion of friendship itself as a curative for illness and source of comfort in times of malaise – a conviction frequently voiced in Rosa's letters.[230] Rosa also alluded to the curative capacity of poetry: beset by

---

[226] In the context of Rosa's and Ricciardi's friendship, this anxiety is apparent in their endeavour to draw distinctions between their poetic writing during the 1650's, when Rosa was accused of plagiarizing Ricciardi in writing his satires. On the recognition of "difference" within the early-modern trope of the "friend as the second self", and its role in asserting individuality, see Patrick Henry, "Recognition of the Other and Avoidance of the Double. The Self and the Other in the 'Essais' of Montaigne," *Stanford French Review* (1982), 175-187.

[227] In anthropological terms, gift exchange entails not only an equalizing of participants, but also involves a certain degree of rivalry. It is an expression of the important roles played by "authority, power and dependency" in relationships, in which the giver could by his or her very action of giving obtain a position of superiority over the recipient. Komter, *Social Solidarity and the Gift*, 27.

[228] Ricciardi drew attention to this dual ability in his *canzone*, praising Rosa's "double laurel" as painter and poet. See Appendix II. 1, vv. 169-180. Here Ricciardi compares Rosa to Geryon, the three-bodied warrior-creature of Greek mythology associated in astrology with the constellation Gemini. Rosa's dual talent was also a lietmotif in the eulogistic poetry of his other academic friends, who frequently praised the rhetorical efficacy of his paintings.

[229] The practice of writing was popularly considered a form of remedy for malaise and malady. Montaigne, for example, considered writing a curative for illness and suffering; he considered his *Essais*, and the process of writing them, a means of consolation for the loss of his close friend Etienne de La Boétie. Montaigne, *The Essays*, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt, trans. C. Cotton (Chicago: William Benton; Encyclopaedia Brittanica, Inc., 1988); Dorothea Heitsch, "Approaching Death by Writing: Montaigne's Essays and the Literature of Consolation," *Literature and Medicine* 19: 1 (2000): 96-106.

[230] Friendship was considered a remedy for illness and a means to evade mortality. As Rosa wrote to Ricciardi in 1654, "la magior mia consolatione è il pensare che ho voi per amico." Borelli, letter 179. In a letter of 1649 to Giulio Maffei, Rosa alluded specifically to the role of epistolary correspondence in consolation. Borelli, letter 39. He also describes the letter as a "consolation" in a letter to Ricciardi of 1666. Borelli, letter 322. For similar statements, see Borelli, letters 42, 319, 379, and 199 (where Rosa concedes that in his deepest moment of suffering even the consolations of friends may not be enough). The idea that friends could provide solace for the

frustration over accusations of poetic plagiarism and worries concerning the plague in Naples, he wrote to Ricciardi in 1656 about the various preventative and curative potions that people were adopting in the city, declaring that he "would willingly undertake again another satire in order to distil from it however much hemlock and aconite aloe is to be found."[231] The writing of poetic satire itself, then, offered a restorative therapy for suffering. (The cathartic function of satirical poetry in particular was, after all, an essential aspect of its value for Rosa's mentor Juvenal.[232]) In 1657 Rosa once again praised the benefits of writing poetry in times of illness and distress:

> "I swear to you that if ever poetry was of benefit to anyone, today I have proven it to be an extraordinary relief to my diabolical afflictions, which consist in such stabbing pains that I make myself ill. In order not to think so much of the ongoing wraths of God, I am preparing myself to compose a short satire which you can see any time that you please".[233]

On another level, however, Rosa's portrait implicitly competes with Ricciardi's *canzone* by its visual nature. As an image, Rosa's portrait is imbued with the same conviction in the rhetorical dimension and efficacy of art that pervades the rest of his pictorial *oeuvre*. By making a painting in reciprocation for a poem, Rosa may have intended to participate in the contemporary *paragone* of the two arts.[234]

---

suffering of melancholia or misfortune in general is suggested by Guazzo in his *La Civile Conversazione* (1574), 15.

[231] Borelli, letter 198: "Credetemi che mi sento in guisa tale arrabiato che volentieri m'impegnerei di nuovo ad un'altra satira per distilarvici quant'aloe cicuta e nappello si trova."

[232] Juvenal described satire as an outlet for indignation, aiming "primarily at the catharsis of exposure" and "only incidentally at justice and reform." Roger Kimball, "Lessons from Juvenal," *New Criterion*, 21: 8 (2003). On the cathartic nature of satire, also see Randolph, "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: Its Possible Relationships and Implications," *Studies in Philology* 38 (1941): 154-6; and Helen Ostovich, *Ben Jonson, Every Man Out of His Humour* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 113, notes 10-11.

[233] Borelli, letter 211: "Vi giuro che, se mai la poesia fu di giovamento a nessuno, oggi la provo di non ordinario sollievo alle mie diabolliche aflettioni; le quali sono a così fitte, che mi nausea da me medesimo. Mi sono, per non pensare tanto a le correnti ire di Idio, posto a comporre una satiretta la quale vederete ogni volta che vi sarà di gusto." Festa considered that this "*satiretta*" must be the *Il Tirreno*. Festa, ""Una redazione inedita".

[234] The *paragone* between the arts had a revival in the early *seicento*. On Galileo's role in this revival, see Martin Kemp, *The Science of Art: Optical Themes in Western Art from Brunelleschi to Seurat* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 93-98; S. Y. Edgerton, Jr., "Galileo, Florentine 'Disegno' and the 'Strange Spottednesse' of the Moon," *Art Journal* XLIV: 3 (1984): 225-32; H. H. Mann, "Die Plastizitat des Mondes - Zu Galileo Galilei und Lodovico Cigoli," *Kunsthistorisches Jahrbuch Graz* XXIII (1987): 55-59; and Steven Ostrow, "Cigoli's Immacolata and Galileo's Moon: Astronomy and the Virgin in Early *Seicento* Rome," *Art Bulletin* 78: 2 (1996): 218-235. Also see Lee, "Ut Pictura Poesis"; Peter Hecht, "The Paragone Debate: Ten Illustrations and a Comment," *Simiolus* 14: 2 (1984): 125-136; and Jürgen Pieters and Lise Gosseye, "The Paradox of Paragone: Painters and Poets in Constantijn Huygens' *Ooghen-Troost*," *Neophilologus* 92: 2 (2008): 177-192. Lorenzo

Rosa's interest in the discourse of *ut pictura poesis* is apparent in images like the paired *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10] and *Lucrezia as Poetry* [Fig. 11], which jointly allude to the ancient *topoi* of "painting as mute poetry" and "poetry as speaking painting."[235] It is also a feature of his satires: in the *La Pittura*, he describes painting, music and poetry as the "sister arts", while in the *L'Invidia* – in defense of his own poetic prowess against the charges of his Roman detractors – he praises the painters of the past who were also acknowledged as great poets.[236] In the *La Pittura*, where Rosa is concerned above all with touting the powers of painting (which, in his estimation, is inherently and always "poetic"), Rosa stakes a claim for the superiority of the pictorial over textual brand of poetics when he says he will "*pinger per gloria e poetar per gioco*" ("paint for glory and write poetry for fun").[237] In his description of Rosa's now lost painting of "Pittura Solitaria", Rosa's friend Antonio Abati constructed an image of *Pittura* that was based on Simonides' famous dictum but that gave it an important twist: instead of conceiving

---

Lippi appears to have engaged his painting and poetry in a complex and highly self-conscious *paragone*, in a manner akin to Poussin, in which he attempted to outdo, in the invention of pictorial *concetti*, the perceived "limitations" of poetical expression – a practice that may have influenced Rosa. Colantuono, "The Cup and the Shield," 398-401.

[235] Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 61. Daprà notes that the paired paintings convey Rosa's desire to display his knowledge of ancient philosophy and to affirm his identity as a learned philosopher, in keeping with the words from his satire *La Pittura*, roughly contemporaneous with the two portraits: "Bisogna che i pittori siano erudite/ Ne le scienze introdotte, e sappian bene/ Le Favole, L'Istorie i Tempi." Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 175-177. Rosa's interest in constructing such comparisons was part of a more general desire to explore contrasts between two disparate or opposed concepts, particularly evident in his habit of making pendant paintings. Daprà, *ibid*, 62; citing Salerno. On this duality as a central feature of Rosa's professional practice, see Salerno, "Il dissenso nella pittura," 54; Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 73.

[236] Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 88-93: "E tant'empio è 'l pennel, tant'è superbo,/ che sol tra i vezzi si trastulla e scherza,/ e de gli sdegni tuoi tu fai riserbo?/ Sotto la destra tua provò la sferza/ Musica e Poesia: vada del pari/ con fàltre due sorelle anco la terza." (For similar references, see vv. 205-7 and 861.) Rosa, *L'Invidia*, vv. 649-60: "Ma ne l'antichità non vo' ingolfarmi:/ mira come dan aura al Buonaroti/ non men le carte che le tele e i marmi;/ s'i libri del Vasari osservi e noti / vedrai che de' pittori i più discreti / son per la poesia celebri e noti./ E non solo i pittori eran poeti,/ ma filosofi grandi, e fúr demonii/ nel cercar di natura i gran segreti:/ Metrodoro e Platon sian testimonii/ e Pirrone Elidense, onde discesero/ gli sceptici da lui detti pirronii." Rosa goes on to defy his critics for refusing to acknowledge the poetic abilities of the painter: "Ah, razza senza onor, dubiti e temi/ a quattro versi d'un pittore, e ammetti / i villani e i bifolchi a far poemi?" Rosa, *L'Invidia*, vv. 664-6. In the final stanza of the *Il Tirreno* (vv. 625-34), Rosa again cites music, poetry and painting as a united triumvirate: "il voler censurare è un grand'impaccio;/ no, no, per l'avenir meglio è ch'io finga:/ Musica, Poesia, Pittura, io taccio./ Gl[i] abusi un altro a criticar s'accinga,/ per me da questa pasta alzo le mani:/ canti ognun ciò che vuol, scriva o dipinga, ch'io non vo' clirizar le gambe a i cani."

[237] Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 127-132: "Pur che si sfoghi il cor, dica chi vuole:/ a chi nulla desia soverchia il poco,/ sotto ogni ciel padre comune è'l sole;/ l'estate a l'ombra e'l pigro verno al foco,/ tra modesti desii l'anno mi vede/ pinger per gloria e poetar per gioco."

painting as "silent poetry", Rosa's *Pittura* is "mute Poetry … becoming *speaking Painting*."[238] As Roworth has noted, painting is here *contrasted* with poetry as an active, rather than passive, force, capable of asserting his satiric indignation.[239] Rosa endeavours to make painting into the method of his indignant poetic spirit, and to find a "pictorial" mode of satirical philosophy.[240] This is the same active, efficacious interpretation of painting that Rosa asserts in his satire *La Pittura* (with which the lost painting described by Abati may be intimately related[241]) and that may have informed the conceit for his Met portrait.[242]

The portrait for Ricciardi thus argues for its own authority as a "poetic" instrument that can both reproduce and even contend with poetry itself in its emotive efficacy. By reciprocating Ricciardi's *canzone* with a painted "poem" (on the subject of poetry, no less), Rosa asserted a position of uniqueness within the parity of friendship. In claiming his superiority as a skillful practitioner of both poetry and painting – the latter of which Rosa frequently described as beyond Ricciardi's comprehension[243] – Rosa touted the alternative and even superior rhetorical power of art as a poetic, imitative and ekphrastic device. In staking a claim for the emotional or cathartic efficacy of painting, in particular, Rosa would have found support in the theory that proposed the painter as superior for his ability to convey emotion through facial expression and physical gesture. Rosa took pride in his particular ability to equal and even outdo the textual source of his imagery: in 1663 he boasted to Ricciardi that his *Conspiracy of Catiline* was "exactly as Sallust had described" in his *Bellum Catilinae*, implying that painting could reproduce its originary text in

[238] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 54-55. The origin of the conceit is generally attributed to Simonides of Keos, who Plutarch identified as stating in his *De Gloria Atheniesium*: "Poema pictura loquens, pictura poema silens" ("Poetry is a speaking picture, painting is a silent [mute] poetry"). See Lee, "Ut Pictura Poesis," 1.
[239] See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 54-55.
[240] Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 73.
[241] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 45ff, esp. 57.
[242] As Langdon observed, Rosa's art in general (especially the most self-consciously "literary" work of the 1650's and 60's) displays an ambition to render painting the rival of poetry. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 47.
[243] Rosa took pride in his superior knowledge of painting, often reminding Ricciardi of it and chastizing him for attempting to understand a thing that Rosa considered to be beyond his grasp. See for example Borelli, letters 137 and 303.

immediacy and emotive effect.[244] The imagery of lamentation – a feature of Rosa's Met portrait – was especially noted by Alberti for its therapeutic value: largely inspired by the ancient discourse on tragic drama, he emphasized the effect of sorrowful imagery in particular in his account of the range of emotions produced in the experience of viewing paintings.[245] The melancholic (characterized as "mournful"), no less, is offered by Alberti as the primary example in his discussion of the empathetic and rhetorical efficacy of painting.[246]

IV.6. Melancholia as Bane and Blessing: Friendship and the Creative and Destructive Power of Melancholy

The subjects around which both Ricciardi's *canzone* and Rosa's portrait revolve were particular favorites for both friends: the vanity of life, the suffering of ill-fortune, the desire for immortality and fame, and the conflicted experience of melancholia. Indeed, these were the

[244] Borelli, letter 291. Rosa's ability to match and vie with Sallust's text in this painting is also celebrated in Lorenzo Magalotti's panegyric poem on the painting. See my discussion of this poem in chapter three, 198.

[245] Alberti writes that, "[t]he narrative [in the painting] will move the mind when the men painted therein exhibit much of their own emotion. It happens according to nature, than which nothing is more able to produce its like, what we weep with the weeping, laugh with the laughing, and sorrow with the sorrowing." Alberti, *On Painting*, in Holt, *A Documentary History of Art*, 214; also see Spencer, "Ut Rhetorica Pictura"; and Elizabeth Belfiore, "Pleasure, Tragedy and Aristotelian Psychology," *The Classical Quarterly* 35: 2 (1985): 349-361.

[246] Alberti, *On Painting*, 76-77: "Yet these feelings [which the painter must depict in their work in order to inspire empathy in the viewer] are known from movements of the body. We see how the melancholy, preoccupied with cares and beset by grief, lack all vitality of feeling and action, and remain sluggish, their limbs unsteady and drained of colour. In those who mourn, the brow is weighed down, the neck bent, and every part of their body droops as though weary and past care." Alberti's second example, also significant for Rosa's humoral identity, was the "angry" man, whose "passions, aflame with ire" cause their faces and eyes to "become swollen and red, and the movements of all their limbs are violent and agitated according to the fury of their wrath." Alberti, *ibid*, 77. As a demonstration of Rosa's visual mastery of melancholic gestural and physiognomic signs, the Met portrait can be interpreted as an *exemplum doloris*, akin to an image like Poussin's so-called *Self-Portrait* chalk drawing (c. 1630, British Museum, London) [Fig. 215] which may similarly represent a "character" as much as an individual. The authorship of Poussin's drawing, historically considered autograph, was doubted by Pierre Rosenberg ("Poussin Drawings from British Collections," *Burlington Magazine* 133: 1056 (1991): 210-13. Nicholas Turner reasserted the attribution to Poussin ("L'Autoportrait dessine de Poussin au British Museum," in Alain Merot ed., *Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665): Actes du colloque organisé au Musée du Louvre* (Paris: Documentation Francaise, 1996), 1: 81-97. The inscription on the drawing, added at a later date, records that the artist made it "with a mirror by his own hand around the year 1630, during his convalescence from a serious illness." Sheila Barker has suggested that in basing his *affetti* on his own physical experience of pain, Poussin's image may represent "a sort of purgative catharsis" – an *exemplum doloris*, or exemplary image of pain and suffering. Barker, "Poussin, Plague, and Early Modern Medicine," *Art Bulletin* 86: 4 (2004): 676 and notes; also see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 85, 228-30, for Poussin's construction of *exemplum doloris*. Like Poussin's drawing, Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi finds its basis in the physical and psychological characteristics of the melancholic humor – one that he celebrated in the portrait as a feature of his bond with Ricciardi, but that he simultaneously exploited as a canonic visual symbol in order to rival his friend's textual *consolatio*.

fundamental preoccupations of all moral philosophers. As I noted above, the melancholic iconography of Rosa's portrait has been interpreted as a response to the theme of Ricciardi's poem in the manner of the "*malattia amorosa*": it expresses Rosa's sense of loss, his philosophical anxiety, and his personal sense of longing for a distant friend.[247] However, the melancholic content of the portrait is also a vital component of both Rosa's and Ricciardi's shared creative *ingegno* as "poet-philosophers". I propose that the humoral iconography of Rosa's painting operates in a more complex manner than scholars have suggested: more than simply lamented as a troubling and destructive affliction, melancholia is celebrated here as an obligatory and productive component of creativity. The portrait is a sophisticated essay on the nature of the melancholic poet-philosopher's experience – its duality, its self-consciousness, and its inherent aestheticism – which locates its mastery in the practice of friendship.

The dual nature of melancholia, as a debilitating illness and a powerful source of creative ingenuity, is a central theme in its discursive history.[248] Rosa's own comments on melancholia, an ever-present theme throughout his pictorial and textual *oeuvre*, echo this dual conception. In his final letter to Ricciardi of 1673, for example, Rosa described melancholia as an obstacle, its detriments only to be diminished by the consolations and company of close friends.[249] On other

---

[247] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 190-191. Melancholia is described as a "malattia amorosa" (or "love-sickness") by Marsilio Ficino, the doctor Dino del Garbo (in his *Libro dell'Amore*), and Guido Cavalcanti (in his *canzone* "Donna me prega"), the latter of whom included in his text the theme of spirits who enter the beloved through the eyes of the lover, carrying with them the sickness of love, melancholia.

[248] The "destructive" potential of melancholia "was based on the idea - drawn from the medieval world of ideas - that it was not only a physical and psychic disorder but also the cause of lethargy. The melancholic's typical inactivity and apathy were considered to be the result of too much thinking. Exhaustion, sorrow and, finally, idleness were the outcome of an overly intense life of the mind. Melancholy thus came to be associated, and even confounded, with the deadly sin of *acedia* or sloth." Notarp, "Jacques de Gheyn II's 'Man Resting in a Field'," 312, 317; also see Goltzius's series of *Virtues and Vices*, which includes an engraving of "Sloth", in Walter L. Strauss ed., *Hendrick Goltzius, 1558-1617. The Complete Engravings and Woodcuts*, vol. 1 (New York: Abaris Books, 1977), 178, no. 88. If mastered, however, the otherwise harmful effects of melancholia were rendered the source of creative genius and insight. This theory originated with the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* xxx, I (now ascribed to Aristotle's student Theophrastus). See Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 18-29.

[249] Borelli, letter 392: "Se non mi guarisce la vostra venuta, non mi gioverà cosa nessuna: però vi suplico per quanto può la nostra amicizia a mutarsi di parere et essere da me assai prima del propostovi fine di Marzo, altrimenti mi farete stare in una continova impazienza et in una più atroce malinconia. Né mi state a dire di volervi trattenere un mese solo ch'io darò nelle smanie. Basta, vi sto attendendo per far tutto quello che voi vorrete circa

occasions, particularly at an earlier stage of his career, Rosa invoked his melancholic temperament (especially when roused to a heated passion by its choleric proclivity) in connection with an individual, antagonistic and independent spirit. Discussing his satire *L'Invidia* with Ricciardi, for example, Rosa credited the biting potency of his satirical poetry to his "bilious" nature.[250] Here, as on many other occasions, Rosa shared in the contemporary vision of melancholia as a key component of creative *ingegno* and an integral feature of the painter-philosopher's inspired identity.[251]

Roworth made an important observation concerning another of Rosa's melancholic images, the *Democritus in Meditation* of 1651-2 [Fig. 62], that may also offer a clue for understanding Rosa's Met portrait. Interpreting the *Democritus* as a pessimistic vision of melancholia, she links the painting with the fundamental concept behind Albrecht Dürer's engraving of *Melencolia I* [Fig. 149].[252] Significantly, as Roworth noted, Dürer appears to have

---

ai patti, e se veramente mi amate adesso ne vedrò gli effetti più vivi, attesoché mai mi son trovato in maggior necessità di desiderrarvi, e col core v'abraccio …". For other comments that align melancholia with psychological distress, physical illness or hypochondria, see Borelli, letters 69, 158, 276, 285, 353, and 375.

[250] Borelli, letter 174: "a suo tempo ne sentirete lo scoppio, assicurandovi che i miei nemici questa volta haveranno carestia di parole tutto che mi sia contenuto straordinariamente nella parte dell'agricomico e mitigata la bile che mi portava a dir cose diaboliche …". Against the slander he received for his satires, his mind became "all bile, all spirit, all fire!" Borelli, letter 178. See chapter two, 142, note 309.

[251] An excess of black bile was considered to be the defining physical symptom of the melancholic humor. Rosa again refers to his "bile", contrasting it with the "phlegm" of the phlegmatic humor, in another letter to Ricciardi. Borelli, letter 287. For other instances of Rosa's recognition of the positive, creative effects of melancholia and its choleric proclivity, see letters 174, 325 (where he refers to the "heat" produced by creativity), 282 (painting as a "relief" for illness), and 373 and 375 (finding it hard to work, having lost his natural "warmth" and passion).

[252] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 276. Rosa's interest in Dürer's distinctive iconography of melancholia is apparent in many of his images, such as the *Moral Philosophy*, the *Umana Fragilitas*, the *Democritus in Meditation*, the *La Menzogna*, and the *Portrait of a Poet* (*Seated Philosopher with a Book* or *Allegory of Study*. For comments on the influence of Dürer on Rosa's art, see for example Mahoney, *Drawings*, 232, 295-6; Miller, "A Preparatory Study for Salvator Rosa's 'L'Umana Fragilita," (Notice) *Burlington Magazine* 119: 889 (1977): 272; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 273ff; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 46, note 109. Dürer also exerted a profound influence on Rosa's graphic work and his activity as a printmaker, and – as Volpi notes – Rosa was likely intrigued by Dürer's attitude toward his professional status and identity. In this context, Rosa's Met portrait can be linked to the tradition of self-images by artists who depict themselves in compositional variants of Dürer's prints *Melencolia I* and *St. Jerome*, citing alternatively the skull, the shadowed face, or the pensive pose with head rested on hand, ranging from Lucas Van Leyden's *Young Man (Self-Portrait?) with a Skull* of 1519 [Fig. 189] and Federico Barocci's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1600, Uffizi, Florence), to Michael Sweert's *Portrait of a Young Man (Self-Portrait?)* (1656, Hermitage, St. Petersburg) [Fig. 190]. Volpi has also suggested a close connection between Rosa's Met portrait and Francesco Curradi's *Portrait of a Young Man* (1611, Staatsgalerie, Stockholm) [Fig. 188]. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 30, 43 note 22.

paired this pained, inactive representation of melancholy with another image that signaled the humor's creative and productive potential: an engraving of *St. Jerome in his Study* [Fig. 148], devised as the "composed and industrious" melancholic philosopher absorbed in "purposeful meditation and faith".[253] (It has been proposed that Dürer initially conceived the *St. Jerome* as a "Melencolia II," representative of a superior state of "*melencolia rationalis*".[254]) With this duality in mind, Roworth detected in Rosa's etched version of *Democritus* (1661-2) [Fig. 107] an acknowledgement (absent in the painted version of the subject) of the twinned nature of melancholia as destructive and creative, an idea alluded to elsewhere in Rosa's work.[255] I propose that Rosa's portrait for Ricciardi combined the two concepts of melancholia represented by Dürer's prints into a single image.

Unlike the *Democritus* etching, where the creative impetus of melancholia arises from his choleric inclination, in the Met portrait that productivity results from a ponderous, meditative phlegmatic proclivity. In this, however, the figure is active rather than passive in his contemplation. This is the fundamental distinction between the two "modes" of melancholy represented by Dürer's

---

[253] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 276. On the "paired" nature of Dürer's two prints, see Panofsky, *Dürer's Melencolia I*; I, 156, in Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*; and Dempsey, "Castiglione in Philadelphia," *Burlington Magazine* CXIV, 117-118. On the *St. Jerome*, see Pächt, "Zur Entstehung des 'Hieronymous im Gehäus'," *Pantheon* XXI (1963): 131-142.

[254] Dürer may have conceived a series of images corresponding to Ficino's distinction of the three hierarchical faculties of the soul, the "*imaginatio*", the "*ratio*" and the "*mens contemplatrix*". Thus the print of *Melencolia I* would represent "a '*melancholia imaginativa'* … [and] the first stage in an ascent via *Melencolia II* ('*melencolia rationalis*') to *Melencolia III* ('*melencolia mentalis*')." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 350; also see Panofsky, *Albrecht Dürer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943), 156.

[255] In the etching, Rosa added an inscription (*Democritus omnium derisor, in omnium fine defigitur*) that suggested an intention to combine the roles of the "laughing" philosopher Heraclitus and the "crying" philosopher Democritus, in order to convey a specific vision of Democritus as mocking but ultimately afflicted by earthly vanities, as simultaneously melancholic and vitriolic. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 279-281. In answer to Wallace's confusion concerning the apparent contradiction inherent in a Stoic adopting in this image a melancholic response to death (Wallace, in *Salvator Rosa*, ed. Kitson, 59), Roworth argues that Rosa's vision of melancholy was not one of submissive and brooding meditation but rather "that of the Cynic who is compelled to instruct, admonish and provoke, and he does so armed with the satirist's irony and wit." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 284-5. She also notes that Rosa intended the painted version of the *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62] to be paired with another painting, *Diogenes Casting Away the Bowl* (1651, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen) [Fig. 61] which, in combination, represented both the contemplative and active forms of philosophy or, seen from alternative point of view, the dual nature of melancholia as a disease to be suffered (with the potential to distress and weaken) or a disposition – with significant productive potential – to be mastered.

two engravings: while Melencolia sits with her tools strewn about on the ground in front of her, Jerome is absorbed in writing.[256] Rosa includes the same activity in his painting in order to refer to melancholia's creative potential. In this context, Rosa's portrait may owe an even greater debt to a painting by Dürer that combines the two types of melancholia into a single, symbolic form: the *St. Jerome* of 1521 (Museo Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon) [Fig. 191], an influential image in the development of melancholic iconography.[257] Here, Jerome has moved the skull from the saint's windowsill (as seen in the earlier engraving[258]) to the table in front of him, aligning it with the book in his hand as a concurrent object of interest. Here, too, he rests his head on his hand in the familiar pose of Dürer's earlier allegorical personification of *Melencolia*.[259] His body turned toward the books in front of him, he gestures toward the skull with his left hand as if to advocate a balanced practice of intellectual pursuit and moral self-admonishment. Having mastered his melancholic temperament, Jerome channels his fatalistic self-awareness (represented by the skull) into the creative practice embodied by the books on the table. Certain features of this "melancholic

---

[256] Dürer's personification of melancholy fuses the "*typus Acediae*" (melancholy inactivity) with the "*typus Geometriae*" (the personification of the liberal art of geometry), in which Geometry either "surrenders" to melancholia or expresses an interest in its practice. Klibansky et al, *Saturn and Melancholy*, 317. Dürer's melancholia "sits surrounded by the instruments of creative work, but sadly brooding with a feeling that she is achieving nothing", while the *putto* who accompanies her seems to signal both the potential to be gained by industry and *pratica* and an ignorance to the malaise that thought produces. Klibansky et al, *ibid*, 320-1. While the figure of *Melancholy* "signifies Art *generating* power" her "non-intellectual counterpart" (the *putto*) may represent "Practice *revealing* power." The putto who is "also winged, but for all that only a little assistant, offering mere manual activity in exchange for the power of the mind" may represent "an example of activity without thought, just as Melencolia herself is an example of thought without activity. He takes no share in intellectual creation, but neither does he share the agony bound up with that creation. If Art feels herself faced with impassable limits, blind Practice notices no limitations." Klibansky et al, *ibid*, 342-3. In Rosa's portrait, the inactivity that plagues the figure of Melancholy in Dürer's print, caught in limbo and transfixed by the malaise elicited by the productivity of the "art of measurement" – that is, both creative and depressed, prophetic and "confined within her own limits" (*ibid*, p 360) – is turned on its head. Rosa's melancholic poet-philosopher opens his books and takes up his pen in order to put practical and intellectual activity to curative use. Klibansky et al, *ibid*, 328-332.

[257] Panofsky, *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*, 211-213; Fedja Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer. Das malerische Werk* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1971), 259-60, no. 162, pl. 177. For its influence on Netherlandish artists, see Held, *Dürers Wirkung auf die niederldndische Kunst seiner Zeit*, 87, 139-40.

[258] In the print Dürer includes a skull on the window sill only as an incidental allusion to the *vanitas* theme: Jerome does not engage with the skull directly but is absorbed instead in reading and writing, his room bathed with the bright light of creative inspiration.

[259] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 286-89; Meidow, *Das Motiv, den Kopfaufdie Hand zu stuetzen* (Greifswald, 1945).

scholarly" St. Jerome would have greatly appealed to Rosa, among them the saint's passion for and mastery of ancient texts and languages (Greek in particular) and the notion of mortal transcendence implied in the combination of the skull and bible – an allusion to the power of Christian faith in particular, but equally applicable to the immortalizing efficacy of humanist endeavour.[260] Most importantly, Dürer's productive melancholic scholar is linked to a set of images that likely inspired Rosa's novel *concetto* of writing on a skull.

The *Concetto* of "Writing on a Skull"

Rosa's inclusion of an inscription in his portrait for Ricciardi is connected to a more general interest in introducing mottos or pithy axioms into his images, a practice also taken up by contemporaries similarly inclined toward moral-philosophical themes.[261] The action of inscribing on a *skull*, however, appears to be entirely unique, although there are paintings that make use of similar motifs.[262] A painting by an unknown British artist of *Lady Philippa Coningsby* (c. 1612,

---

[260] On the iconographic tradition of the "scholarly" St. Jerome, see John Oliver Hand, "'Saint Jerome in His Study' by Joos van Cleve," *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 49: 2 (1990): 2-10; Anna Strimpell, "Hieronymus im Gehause," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 2 (1925/1926): 173-252; Millard Meiss, "French and Italian Variations on an Early Fifteenth-Century Theme: St. Jerome and His Study," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 62 (1963): 147-70; and Pacht, "Zur Entstehung des 'Hieronymus im Gehause'." On St. Jerome, see Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, vol. 3 (New York, 1963), 686-93; Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chretien*, 740-50; and Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore and London, 1985), 1-22. The inclusion of the skull, as a symbol of *memento mori* or *vanitas*, alludes in the iconography of St. Jerome to the capacity of religion to overcome death. Hand, *ibid*, 6. Scholars have previously noted the similarity of Rosa's Met portrait to images of St. Jerome: see De Rinaldis, *Lettere Inedite*, 73, n. 3; Wallace, *Etchings*, 54; Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 21. Rosa's interest in St. Jerome as a subject is indicated by his painting in San Venanzio, Fabriano [Fig. 4], a painting of *St. Jerome in the Wilderness* in Dresden that has been attributed to Rosa (Mahoney, *Drawings*, 353 and fig. 30.8A), and another of the same title in the Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica in Rome, likely a copy of an original by Rosa. Mahoney, *ibid*, 355, Fig. 30.13A.

[261] Rosa includes mottos in the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*, the *Umana Fragilitas*, the so-called *Portrait of Rosalvo* [Fig. 87], the large *Battle Scene* [Fig. 9a], the large *Vanitas* (private collection, Naples) [Fig. 129] (only recently, and perhaps dubiously, attributed to Rosa), the drawing of *The Artist with a Friend* for Ascanio della Penna (on the back of a letter by Lorenzo Lippi) [Fig. 25], the *Vanitas* drawings [Figs. 46a, 46b, 47, 49], and many of Rosa's etchings. Rosa's also compiled mottos in his *Teatro della Politica*. Pietro Testa and Giovan Benedetto Castiglione, among others, shared his interest in using mottos in images. Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 60.

[262] Rosa included a Latin inscription on a skull in his *Moral Philosophy* for Cordini [Fig. 31], which reads "sustine et abstine", or "Endure and abstain", a Stoic phrase derived from Epictetus. See Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 72; Wallace, "Genius", 478; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 191. He may have made at least one other painting with a similar conceit: the so-called *Portrait of Rosalvo* (Galleria d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome) [Fig. 87], which depicts a young boy crowned with a wreath (of what look more like laurel than cypress leaves) holding a

whereabouts unknown) [Figs. 193a and 193b] includes a skull with a poetic *vanitas* inscribed on its surface, suggesting that the conceit of the "inscribed skull" (if not the *act* of inscribing on a skull) was perhaps more widespread.[263] Robert Walker's *Portrait of John Evelyn* (1648, National Portrait Gallery, London) [Fig. 192] bears a Greek *vanitas* inscription from Seneca, although the words are placed on the wall behind the figure rather than on the skull in his hand.[264] At the very least, these images are broadly related to Rosa's portrait as examples of the Northern brand of melancholic iconography that inspired his own *concetto*.[265] To this list can be added another image that bears the closest compositional affinity to Rosa's painting: a drawing by Hendrick Goltzius of 1614 [Fig. 206], identified by Wallace, that depicts a young man holding a skull with a tulip that looks like a quill pressed against it.[266]

---

skull with a Latin (rather than Greek) inscription on its surface: "*Morti praeludit infantia*" ("Death precedes infancy"). The inscription is not, however, in the process of being written on the skull itself. Ozzola was the first to suggest it was a portrait of Rosa's first son, Rosalvo, who was likely born prior to 1641. Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 128; for the painting also see Salerno, *L'opera completa*, cat. 28, who notes its possession by Rosa's heirs until the start of the twentieth century. The portrait is clearly not by Rosa himself, although there are qualities in it which both support and contest Rosa's authorship. It may be a poor copy of a now lost original by Rosa. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 74. It is tempting to see this painting in connection with Rosalvo's premature death in Naples. As further evidence of the dubiousness of the picture as Rosa's, the child in the painting appears to be much younger than Rosalvo would have been at the time of his death. Rosalvo was likely born in August of 1641 (see Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 402) and would therefore have been 15 years old when he died in Naples. It is also possible, however, that Rosa treated the image, like so many others, as an "allegorical" portrait.

[263] Christie's in London, November 25 1955, lot 83; the artist has been proposed as George Gower (c. 1540-1596). Also see Cooper, "'Frail flesh, as in a glass'," 205; and Roy Strong, "A portrait by Queen Elizabeth's Serjeant Painter," in *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography*, II: Elizabethan (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995), 169-175. The poem inscribed on the skull reads: "See here thyself, frail flesh, as in a glass:/ No odds between us, but uncertain hours;/ Which are prescribed by the highest powers,/ For Death in time all kind of flesh devours./ Farewell then sister flesh, and think on me/ What now I am, tomorrow thou must be."

[264] See Charles Saumarez Smith, *The National Portrait Gallery* (London, 2004), 61. The quotation from Seneca can be loosely translated as "When death comes to meet him, no one welcomes it cheerfully."

[265] Pigler, *Barockthemen*, II: 577-80. Oertel also saw a connection between Rosa's Met portrait and Northern portraits that depict figures with skulls. Oertel, "Die Vergänglichkeit der Künst," 108.

[266] Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 21; Pierpont Morgan Library, Inv. III, 145; see E. K. J. Reznicek, *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*, I: 389f, no. 332, ii, pl. 443; and Huigen Leeflang and Ger Luijten eds., *Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617). Drawings, Prints and Paintings*. Exhibition catalogue (Zwolle: Waanders, 2003), 262-3. The drawing is inscribed "QVIS EVADET NEMO" ("Who can escape? No one") Goltzius's drawing was largely inspired by Lucas Van Leyden's *Young Man (Self-Portrait?) with a Skull* of 1519 [Fig. 189], which was in Goltzius's time considered to be a self-portrait of the artist who had died at a young age. Leeflang and Luijten, *ibid*, 262. Goltzius was himself considered a melancholic, a quality that likely made him even more attractive to Rosa as an iconographic source. Roworth has noted the influence of Goltzius on Rosa, particularly in his "Genius" etching. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 86. Sybille Ebert-Schifferer identifies an alternative, Italian iconographic precedent in Battistello Carracciolo's *Saints Cosmas and Damian* (c. 1618-19, Gemäldegalerie,

Rosa's conceit of "writing on a skull" also derives from another popular *seicento* tradition of images that are on the one hand intimately connected to the Dürer's representations of *Melencolia* and the "scholarly" St. Jerome, and, on the other hand, distinguishable as a separate category of representation. These are the paintings of figures of saints, astrologers, astronomers, cosmographers, geographers, physicians, or philosophers,[267] occupied with the study of a spherical object (a globe, glass sphere, or skull for example) from which they appear to divine wisdom with their hands or with the use of an instrument like a compass or pair of callipers. All of these images derive from earlier representations of "Geometry," whose symbolic attribute of the compass was eventually absorbed (via its association with creative aptitude or wisdom and its link to the "divine" generative powers of God) as an iconographic attribute of melancholia.[268] The figure in Rosa's

---

Berlin) [Fig. 207]: here the figures, accompanied by a skull, are "conceived as engaged in a discussion of natural philosophy;" but neither figure is shown writing directly on the skull itself. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68; Stefano Causa, in Ferdinando Bologna ed., *Battistello Carracciolo e il primo naturalismo a Napoli*. Exhibition catalogue (Naples: Electa, 1991), 223, n. 1.13.

[267] The astrologer is typically shown with a globe of the heavens, although he is sometimes accompanied by a skull. Examples which show the astrologer in the company of a skull are provided by Rembrandt's *Faust* (also known as *The Astrologer*), as well as images by Parmigianino and Giulio da Campagnola. Other examples include Mola's *Astronomer* (formerly Lugano, Galleria dell'Angelo; Petrucci ed., *Mola e il suo tempo, Pittura di figura a Roma dalla Collezione Koelliker* (Milan: Skira, 2005), 42, fig. 21), a *Philosopher* attributed to Ribera's workshop (formerly Fine Arts Gallery, San Diego) where the figure is shown contemplating a globe with compass in hand (Spinosa, *Ribera*, cat. C29), Fede Galizia's *Portrait of a Physician (Ludovico Settala?)* (c. 1600-5, Koelliker Collection, Milan) or Daniele Crespi's *Portrait of the Surgeon Enea Fioravanti* (late 1630's?, Castello Sforzesco, Milan) where the skull is a symbol of the medical profession. For Galizia, see Bayer ed., *Painters of Reality*, 182; F. Frangi and A. Morandotti eds., *Maestri del '600 e del '700 Lombardo nella Collezione Koelliker* (Milan: Mazzotta, 2006), 30-31; for Crespi, see S. Rossi ed., *Scienza e Miracoli nell'Arte del '600*, 272, cat. D13. Among the many other examples of these types of image are Giovanni Martinelli's *Allegory of Astrology* [Fig. 194] (which I referred to in chapter two), Guido Cagnacci's *Allegory of Astrology* (c. 1650-55, Musei San Domenico, Pinacoteca Civica, Forlì) [Fig. 196], Ribera's *Astronomer* (*Ptolemy or Anaxagoras?*) (1638, Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts) [Fig. 197] and numerous of images of Democritus or Heraclitus, such as the pair by Ribera (1635, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, Genova) [Figs. 195 and 198].

[268] For example Hans Sebald Beham's *Melancholy* (1539) [Fig. 200]. The compass and globe have an ancient association with the figure of Saturn, and, consequently, with its related temperament of melancholia – an association that derives from early descriptions of Saturn as the father of geometry and his eventual characterization as the wise and God-like "architect of the world." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 149; Palchus, *Cat. astr. Gr*. vol. V, I, 189. Images of Saturn along these lines are also connected with the iconography of God the Father "as architect", holding the compass. This connection (as described by Macrobius), linked rational and speculative thought with Saturn, and thus with melancholy. Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 154-5. By the early-modern period, the long-standing association of the compass with "rational philosophy and mathematical order" made it an attribute of philosophy or melancholia itself; geometry was deemed the science "par excellence". Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 339; see Rothschild, "Lorenzo Bartolini's Demidoff Table," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 17 (1982): 81-82. On the symbolism of the compass, see Anthony Blunt, "Blake's 'Ancient of Days': The Symbolism of the Compasses," *JWCI* 2 (1938-39): 53-63. For the iconographic association of the

portrait combines this tradition of melancholic "Geometry," actively engaged with his sphere-like skull and applying the tool of his wisdom to its surface, with the imagery of the "melancholic scholarly" St. Jerome, who often kept a skull close at hand as he went about the business of writing. There are many images of this type of St. Jerome that place the skull and the act of writing in suggestively close proximity,[269] or in which the skull acts as a literal "support" for books or texts,[270] the association of which may have suggested to Rosa the possibility that the skull itself could be interpreted as a "text".[271] In certain of these images, the figures appear to be almost "reading" the line of the skull's fissure.[272] A further source of inspiration may have come from contemporary treatises on anatomy, in which the skull and other parts of the human skeleton are identified with individual letters or words. Of particular significance in this regard are anatomical drawings that allude specifically to the *vanitas* theme, such as Andreas Vesalius's woodcut of a standing skeleton in a melancholic pose from the *De humani corporis fabrica librorum epitome* of 1543 [Figs. 203a-b

---

compass with melancholia, see Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, figs.1, 52, 104, 107, 108, 115, 118, 122, 132, 133, 134, 135, 139, and 143.

[269] For example Caravaggio's *St. Jerome* (c. 1605-6, Galleria Borghese, Rome) [Fig. 199] or Ribera's *St. Jerome* (1651, Certosa e Museo di San Martino, Naples) [Fig. 201]. Three paintings of *St. Peter of Alcantara*, formerly attributed to Ribera but more recently attributed to Francesco Fracanzano (Rosa's brother-in-law and teacher), also suggest an analogy between the act of writing and the contemplation of the skull: in both paintings the composition is the same and the figure is given the same pose, turned to the left and contemplating an object in front of him, but in the one he looks at a skull while in the other he is depicted writing. (Spinosa, *Ribera. L'opera completa*, 135.)

A similar analogy between the skull and writing is suggested in still-life paintings, such as Pieter Claesz's *Still-Life with a Skull and Writing-Quill* (1628, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) [Fig. 202].

[270] For example Ribera's *St. Jerome and the Trumpet of the Last Judgement* (1629, Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphilj) (Spinosa, *Ribera*, 74, cat. A66), in which a scroll with text is laid across a skull resting on a book on a table, Tanzio da Varallo's *St. Jerome* (mid 1620's, Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City; see Bayer ed., *Painters of Reality*, 195), where the figure uses the skull as a support for the book he reads, or Giovanni Martinelli's *Magdalen* (1653, Cassa di Risparmi e Depositi, Prato; Rossi ed., *Scienza e Miracoli nell'Arte del '600*, 142.

[271] Along this line of thinking Rosa may have been inspired by images of St. Jerome (or other philosophers or philosopher-saints) accompanied by skulls with deeply incised markings, particularly the joint in the plates of the cranium, that suggest hand-written script. This is a feature of the skull in Dürer's Lisbon *St. Jerome* [Fig. 191], but it also appears in countless other examples, such as Sisto Badalocchio's *St. Mary Magdalen* (Collection of Mrs. Mary Jane Harris, New York; for the painting, see E. Schleier ed., *Giovanni Lanfranco. Un pittore barocco tra Parma, Roma e Napoli*. Exhibition catalogue (Naples: Electa, 2001), 214) or Cristofano Allori's *Penitent Magdalen* (Palazzo Pitti, Florence) (*Sovrane Passioni*, 402, cat. 154), both of which include skulls with script-like markings. The skull in Peter Claesz's *Still Life with a Skull and a Writing-Quill* [Fig. 202] also has a deep crack in its surface.

[272] For example Lucas Van Leyden's *St. Jerome* (1521, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) or Joos van Cleeve's *St. Jerome in his Study* (1528, The Art Museum, Princeton University).

and 204], or Georg Thomas's woodcut of a skull accompanied by an hourglass and the inscription "*Inevitabile Fatum*" ("Unavoidable Fate") from Johannes Eichmann's *Anatomiae* (Marburg, 1537) [Fig. 205].[273]

In combination with the compass, the spherical object was conceived as a symbol of the melancholic's "aptitude for geometry," a skill that Alberti considered essential to the artist.[274] The skull, like the geometer's globe, was also considered an intellectual symbol: the Stoics, for example, drew a close connection between its physical form and the nature or degree of the rational intellect, while astrologers considered it an enlightening symbol of portent.[275] The novel conceit of "writing on a skull" is central to the optimistic and creative vision of melancholia conveyed by Rosa's portrait. Instead of showing his figure with the popular "head in hand" pose – a gesture originally associated with the slothful and indolent propensities of the melancholic and aligned by

---

[273] For Thomas's print, see Tenenti ed., *Humana Fragilitas*, 78. Vesalius's original woodcuts date to 1538. Stemming from its association with the medieval iconography of the *danse macabre* "[t]he skeleton or skull of the anatomical illustration conveys a kind of moralistic teaching." Vesalius's skeletons, one of which is shown in the traditional melancholic pose contemplating a skull on a plinth, are accompanied by the motto "vivitur ingenio caetera mortis erunt" ("genius lives on, all else is mortal", or "Man's spirit lives; all else Death's hand shall claim"; or "It is his genius that yet walks the earth; all else of him may go down into silence"). See Roberts and Tomlinson, *The Fabric of the Body. European Traditions of Anatomical Illustration*, 142; also see Hsiu-Li Kuo, "The Solitary Notations" (PhD Dissertation, University of Wollongong, New South Wales, 2004), 70-71. The practice of writing on skulls, or other bones, was also taken up in ancient, Christian, and Judaic religious traditions as a means to identify the deceased individual; if Rosa was aware of this practice, he may have considered it appropriate in connection with the mournful aspect of his image. In ancient Rome, the name of the Capitol originates (according to legend) from the tradition that the Etruscan king Olus (Aulus Vulcentanus) was killed and buried on the site, and that the Capitoline temple and hill were named after his skull was found with the words "caput Oli regis" written across it in Etruscan letters. Arnobius, *Adversus gentes* VI, 7; Servius, *Aeneid-Commentary* VIII, 345; see also Isidor, *Origines* XV 2.31.

[274] Alberti, *On Painting*, in Holt, *A Documentary History of Art*, 216; Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," 88. The formal flexibility of circular objects used in these images is suggested by the correlation between Jacques De Gheyn II's engraving of "Saturn, or The Melancholic Temperament" and a pen-drawing known as the *Mélancolique speculatif* (Paris, École des Beaux-Arts): De Gheyn's globe may have been inspired by the circular barrel the melancholic figure sits on in the Paris drawing. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 399, note 76.

[275] For the idea of the skull as a symbol of portent I am indebted to a talk given by Paul Crenshaw on Rembrandt and Vermeer at the annual College Art Association conference, New York, February 2006. In his *Attic Nights* (a book that Rosa knew well), Aulus Gellius explained that, according to Chrysippus, the skulls of intelligent men were fragile and thin by necessity, since a thick skull left little room for the brain. Brad Inwood ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 171, n. 48; Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, VII. I. 1-13; Chrysippus, *On Providence*; the idea may be derived from Plato, *Timaeus*, 75a-c. The idea resonates with Rosa's and Ricciardi's own poetic references to "naked" or fragile skulls. See 294 above.

Dürer with the melancholic's pessimistic proclivities – Rosa engages him in the creative act of writing.

The act of inscribing, like all forms of writing, conveys the melancholic poet's desire for both public fame and personal remembrance. Like the crown of cypress that I suggested might be interpreted not merely as a symbol of death but of immortality, the act of writing asserts both presence and endurance, calling to mind the popular early-modern platitude that writing had the power to transcend the mortal sphere.[276] This takes on a particular significance when one considers that the writing surface in Rosa's portrait (the skull) is a symbol of transience: by inscribing words onto the skull itself, Rosa turns it into a document and thereby complicates its status as an emblem of ephemerality. A pessimistic conception of the endurance of the written word would be averse to Rosa's conviction in his activity as a moral-satirical poet, the identity celebrated in the portrait itself. Instead, Rosa intends with his *concetto* to invert the skull's meaning from absence and transience to presence and permanence – a process that operates in conjunction with the skull's function as an index of Ricciardi's (or Rosa's) own presence in the painting.

In the context of the melancholic's creativity, the practice of writing was considered in the early-modern period both an antidote to the detrimental aspects of that temperament and an

[276] I discuss this idea further in chapter three. Writing was conceived of in the early-modern period as a way in which to signal presence not only in the here-and-now, but into the future. There are comments to this effect by Torquato Tasso and René Descartes who consider writing as a way to make one's "mark" on the world. (For Descartes, see the *Discourse on Method* (1637); Fumaroli, "The Republic of Letters", 135; for Tasso, see Gianvito Resta, "Le Lettere del Tasso: Scrivere per esistere", in Doglio, *L'Arte delle Lettere*, 154-156; citing Tasso, *Opere*, vol. IV, 1232, 297. That the act of writing had a power and permanence beyond death is also indicated by the popular image of the figure of Death himself in the act of inscribing, for example in Gian Lorenzo Bernini's *Tomb of Urban VIII* (1627-47, St. Peter's, Rome), Domenico Gamberti's commemorative engraving of 1659 for Francesco I d'Este (where a skeleton inscribes the funerary placard on the prince's monument) (see Bentini ed., *Sovrane Passioni. Le raccolte d'arte della Ducale Galleria Estense* (Modena, 1998), 296, cat. 87), or in Rosa's own *Umana Fragilitas* [Fig. 97]. Panofsky considered that the figure of Death inscribing the name of the pope on Urban's tomb was not intended to signal his role as a "destroyer of life" but rather a route to immortalizing the pope and his name. Shelley Perlove, *Bernini and the Idealization of Death*: *The Blessed Ludovica Albertoni* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990), 81, n. 40; Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture. Four Lectures on its changing aspects from ancient Egypt to Bernini* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1964), 221-36. In his Met portrait, Rosa co-opts Death's inscriptive power by writing on the skull itself.

illustration of the positive, creative outcome that its mastery could achieve.[277] Rosa's own comments on the matter suggest he likely knew Robert Burton's famous prescription for writing as a remedy to the negative effects of melancholia: "I write of melancholy," he says in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), "by being busy to avoid melancholy".[278] In particular, Burton recommended writing *about* the disease itself as a way to calm its effects, and, indeed, the figure in Rosa's portrait is writing an inscription with a message of melancholic *vanitas*.[279] More than this, the figure's pen is still touching its writing surface [Fig. 71], as if to suggest the ongoing process of writing that was itself considered the surest remedy. That Rosa had more than just a passing familiarity with Burton's text is suggested by an allegorical drawing attributed to the artist that depicts a male head, with his mouth open wide and eyes turned upward, accompanied by a scroll with the words "DESPERATIONIS RADIX, IGNAVIA" (or "Sloth is the root of despair") [Fig. 27] – an image that seems to express Burton's recommendation of activity over idleness as yet another cure for melancholic malaise.[280]

---

[277] As Roworth noted, "[t]he cure for the artist's melancholy is found through strengthening the bond between intellectual and practical skill and pursuing purposeful activity." Thus, "although Rosa portrayed himself [in the Met portrait] as a melancholic, he is not shown in passive contemplation of the death's head but as writing directly on the skull." Roworth, "The Consolations of Friendship," 118. Roworth interpreted the inscription in the Met portrait in connection with the similar act of writing depicted in Rosa's *Umana Fragilitas*, where an "actively scribbling" young child (or *putto*), writing a similarly ominous and doleful inscription (his hand guided by the winged figure of Death), is contrasted with the "passive, contemplative figure of Melancholy", implying that "artistic practice served from theory results in the impossibility of meaningful creation."

[278] Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 36. He continues: "I doubt not but these following lines, when they shall be recited, or hereafter read, will drive away melancholy." Breitenberg, *ibid*, 47; Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 20. The presence of other forms of text in the painting – the books and letter – may also point to Rosa's awareness of this remedy. For Rosa's comments on the potential of epistolary and poetic writing to ameliorate the debilitating effects of melancholia, see Borelli, letters 147 and 188, for example.

[279] Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 47; see Michael O'Connell, in *Robert Burton*, ed. Kinney, 62. Rosa also spoke in his letters of painting itself, in addition to writing, as a remedy for the ill effects of melancholia.

[280] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 285. Mahoney, who dates the drawing to the late 1640's, notes that "[t]he head is without parallel in Rosa's work, recalling, as Waterhouse suggested, certain of Ribera's engravings. E. Trapier, *Ribera* (New York, 1952), 20, fig. 11. But the two small comic figures in the upper right resemble passages in [another drawing by Rosa], no. 28.6." Mahoney, *Drawings*, 338. It is also tempting to propose, in the context of the desirous and ameliorating nature of writing, that the act of "writing on a skull" bears a connection to the magical and mysterious rites of witchcraft, in which human bones were frequently used in love potions – a practice that appears in Rosa's own witchcraft scenes. The human skull appears in Rosa's Corsini *Scene of Witchcraft* and the London *Scene of Witchcraft* [Fig. 41] as an instrument of incantation. Zika, "The Corsini Witchcraft Scene by Salvator Rosa: Magic, Violence and Death," in *The Italians in Australia*, ed. Marshall, 184-185. It also features as part of a witchcraft ritual in Lippi's *Malmantile*. See Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 49. In his

Just as Rosa's portrait reveals his anxiety over the similitude implicit in true friendship, so does it also convey a similar sense of unease about the experience and practice of melancholia. As Julia Schiesari has shown, melancholia was in the early-modern period conceived as the privileged and erudite source of a distinctively masculine creative genius.[281] In its negative manifestation, melancholia was considered a dangerous affliction which, according to Burton, presented a potential "threat to masculine reason".[282] As a destructive force, melancholia was often given a female gender (in keeping with Dürer's ur-image) and described as effeminate. There are aspects of Rosa's portrait that suggest his engagement in the gendered aspect of melancholia and the conflicts inherent within it. The allegorical figure in the painting is given a male rather than female gender appropriate to a literal embodiment by Rosa or Ricciardi as "poet-philosopher" but also a convenient means with which to evade associations with the female allegory of Dürer's initial engraving as an emblem of that more harmful brand of melancholia.[283] Like the inscription on the skull, the inclusion and subsequent erasure of the tear on the figure's left cheek may reflect Rosa's desire to emphasize the positive (rather than negative) effects of melancholia and his ability to wield the humour toward productive ends.

The portrait consists in a combination of inscription, erasure and an intermediate fragmentation (in the form of the ostensibly incomplete inscription on the skull) that collectively

---

letters to Ricciardi, too, Rosa alluded on more than one occasion to his own surrender to the magical power of witches in matters of love and reunion. See Borelli, letters 147, 210 and 288.

[281] Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 39, citing Schiesari, *The Gendering of Melancholia*, 112. For early-modern intellectuals, the experience of melancholia, the practice of philosophy, and the friendship that bonded the philosopher to his learned companions were all closely intertwined. In this sense, Rosa's portrait and its commemoration of the "melancholic" expresses at once Rosa's claim for a unique, inspired persona and a desire for inclusion in the broader pan-historical social network of intellectuals.

[282] Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 40.

[283] Rosa's awareness of the gender distinction implicit in the experience of melancholia and the creative activities of writing and reading is perhaps detectable in a comparison of the figure in the Met portrait, with his pen poised on its writing surface, and the allegorical figure in Rosa's *Lucrezia as Poetry*. In the latter image, the female "poet" has dipped her pen in ink, but holds it aloft – she is not shown in the act of writing itself; she is more a passive, symbolic personification of writing than an active illustration of the effective or productive act. In addition, the book she holds is closed, unlike the conspicuously open book visible in the Met portrait. The same is true of Rosa's personification of *Lucrezia as Music* (Palazzo Barberini, Rome) who holds a sheet of music with a prominent signature displaying Rosa's own authorship of the composition.

point to the artist's anxiety about the best way to express the complex nature of his subject. Rosa seems to have been particularly conflicted about the depiction of tears, for, although he chose to paint out the tear streaming down the figure's left cheek, he seems to have left a much smaller, barely-detectable tear on the right-hand side at the corner of the eye. In Burton's theory of melancholy, tears represented the expunging of excess fluids – fluids that gave the melancholic man female characteristics such as "inconstancy and changeability, moodiness, sullenness, an inability to be governed by reason, the excess of passion and imagination."[284] Rosa's decision to paint out the more prominent, "weeping" tear could have been from fear of presenting too "irrational" a comportment. His letters, however, show that he was not averse to expressing his emotion and affection with tears – particularly toward friends: the loss of his brother and son to the plague in Naples moves him to tears, as he admits in two letters to Ricciardi of 1656;[285] and in a letter to Giulio of 1649, Rosa was moved "to lamentations, to tears" at the thought of not being able to come to the villas of Monterufoli and Barbaiano.[286] Tears were an important sign of affectionate friendship and a sign of longing for distant companions.[287]

[284] Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, 54. Even Petrarch, who commended tears as therapy for grief, expressed anxiety over the choice between submission to emotion or reason. He writes: "Weeping is great comfort for a grave grief,/ sighs and laments relieve an afflicted soul./ Contained grief destroys the mind,/ the greatest medicine for a sad heart is to weep openly." McClure, *Sorrow and Consolation*, 21; Petrarch, *Eclogue* 11; in F. Neri et al. ed., *Rime, Trionfi e poesie latine* (Milan: R. Ricciardi, 1951), 826.
[285] Borelli, letters 200 and 201. Having just lost Rosalvo and Giuseppe to the plague, Rosa writes, "Questa volta il Cielo m'ha percosso di maniera che mi fa provar vani tutti i rimedii humani, e la meno pena ch'io provo è di dirvi che vi scrivo piangendo. … Il raccomandarsi al Cielo è vanità, poiché, in faccia a lui, solo gli iniqui et i rei sono felici e vivi, e'l mio linguaggio, tutto che sia di lagrime, non è inteso per niente." Borelli, letter 200. In his next letter he writes, "A pena havevo persuaso i miei occhi a dar qualche tregua alle lagrime che mi sopragiunge la seconda catastrofe della morte di mia sorella, e di mio cognato socessa tre settimane sono assieme con cinque suoi figlioli." Borelli, letter 201. The news of these deaths, however, turned out to have been falsely reported to Rosa.
[286] Borelli, letter 33. Rosa is similarly moved to tears at the thought of the Volterran villas in 1660: "[m]a parliamo d'altro, ché per essermene appena ricordato, mi vien voglia di lagrimare." Borelli, letter 240.
[287] In 1649 Rosa wrote to Giulio about his brother Giovanni: "stimo più quelle sue lagrime nate da un core affettuoso che quante monarchie siano mai per trovarsi, et assicuratelo che troverà sempre in me una vera corrispondenza". Borelli, letter 23. Tears were also an expression of the longing for the presence of friends, and Ricciardi, seems to have been moved to tears at the memory of past meetings and the desire for future companionship. In 1664, he apparently wrote to Rosa of his own tears: "mi vennero le lagrime, non tanto per lo spavento del fine, quanto per il desiderio di trovarmi con voi, amico, che sapete amare anche i miei difetti". Borelli, letter 305.

Rosa's indecision regarding the tears of his melancholic doppelganger may have reflected his desire to present on the one hand a rational vision of the creative intellectual's mastery of melancholia, and the emotional nature of friendship on the other. This feature of the portrait seems to reflect the "anxious" condition of early-modern masculinity identified by gender historians.[288] Allison Levy's discussion of the problematic confluence of gender, mourning and melancholia within the commemorative function of early-modern portraiture offers an appropriate interpretive frame for Rosa's portrait.[289] As an image fraught with the iconography of desire, the tropes of presence and absence, and the angst of threatened memory, Rosa's painting is a suitable candidate for inclusion among a relatively rare number of works that Levy identifies as "men mourning other men", such as Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* (c. 1534-35, Philadelphia Museum of Art) [Fig. 210].[290] Like these images, Rosa's painting intended to "defer memory loss" – particularly in its inscriptive and "documentary" impulse. It, too, expresses a fear of losing both the self and the other – the "other," in this instance, being the friend.[291]

The Night and the Moon

Two final features of Rosa's portrait signal its binary vision of melancholia: the night sky and the crescent moon [Fig. 72]. The nocturnal setting of the painting was undoubtedly inspired by Dürer's *Melencolia I* [Fig. 149] where, despite the absence of the moon itself, the scene is conceived as if "bathed in moonlight".[292] The night and moon are featured in other images

[288] See Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*; Allison Levy, *Re-Membering Masculinity in Early Modern Florence. Widowed Bodies, Mourning and Portraiture* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006); Kathleen Long, *High Anxiety: Masculinity in Crisis in Early Modern France* (Kirksville, Mo.: Truman State University Press, 2002); and Paster, *The Body Embarrassed*, esp. chapters 1 and 2 for a discussion of bodily fluids and early-modern gender associations.
[289] Levy, *Re-Membering Masculinity.*
[290] Levy discusses Pontormo's "cryptic" portrait of Alessandro de' Medici, c. 1534. If the figure is Alessandro, which is generally accepted, then it may show him mourning the death of his father, Giulio de' Medici (Pope Clement VII), who died in 1534. Levy, *ibid*, 95-7.
[291] *Ibid*, 99.
[292] In Dürer's print "the foreground seems to be lit by a moon standing high in the sky and casting deep shadows" creating a "literal twilight" that is reflected in the overall melancholic symbolism that pervades the rest of the

associated with the iconographic tradition of *melancholia*, such as Gregor Reisch's woodcut on the theme of geometry, entitled *Margarita philosophica* (1504, Strasburg) [Fig. 213], and Jacques de Gheyn II's etching of *Saturn* or *The Melancholic Temperament* after a drawing by Goltzius (c. 1595-6, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) [Fig. 212].[293] In both Reisch's and De Gheyn's images, the clouds, night sky and moon share a close affinity with Rosa's portrait as atmospheric symbols of melancholia that encode its duplicitous nature. De Gheyn's print, which seems a particularly promising candidate as a compositional, iconographic and thematic source for Rosa's painting, contrasts a positive appraisal of melancholia as the source of quasi-divine creativity with a pessimistic view of the temperament as a psychological affliction: the "melancholic" is likened to the god Saturn, the master of Geometry who presses his compass against the globe in his hand, but the Latin inscription below proclaims that "Melancholy, the most calamitous affliction of soul and mind, often oppresses men of talent and genius." Like De Gheyn, Rosa aimed to present a more complex interpretation of melancholia as both affliction and advantage.[294]

The night and its moon represent the dual nature of melancholy: the night is the dark, harmful sphere of the melancholic experience but also the birthplace of its creative promise, while the moon was associated with corruptibility, changeability and madness but could also be the source

---

image. "[T]he sun could not possibly stand so high at the time of day indicated by the sky and the bat as to cast, for instance, the hour-glass's shadow. The scene, therefore, if indeed such a realistic interpretation is desired, was imagined as by moonlight, once more in significant contrast to the sun-drenched interior in the *St. Jerome* engraving." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 320 and note 120.

[293] Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn*, 9. As one of a series of prints on the *Four Temperaments*, De Gheyn's *Saturn* makes the moon into a veritable canonical attribute of melancholia itself. On De Gheyn's etching, see F. W. H. Hollstein ed., *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts c. 1450-1700.* Vol. III, Fouceel-Gole (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1949), 134; Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 398-399; and Jean Clair ed., *Mélancolie. Génie et folie en Occident*. Exhibition catalogue (Paris: Galimard, 2006), 146. In addition to De Gheyn's *Wapenhandelinghe* of 1607 (see chapter three, 233 above), Rosa may also have been inspired by De Gheyn's *vanitas* imagery: Rosa's *Vanitas* images (in particular the Munich and Haddo House paintings [Figs. 63 and 48]) are traceable to De Gheyn's *Vanitas* still-life of 1603 (Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven), the first autonomous vanitas still-life painting. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 78.

[294] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 399. De Gheyn fuses the "black bile" of the melancholic with the classical divinity of Saturn who "guides and protects" that affliction. Both Rosa's and De Gheyn's images represent the moon as a crescent in its decreasing phase, they both position it in the upper left-hand corner of the composition, and they both include a clouded sky and indeterminate background.

of ingenuity and insight.[295] Black, nocturnal imagery was often associated with the negative experience of melancholia as the "clouding of consciousness, depression, fear and delusions".[296] Marsilio Ficino associated melancholia – identified by its "black" bile – with the "ruinous and destructive effect of night study".[297] Others, however, associated the imagery of night with the ancient *topos* of sleep and dreams as places of divine creative inspiration – an idea that would, via a re-location of its power in the artist's own imaginative faculties, have strongly appealed to Rosa's conviction about his own inventive *fantasia*.[298] Alchemical theory also put a more positive spin on the colour black as a sign of "the beginning of consciousness".[299] The idea of the moon itself as a source of insight is a recurring theme in ancient and early-modern texts. Plutarch stressed its creative potency, considering it to have "effects similar to those of reason and wisdom".[300] In Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1532), the moon was the location of his protagonist's lost wits.[301] And in the *Metamporphoses*, Ovid described it as "conscious" witness and discloser of nefarious deeds.[302]

---

[295] Aristotle described the moon as a dark, corruptible and changeable sphere. Nadia Minerva ed., *La Luna allo specchio. Rappresentazioni, simbologie e metafore seleniche nella letteratura e nell'immaginario* (Bologna: Patron Editore, 1990), 10. On the ancient association of the moon with madness or "lunacy", see Walter Pagel, *Paracelsus: An Introduction to Philosophical Medicine in the Era of the Renaissance* (Basel and New York: Karger, 1982), 150ff. Cesare Ripa's allegorical personification of "Inconstancy" (*Incostanza*) holds aloft a crescent moon. Ripa, *Iconologia*, 184.

[296] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 15-16.

[297] Klibansky, et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 323. Ficino, *De v. tripl.*, I, 7. Ficino is commenting on the symbol of the bat, which was itself alternatively interpreted (by Agrippa of Nettesheim) as a more positive, creative symbol: a characteristic of vigilance and the productive nature of night study.

[298] On the link between dreams and "divine" inspiration, see Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," 100-104. Ruvoldt cites a sonnet by Michelangelo that makes an explicit "fusion" between night, sleep and the "Ficinian definition of genius", where "the artist celebrates his status as a dreamer"; the sonnet begins: "O night, O time so sweet, even though black,/ who infuses all labor with peace at the day's end,/ whoever exalts you shows good judgment and vision/ and whoever honors you has a sound mind." See James Saslow, *The Poetry of Michelangelo* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), no. 102.

[299] The "*nigredo*" is "a stage in alchemy where there is an inward turning toward creative and fecund activity." Marlan, *The Black Sun. The Alchemy and Art of Darkness* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2005), 93.

[300] Whitehouse, *The Moon. A Biography* (London: Headline, 2001), 52-3. Plutarch writes, "For the [revolutions] of the Moon resemble works of reason (*logos*) and super-abundant wisdom, while those of the Sun are like penetrating strokes [given] with force and power." G. R. S. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes: studies in Hellenistic theosophy and gnosis* (London: Theosophical Publ., Society, 1906), 1: 319.

[301] Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, trans. Guido Waldman. Oxford World's Classics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), canto XXXIV: 87, 420.

[302] Ovid, *Metamporphoses*, Book 13: The Speeches of Ajax and Ulysses.

Still others regarded the moon as an emblem of the melancholic's divided nature. For John Milton, it represented the melancholic's contradictory position in the creative and destructive simultaneity of his pensive and self-reflective state.[303] For Ricciardi, too, the moon was a symbol of the inconstancy of fortune.[304] The nocturnal aspect of Dürer's *Melencolia I* signals the melancholic's state of ambiguity: it represents not a specific time of day, but rather the "twilight of the mind," capable neither of "cast[ing] its thoughts away into the darkness nor 'bring[ing] them to the light'."[305] Here it is worth noting that both the night and crescent moon are the setting for Rosa's painting of *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31], where they are similarly intended to evoke the realm of philosophical introspection and revelation and its simultaneously destructive and creative nature.

Rosa's figure is not sleeping, and therefore not dreaming. But there is nonetheless a dream-like quality to the indeterminate, nebulous space he occupies: the table and books imply the interior setting of scholarly study (as in Dürer's *St. Jerome*, for example [Fig. 148]), but they are detached from their more usual location and left to float against the boundless night sky. This is the night of inspiration, dreams and imagination – all of which the melancholic was considered to be particularly susceptible toward, for better or worse.[306] Rosa's own estimation of the night as the

---

[303] In Milton's *Il Penseroso*, the melancholic takes pleasure at sight of moon. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 230. The melancholic's "love of nocturnal studies" also features in the *L'Allegro*. Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 228-9.

[304] The moon does not feature in the *Sotto rigida stella* but makes an appearance in other poems on the subject of fortune, for example the *Vita umana fugace, consigliera*: "Muove il piè lieve, ed instabile,/ E' la vita, e la fortuna/ E' di lor sotto la luna/ Non si sa chi sia piu labile". Another version of the same poem (see Appendix II. 7) includes a further reference to the "instability" of the moon: "Non si sa qual sia piu stabile/ O la vita, o la fortuna,/ L'ambidue soto la luna/ Fanno a gara, a chi e piu labile." See Appendix II.6.

[305] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 320.

[306] In Raimundus Lullus's *Tractatus novus de astronomia* of 1297, for example, the "Saturnine man" was considered particularly prone to the "*species fantasticas et matematicas*". In addition to his particularly strong powers of memory, the melancholic was susceptible the force of imagination because of "the fact that water was an impressionable substance and earth [the elemental symbol of melancholia] a solid one which long retained al impressions received", and because of the "quite special correspondence ('*concordia'*) between melancholy and the imagination." See Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 337; also see 337-8 for other authors who draw a close connection – deriving ultimately from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* – between melancholia and the imagination. On the symbolism of the night as the "matrix of inspiration," see David Summers, "Form and Gender," *New Literary History* 24: 2 (1993): 243-271. Leonardo, among others, had argued that dreams offered a more reliable and lasting vision to the artist than the experience of reality. Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," 102-3; Richter, *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), vol. 2, no.

place of thoughtful and creative productivity is suggested in a letter of 1668, where he recalls "rising at midnight for the devising of future subjects" with Ricciardi and his fellow academics in Florence.[307] Rosa's portrait attempts to translate this purely psychological experience into visual terms that rival the otherwise intangible nature of the poet's "inner" vision.[308] The ability of dreams to construct an alternate reality – in which distant friends seemed to be reunited together again, for example – also made the nocturnal setting a fitting iconographic feature for a portrait and gift intended to replicate that very experience: in two letters to Ricciardi of 1659 and 1661 (the period in which the portrait was probably made) Rosa claimed to be "dreaming" of his beloved Strozzavolpe.[309]

The particular form of Rosa's moon – a thin, decreasing crescent – may also point to the melancholic's dual nature. In De Gheyn's print of *Saturn* or *The Melancholic Temperament* [Fig. 212] the crescent moon expresses both the lunar association of the melancholic humor and Saturn's sickle or *sicilis*, considered to represent the inherently contradictory disposition of Saturn (and melancholia) as a creative and destructive force [Fig. 216]: the sickle represented his role as the god of agriculture, but it was also the instrument he used to castrate his father Uranus.[310] On the

---

1144. Dürer concurred: "how often in my sleep do I behold great works of art and beautiful things, the like whereof never appear to me awake, but so soon as I awake even the remembrance of them leaves me." Ruvoldt, *ibid*, 102; William Martin Conway ed., *Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889), 180.

[307] Borelli, letter 355. See my discussion in chapter two, 125. The practice is also reflected in the nocturnal *vigilie* or "vigils" initiated by Rosa's friend Carlo Dati among the *Crusca*. See chapter two, 78 note 55 above; Fontani, *Elogio di Carlo Roberto Dati* (Florence, 1794), 187; and Rosen, "Carlo Dati on the Invention of Eyeglasses," 9.

[308] As Ruvoldt notes, the concepts of night and dreams offered artists "an especially potent metaphor for their activity" in seeking "to claim equality with poets and philosophers as the recipients of divine inspiration. … In addition to signifying divine favor, dreaming is, after all, a visual experience. Those concerned with inner vision would naturally see the dream, with its potential for fantastic imagery, as an appropriate analogy for their own work." Ruvoldt, "Michelangelo's Dream," 102.

[309] Borelli, letters 226 and 243.

[310] On the sickle as a symbol of Saturn see Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 134-135. The sickle, which eventually became the planet's astrological symbol, represents the "double-valency" or contradiction intrinsic to Saturn as both creator and destroyer. Thus Saturn is a conceived as a ruler of the Golden age of abundance, but also a "gloomy, dethroned, solitary god" who was "exiled beneath the earth," lived as a prisoner or bondsman, and later became associated with the god of death and the dead, who punished his father and ate his children. "Like

one hand, Saturn as Melancholy was granted with positive traits (a skill for riches, an aptitude for geometry and architecture, a "knowledge of hidden things", and a profound intelligence and strength), and, on the other, the negative associations of murder, suffering and destruction.[311] The type of crescent in Rosa's portrait – a waning, old, or decreasing moon – was also interpreted alternatively as a harmful or beneficial portent: as "light heading into darkness", or, as a sign of hope in times of despair and "remedy for the shadows of darkness".[312]

There is yet another aspect of the moon that emphasizes the positive, favourable proclivities of the melancholic humor. Prior to its adoption by the melancholic, the moon was strictly an attribute of the phlegmatic humor, due to its physiological association with the "watery" brain, lungs and phlegm.[313] Unlike the volatile melancholic, the phlegmatic was characterized as calm and unemotional. In appropriating the moon from the phlegmatic's symbolic repertoire, then,

---

melancholy, Saturn, that demon of opposites, endowed the soul both with slowness and stupidity and with the power of intelligence and contemplation." Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 159.

[311] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 143, 188. Saturn may also have appealed to Rosa for his association with tears and water.

[312] Sandra Sider, "New Resources for Emblem Studies," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54: 4, part 2 (2001): 1579. The particularly thin sliver of Rosa's crescent may even intend to evoke a lunar eclipse, a number of which took place in Europe in the mid-seventeenth century (lunar eclipses are recorded for November 1648, April 1642, and May 1639), and which were considered as portents for catastrophic events. A waning moon (that is, a moon depicted in its final stage) can also be more generally associated with the passage of time, and thus an allusion on Rosa's part to both the more profound concept of human mortality and to the more personal notion of the large spans of time that often separated him from Riccairdi. It is not entirely impossible that Rosa's moon, depicted as a thin crescent, is connected in some way to Galileo's drawings of the phases of the moon of c. 1610 [Fig. 214] (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Gal. 48, fol. 28). Galileo's theories exerted a profound influence on many of Rosa's academic friends in Florence. See Michael Segre, *In the Wake of Galileo* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991); and Luciano Bochiero, *Experiment and natural philosophy in seventeenth-century Tuscany The history of the Accademia del Cimento* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007). It is also tempting, along these lines, to connect the celestial body in Rosa's painting with a *solar* eclipse or "black sun", an alchemical phenomenon closely linked to the humor of melancholia. See Marlan, *The Black Sun. The Alchemy and Art of Darkness*, and Julia Kristeva, *Black Sun. Depression and Melancholia*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1989). Rosa often expressed an interest in metaphysics, magic and alchemy, and may have included a cosmic reference to the profundity of his longing for a dear and absent friend. In one of the sayings Rosa records in his book of maxims, he identifies friendship in particular with the light of the sun: "Il levar l'amicizia del mondo non sarebbe di minor danno alla umana generazione che se vi si levasse la luce del sole perché, come il sole co' lucenti raggi illumina e riscalda e purga il nostro emisfero, cossí l'amicizia, illustrando le virtú umane, infiamma di celeste amore i nostri cuori, e li solleva alla perfezzione." Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica*, 38, no. 305.

[313] Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 127.

the melancholic sought to share in its calming effects.[314] It is possible that Rosa regarded the moon in this sense as well, as producing a "phlegmatic" and tranquil antidote to his mournful state.[315] In a letter of 1663 to Ricciardi, Rosa expresses his desire to adopt the calm stolidity of the phlegmatic temperament in spite of his melancholic inclinations:

> "I know nothing more than what I must believe with regard to your most obstinate silence, which begins to pass the mark of remittal. I promise you to remain calm [*Vi prometto d'haver flemma*] in spite my nature, in which there is not lacking the bile to know how to lament."[316]

Rosa's many references to the moon, however, reveal his interest in the double nature of its symbolic meaning. Some of his comments suggest the moon's association with inspired creativity, while others implicate its deceptive and detrimental nature.[317] A particularly revealing interpretation of the moon appears in Rosa's collection of maxims, the *Teatro della Politica*, where he aligns the moon with Fortune – that most fickle entity indispensible to Rosa's self-conception:

---

[314] In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the phlegmatic and melancholic temperaments became almost interchangeable – the "soporific" nature of the phlegmatic becoming a consistent characteristic of the melancholic as well. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 63-4. In the sixteenth century, however, "the sleepy melancholic had been replaced by one doing intellectual work [and] the now unemployed slumber motif naturally reverted to the phlegmatic." Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 300.

[315] Alternatively – if the crescent moon is taken also as a reference to Saturn – it may infer the "healing" effects of the Saturnine temperament itself: for Ficino, one of the possible "cures" for melancholia lay in "the very act of turning voluntarily towards that very same Saturn. The melancholic should, in other words, apply himself of his own accord to that activity which is the particular domain of the sublime star of speculation, and which the planet promotes just as powerfully as it hinders and harms the ordinary functions of body and soul – that is to say, to creative contemplation, which takes place in the 'mens', and only there. … As enemy and oppressor of all life in any way subject to the present world, Saturn generates melancholy; but as the friend and protector of a higher and purely intellectual existence he can also cure it." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 271.

[316] Borelli, letter 287.

[317] In his satires, Rosa makes numerous references to the moon's "crazy," "foolish," or "deceptive" proclivities, but also to its "icy" nature – perhaps alluding to its association with the cold melancholic. See Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 592-7; *L'Invidia*, vv. 1-3; *La Guerra*, vv. 271-9 and vv. 463-5. In the *La Poesia* Rosa also likened the moon to "lunacy" in his comparison of the state of modern poetry to that of antiquity. *La Poesia*, vv. 463-468. In the *La Musica*, Rosa uses explicitly associates the "*lunatico*" (which in Italian refers not to the "lunatic" but to a person of volatile, bizarre or cantankerous character) with a state of "agitated fury" (*agitante furor*) that suggests a conviction in lunar symbolism as expressive of the melancholic's poetic inspiration: "so ch'Asclepiade con un suo trombone/ i sordi medicava, e de' lunatici/ l'agitante furor sopía Damone". *La Musica*, vv. 76-8. In *L'Invidia*, the moon is the recipient of the unworthy "angry maledictions" of Envy – although, by implication, only the commendable lamentations of the Author (Rosa) and not those of *Invidia* (Envy) are worthy of its attention. *L'Invidia*, vv. 625-633. The moon and night also appear in Rosa's sonnet "La Strega". Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 48-50.

"Fortune resembles the moon, which just eclipses itself when at its fullest."[318] A similar statement appears in Rosa's final satire, *Il Tirreno*: Rosa concedes to the will of the stars, appealing to the moon as a guardian of those who seek good fortune as much as a portent of misfortune.[319] The crescent moon in Rosa's portrait, then, can be interpreted as duplicitous Fortune herself, either emerging from the darkness to offer Rosa and Ricciardi her fruits, or depriving them of hope as she moves into obscurity.

Rosa's epistolary comments reveal not only an aesthetic interest in astrology but a genuine credence in an astrological form of fatalism capable of influencing his existence.[320] He frequently appealed to the "stars" as representatives of Fortune's favour or cruelty in reference to his achievements and (especially) his sufferings.[321] Rosa's statements belong to a widespread contemporary ideal: early-modern references to the "stars" and their influence are commonplace. Seen in connection with his poetic-philosophical persona and his zealous fatalism, however, Rosa's

---

[318] Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica*, 39, no. 317: "La fortuna rassomiglia alla luna che allora si ecclissa quando è piú piena."

[319] Rosa, *Il Tirreno*, vv. 496-507. It is worth noting that in the same passage Rosa uses the term "*tugurio*", a word that he uses in his letters in reference to Ricciardi's beloved hideaway, the villa of Strozzavolpe. See Borelli, letters 48, 51, 108, 254, 261, 263, 268, 298, 312, 313 and 328.

[320] For Rosa's references to humorological principles, in addition to the letters I cite above in connection with his self-identification as a "melancholic," see Borelli, letters 26, 53, 119 and 158, for example. The moon, like the stars, could also exert an influence on people: it was described by ancient and early-modern astrologers as exerting certain effects on persons according to its conjunction with other planets. According to the fourth century BCE astrologer Julius Firmicus Maternus, for example, when Saturn was located at a certain point in the sky, and the moon came into conjunction with Mars, the result for the afflicted was "insanity, lunacy, melancholia and languor." Julius Firmicus Maternus, *Matheseos libri* VIII, ed. W. Kroll and F. Skutsch (Leipzig, 1897-1913), book III, 2, 24; 104, 4, cited in Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 147, note 68. Rosa may have followed a line of thinking that regarded the stars as "influential" on man's character or fate, but not to the extent that they overruled his own agency. While Ptolemy saw the stars as "guiding forces" that actually determine man's fate, an alternative view regarded the planets only as symbols. This view was expressed in a commentary on Macrobius's explanation of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, based on William of Conches. "Quoting Plotnius, the writer states that the planets do not bring men either good or ill fortune, but indicate that good or ill fortune will come to them. His real intention is to distinguish between the domain of planetary influence and that of human free will. He parts company with Ptolemy who had acknowledged the dependence of some human actions on the stars, and he emphasizes strongly that though men's predispositions come under the influence of the stars, their various actions do not, for it is left to their own free will to develop these predispositions for good or evil." Klibansky et al., *ibid*, 182.

[321] See Borelli, letters 30, 113, 114, 133, 146, 147, 153, 210, 211, 214, 215, 222, 243, 245, 254, 260, 270, 284, 286, 311, 323, 350, 364, 367, 371, 380. The same conviction in astrological determinism is evident in Rosa's poem entitled *Che la vera feliciti non consiste nell 'abbondanza delle ricchezze ma nella penuria dei desiderii*, which begins: "The heavens foretell destiny ..." ("Prodico il ciel destina ...") BNCF MS Magl. VII, 870, 154; see Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 142-5; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 93.

faith in astrological portent was necessitated by his performance as a poet philosopher.[322] Ricciardi's *canzone* was itself based in astrological determinism, attributing mortal suffering at the outset to the influence of a "cruel star" ("*rigida stella*"), an interesting point of comparison for the celestial body in Rosa's portrait.[323] Ricciardi's poem emphasizes the predestination of one's humorological-astrological character: "Under a cruel star", he begins, "he who is born to languish can expect nothing other than atrocious influences".[324] He may be referring specifically to melancholia, the temperament he shared with Rosa: the "cruel star" seems a fitting description of Saturn, and the idea of "languishing" or "pining" expressed by the verb *languire* recalls the ancient Saturnine characteristics of slothfulness, depression and sorrow. In his letters Rosa frequently quotes the lines of Ricciardi's poem (including the passage cited above) in affirmation of his friend's assessment of their mutual identity and its subjection to a melancholic fortune.[325] Rather like the problematic tenets of Stoicism, however, the astrological component of Rosa's philosophy also presented moments of skepticism. Amid a torrent of praise of celestial influence, Ricciardi interjected in his poem a more grounded passage that urges Rosa to take the ultimate responsibility for his own distress:

> Rosa, this is the deceit
> of the disillusioned intellect,
> …
> And time well expresses,
> that he complains wrongly,
> Not willing to believe

[322] On Rosa and fatalism, see my discussion in the Prologue, 12. Astrological identity, moreover, was one half of the twinned-source of the artist's creative *ingegno*, according to Antonio Abati's definition. See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 75 and note 25. Abati attributed the poet's creative "*ingegno*" and poetic inclination to both an internal source (guided by one's astrological birth-chart) and an external source, defined in the familiar terms of Platonic "ecstasy" or "furor." In the *Frascherie* (108), Abati "discusses the various astrological conjunctions which create the best conditions for poets, and in particular the best formation for Satiric poets: 'Prima Mercurio, la Luna, e Venere uniti con Giove nel Sagittario al cuore della Scorpione, giudicavalo un' acuto, e qualificato Poeta; e sopra tutto l'esser Marte in Decima in Casa di Mercurio indicava in lui una famosa, e risentita inclinatione, nel lacerare gli altrui vitij con Satire.'"

[323] Appendix II. 1. Ricciardi's poem turns on the notion of astrological influence. See for example vv. 55-63. This interest in the astrological nature and impact of fortune also pervades many of Rosa's poetic compositions. See for example the ode beginning "Vedendo solo al Trono". Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 154-9.

[324] Appendix II. 1, vv. 1-3: "Sotto rigida stella/ Chi nacque per languire/ Non aspetti altro mai che influssi atroci."

[325] See Borelli, letters 100, 137, 230, 242, 254, and 320.

> that the only misery is man as he esteems himself;
> He complains to the Sky, but the stars are not to blame
> for his situation – the misfortune is his own doing.[326]

The melancholic iconography of Rosa's portrait was intended to express not a solely pessimistic acceptance of suffering, but rather a complex visual essay on melancholia's double nature. It commemorates melancholia as the source of a shared identity and a bond of amity, and celebrates that same friendship as an instrument for mastering that humor and directing it toward creative purpose and remedying its negative effects.[327] Burton claimed that to deter melancholia one should avoid solitude and idleness, and Rosa's letters often express the same conviction.[328] In 1657, for example, Rosa attributed his melancholic sufferings to the physical distance of his friend, writing to Ricciardi: "My greatest affliction is to consider myself far away from you, and I know not when these growing maledictions [*maledittioni*] will stop, which have me so hardened in melancholy, that I consider it impossible to find a remedy for them, or to recover ever again."[329] In 1659, Rosa wrote to Ricciardi after leaving Strozzavolpe: "I have arrived in Rome accompanied by a most fierce melancholy, since, separated from you, I have not been able to find anything that would satisfy my spirit [*genio*]."[330] Many of Rosa's references to his melancholic suffering, in fact,

---

[326] Appendix II. 1, vv. 265-276.

[327] Evidence of the correlation made between solitude and negative melancholia is provided by Stefano Guazzo in his treatise on conversation. Guazzo describes one of his interlocutors, The Cavaliere, as suffering the afflictions of melancholia because he was far from conversation and had retired to live the *vita solitaria*. Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 223.

[328] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 285; Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, II, 564ff, Part.3, Sec. 4, Mem. 2, Subs.3. Rosa's incorporation of "solitude" into his portrait also signals another characteristic of the melancholic temperament: the melancholic was physiologically more prone to an isolated existence – to withdrawal "from bodily pleasures and worldly turmoil." This solitude, however, was also associated with the melancholic's capacity for receiving "inspirations of a higher degree" than other persons. The thirteenth-century Parisian Bishop, William of Auvergne (1180/90-1249) cited Aristotle's comment that all highly-gifted men were melancholics, "and he even believed that melancholics were fitted for inspirations of this kind in a higher degree than men of other complexions – namely, because this complexion withdraws men more from bodily pleasures and worldly turmoil." Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 73; Auvergne, *De universo*, II, 3, 20, *Opera omnia* (Venice, 1591), 993.

[329] Borelli, letter 212: "La maggior mia affletione è il considerarmi lontano da voi, né so quando cesseranno queste dilatate maledittioni, le quali m'hanno talmente incallito nella malinconia, che stimo impossibile trovargli rimedio o mai più sollevarmi."

[330] Borelli, letter 222: "Giunsi in Roma accompagnato da una fierissima malinconia, poiché disgiunto da voi non fu mai possibile incontrar cosa ch'el mio genio sodisfacesse." For similar statements, see letters 147, 188, 202,

are made explicitly in the context of his longing for Strozzavolpe and Ricciardi's company, suggesting the possibility that the Met portrait was made during one of these sojourns. Rosa was at Strozzavolpe again in 1661, and in 1663 he wrote to Ricciardi from Rome that he could not even think of the place "without being entirely filled with melancholy."[331] Rosa's last extant letter to Ricciardi of February 1673 reads like a postscript to the Met portrait, protracting its unrequited anticipation of reunion into perpetuity:

> "If your coming does not cure me, nothing will make me feel better: so I beseech you as much as our friendship means to change your mind and to come to see me much earlier than the end of March as we had agreed upon, otherwise you will put me into a state of continual eagerness and a more atrocious melancholy… I have never been in greater need of you, and with all my heart I embrace you. …"[332]

IV.7. Concluding Thoughts

In his portrait for Ricciardi, Rosa hovers (quite literally!) on the edge of a precipice. On the one hand, he pays homage to the fragile, irrational nature of melancholia and its consuming potential. On the other, he extols the possibility of "rationalizing" that experience, categorizing melancholia as a fundamentally innate (rather than external, god-given) source of creative genius capable of being controlled and directed to desirable ends. In this, Rosa was caught between two early-modern conceptions of creative inspiration: the classical theory of art as guided by "*ratio*",[333] and the theory that acknowledged a deeper, "divine" but also self-determining source of inspiration.[334] These are the two theories contrasted in Dürer's "paired" prints of *Melencolia I* and

---

212, 221, 251, 285, 353 and 392. Only the proximity of friendship – either in its physical experience or in the form of the letter – can console the detrimental effects of Rosa's melancholia.

[331] Borelli, letter 293.

[332] Borelli, letter 392: "Se non mi guarisce la vostra venuta, non mi gioverà cosa nessuna: però vi suplico per quanto può la nostra amicizia a mutarsi di parere et essere da me assai prima del propostovi fine di Marzo, altrimenti mi farete stare in una continova impazienza et in una più atroce malinconia. … mai mi son trovato in maggior necessità di desiderrarvi, e col core v'abraccio."

[333] The vision of artistic practice as a liberal art in which reason "enables the artist to master reality by means of his rational insight into natural laws, and thereby to raise his activity to the rank of an exact science" – represented by the likes of Alberti, Leonardo, Zuccaro, Lomazzo and Bellori.

[334] As represented by the northern and Mannerist interest in metaphysical and mystic individualism which described the artist as "divine," codified in Cornelius Agrippa's comments on melancholia and creative inspiration

St. Jerome.[335] In fusing together in his portrait the inactive, rational and active, metaphysical "types" of melancholia, Rosa's portrait signals his position at the crux of two ways of thinking about the origins, nature, and potential of the creative impulse.

Melancholia was clearly a cause of distress throughout Rosa's life, particularly in the latter years during a long period of illness. But it was also a crucial aspect of his identity as a poet-philosopher and the efficacy of his inspiration and autonomy. To this end, melancholia was for Rosa a veritable catch-22: a creative force to be wielded in the service of maintaining an intellectual self-image, and a potential threat to the logic or reason that sustained that very identity. In his portrait for Ricciardi, Rosa made a conscious effort to devise a new vision of melancholia, based on traditional iconography,[336] which conveyed his own unique message: the young poet-philosopher in Rosa's portrait is an ode to the shared melancholic spirit that kept the two friends perpetually united, irrespective of the distance between them. As a veritable essay on friendship as the basis of Rosa's "autonomous" identity, the portrait encapsulates in pictorial terms the much wider discourse and set of professional practices he adopted in the service of cultivating that persona. These strategies form the subject of the next chapter.

---

in the *De Occulta philosophica libri tres* (1531) and given visual form in Dürer's print, as well as in his own comments on artistic creativity (Dürer's own "divine" interpretation of creative inspiration associated it explicitly with originality and novelty. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 361-2. For "the transformation of Ficino's doctrine of beauty into a metaphysics of mannerist art", see Panofsky, *Idea*, 52ff; for Agrippa's description of the *humor melancholicus* as the source of the artist's creative frenzy, wisdom and revelation under the influence of Saturn, approximating gods in their own right (and thereby granting creative agency to the artist rather than an unseen, divine force), see Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 355-7. The likelihood that Rosa knew Agrippa's work is suggested by Salerno who includes the *De Occulta* among a selection of books familiar to Rosa and his *seicento* contemporaries interested in the subject of witchcraft. Salerno, "Il dissenso nella pittura," 45; also see Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 75-6.

[335] On the debate concerning the "pairing" of the two etchings, see Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 364, and note 276; A. Weixlgärtner, *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst* (1901), 47ff; R. Wustmann, *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, vol. XXII (1911), 116; and Lange and Fuhse, *Dürer's schriftlicher Nachlass*, 120, 6; 121, 6; 125, 12; 127, 13, 17; 128, 17.

[336] Rosa's search for a novel iconographic or compositional interpretation of melancholia in his portrait for Ricciardi can also be detected in the evolution of the work's preparatory drawings, where the artist seems to be testing out a variety of poses and compositions that play on the alternatives offered both by Dürer's works and the broader tradition of images they inspired: in the first two drawings [Figs. 74 and 75] the figure is seated with his hand resting against his chin or cheek; in the next two [Figs. 76 and 77] he is standing, at first raising the skull aloft for a more intimate examination, and then bending over to study it on a table. Only in the final drawing [Fig. 78] – assumed to be one of the last in the set – is the figure depicted writing on the skull itself.

Chapter V
The Business of Friendship: The Fundamental Sociality of Rosa's Professional Strategies for Autonomy

In a letter to Ricciardi of 1652, Rosa accused his friend of treating affection as a thing to be doled out like some ignoble commodity: "you must be one of those friends who loves by the weight of the steel-yard [*a peso di stadera*], yet you expect me to have great prudence in considering your feelings".[1] In 1649, however, Rosa had given his own friendliness an economic slant, writing to Giulio Maffei, "remember that I am your true friend, and if I am more poor than you it cannot be otherwise; content yourself that I am not a beggar in my love for you".[2] In 1667 Rosa likened amity itself to a profession or enterprise when he reminded Ricciardi to have care with the "*mestiero*" ("business" or "profession") of friendship.[3] More than just inventive metaphors, Rosa's comments hint at the very real economic dimension of friendship, in which affection, favours and obligations are traded instead of money (although it, too, is frequently involved in the exchange). This chapter considers in greater detail the instrumental nature of friendship and its significance for Rosa's professional practice and financial success.[4] More than just a corollary of Rosa's philosophical aspirations or a desired component of his personal life, friendship was also a "strategy" to be pursued and practiced in the service of achieving professional goals. It played a vital role in each of his commercial activities, including the sale of paintings on the art market, the public exhibition, the practice of making copies, printmaking, collecting, gift-giving, the pursuit of novel iconography, and new attitudes toward pricing and valuation.

---

[1] Borelli, letter 136: "si vede che voi sete di quegli amici che amano a peso di stadera, mentre mi desiderate tutto prudenza nel ponderare i vostri sentimenti…"
[2] Borelli, letter 36: "ricordati che sono it tuo vero amico e se sono più povero di te non si puol far altro: contentatevi che non sia mendico nell'amarvi…"
[3] Borelli, letter 343: "vi suplico che di grazia non strappazziamo il mestiero dell'amicizia."
[4] On the mixture of altruism and self-interest in early-modern friendship, see for example Verboven, "The Economy of Friends," 44-45; Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers and Clients*; and Kooijmans, *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 1997).

The "business of friendship" is a pervasive feature of *seicento* artistic practice: patrons, clients, art dealers, antiquaries, and all manner of the artist's professional associates infused the art market with a complex discourse of amity as exalted ideal and practical reality – a discourse increasingly adopted by artists in the service of achieving a position of autonomy.[5] This social nexus was fundamental to the success of artists whose lives were often characterized by a substantial degree of economic instability.[6] Malleable, shifting and context-dependent, the artist's professional relationships often consisted of a variable mixture of affection and utility.[7] An examination of Rosa's contribution to this broader phenomenon reveals a rich panorama of relationships, behaviour, and attitudes about making, selling and evaluating art in *seicento* Italy, a field of study that has only in recent years begun to receive due consideration.[8]

---

[5] See Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market (15th to 17th Centuries)," in *The Art Market in Italy*, *15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, ed. M. Fantoni et al. (Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003), 434. Although Bram Kempers has argued that the terms "client" and "patron" are indistinguishable in the Renaissance, I use the terms in my own discussion to identify two different consumers: "patrons" are persons with a dominant role in the procedure (expressly commissioning works of art, laying out the terms, prices or procedures of the work in question, or devising some form of contract for their production and sale), while "clients" solicit works of art in a less regulated manner (buying works of art already produced, or purchasing works from the exhibition or art market venue). Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage*, 5.
[6] Lorizzo, "People and Practices in the Paintings Trade of Seventeenth-Century Rome," in *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*, ed. Neil de Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 345.
[7] For a sociological consideration of economic friendship, see Linda L. Price and Eric J. Arnould, "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider-Client Relationships in Context," *Journal of Marketing* 63: 4 (1999): 38-56.
[8] As Richard Spear has noted, the majority of research in this field has focused on the Italian Renaissance and the Dutch Baroque. The role of friendship in the context of the artist's economic practice has also received sparse attention. See for example: Martin Wackernagel, *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: projects and patrons, workshop and art market*, trans. Alison Luchs (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), esp. Part III; Arnold Esch and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, eds., *Arte, committenza ed economia a Roma nelle corti del Rinascimento (1420- 1530)* (Turin: Einaudi, 1995); Michael North, ed., *Economic History and the Arts* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1996); Francis Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*; Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Knopf; Random House, 1987); John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982); Montias, "Art Dealers in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands", *Similiolus* 17 (1989): 244-56; *idem*, *Le marché de l'art aux Pays Bas, XVe-XVIIe siècles* (Paris: Flammarion, 1996); Montias, *Art at Auction in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2002); Alpers, *Rembrandt's Enterprise: The Studio and the Market*; Spear, "Guercino's 'Prix-Fixe': Observations on Studio Practises and Art-Marketing in Emilia," *Burlington Magazine* 136 (1994): 592-602; Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi: Notes on Painter's Earnings in Early Baroque Rome," *Art Bulletin* 85 (2003): 310-20; Larry Silver, *Peasant Scenes and Landscapes: The Rise of Pictorial Genres in the Antwerp Art Market* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); numerous studies by Luigi Spezzaferro (see the bibliography in Cavazzini, below); the essays in the volume *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. M. Fantoni et al.; the essays in the volume *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, ed. Michela North and David Ormrod (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998); Neil de Marchi and Hans J. van Miegroet eds., *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe, 1450-1750* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006); Lorizzo,

V.1. The Value of the Artist: Rosa and the Tenuous Link between "Fortune", Fame and Self-Worth

Rosa frequently aligned his economic "value" with his personal or artistic worth, an equation that resulted in significant tensions. Baldinucci saw in Rosa's habitual pursuit of "large, laborious" and erudite histories (and their solicitation by his clients) evidence that the artist believed "his own value" consisted only in the paintings themselves.[9] This association is succinctly expressed one of Rosa's comments to Ricciardi in 1652: unable to find a buyer willing to pay the price he demanded for his large *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62], Rosa joked that the philosopher Democritus was, as his alter-ego, perhaps unwilling to part with him and be "locked up in the palaces of the rich".[10] The confluence of finance and person is encapsulated in one of Rosa's favourite concepts, "*fortuna*", a term he uses to refer to fate and money – both of which were integral to honour and reputation, or what Murray Rothbard has called "psychic income."[11] The collusion of these concepts is apparent in one of Rosa's letters to Ricciardi of 1652:

> "Your advice concerning the thought of the future always was, and is, most pleasing to me, that is of *putting together some money for the maintenance of reputation*, as well as for the comfort of life, even I confess that without money it is impossible to be able to achieve that credit to our operations that we desire and truly need. So I resolve myself to make, on my part, the necessary diligence, every time that fortune herself wants to cooperate."[12]

"Documenti inediti sul mercato dell'arte: I testamenti e l'inventario della bottega del Genovese Pellegrino Peri 'rivenditore di quadri' a Roma nella seconda metà del Seicento," in *Decorazione e collezionismo a Roma nel Seicento: Vicende di artisti, committenti, mercanti*, ed. Francesco Cappellati (Rome: Gangemi, 2003); Lorizzo, "Il mercato dell'arte a Roma nel XVII secolo: 'Pittori bottegari' e 'rivenditori di quadri' nei documenti dell'archivio storico dell'Accademia di San Luca", in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al.; Lorizzo, "People and Practices"; Montagu, *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art*; Patrizia Cavazzini, *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008); and Sohm and Spear, *Painting for Profit*. For more on the early-modern artist and his economic position see Alessandro Conti, "L'evoluzione dell'artista," *Storia dell'arte italiana* 2 (1979): 117-263. Elena Fumagalli is currently conducting a study of the economic lives of *seicento* artists at the Medici court in Florence. See her forthcoming chapter on "Florence" in Spear and Sohm, *Painting for Profit*.

[9] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 478.

[10] Borelli, letter 119. See my reference to this letter in chapter three, 211 note 197.

[11] See Rothbard, *Economic Thought before Adam Smith: An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1995), I: 123, cited in Toon Van Houdt, "The Economics of Art in Early Modern times: Some Humanist and Scholastic Approaches," in *Economic Engagements with Art*, ed. De Marchi and Goodwin, 319.

[12] Borelli, letter 151 (emphasis mine): "Gratissimi mi son stati e mi saranno sempre i vostri avertimenti intorno al pensare all'avenire, cioè di mettere assieme qualche baiocco per lo mantenimento della riputatione, come anche per lo comodo della vita, confessando ancor io che senza denari è impossibile poter consequire quel credito alle

Rosa's complex and often contradictory attitude toward money is a particularly salient manifestation of his conflicted persona. On the one hand, he extols poverty and a disdain for worldly goods in the service of a lofty philosophical ideal, while, on the other, he laments his scarcity of funds (which he often explained as the result of a contemporary lack of appreciation for his art) and – above all – craves the fame and recognition that was, at the time, measured predominantly by a financial barometer.[13] Lamenting (as usual) Ricciardi's "erroneous" impression of Rosa's wealth, Rosa conceded that the notion might benefit his reputation: "it is no small feat that I have managed to secure for myself a piece of bread," he wrote in 1666, "[t]his delusion [that I am rich], however, does not make me unhappy, for the reasons and consequences that result in my favour."[14]

In his biography of Rosa, Passeri emphasized the economic dimension of the artist's fame: money freed him from need and poverty (that "tyrant of noble and uplifted spirits"), granting him honour and reputation and the right to "demand due payment for his hard work."[15] Valuing art on the basis of the artist's reputation (what Rob Hatfield has labeled the "star system" of artists[16]) was pervasive in the early-modern period: Donatello, Titian, Francesco del Cossa, and Guido Reni all equated economic worth with personal fame.[17] Baldinucci acknowledged the difficult paradox that this equation produced for a *peintre-philosophe* like Rosa who was morally obliged to disdain

---

nostre operationi, che noi li desideriamo e che veramente se li deveria. Onde mi risolvo di far dal canto mio le do[v]ute deligenze, ogni volta che la fortuna vi vorrà concorrere anch'essa."

[13] See Warwick, "Gift Exchange and Art Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta's Drawing Albums," *Art Bulletin* 79: 4 (1997): 636.

[14] Borelli, letter 324: "Quest'inganno però a me non dispiace, per i rispetti e le conseguenze ch'a mio favore ne risultano … non è poco che m'habbia assicurato d'un pane." Rosa elsewhere equated affluence (or lack thereof) with reputation in a letter of 1649 to Giulio Maffei, noting that his new house in Rome on the Strada Felice, which he was renting for eighty *scudi* a year, "se non è conforme lo vorrei, è almeno quanto basta a ricevere un par vostro, amico senza cerimonie." Borelli, letter 26.

[15] Passeri, *Vite*, 426-7.

[16] Hatfield, "The High End: Michelangelo's Income," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 195-201.

[17] Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market", 435-6; see Deborah Krohn, "Taking Stock: Evaluation of Works of Art in Renaissance Italy," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 203-9; Michelle O'Malley, "Commissioning Bodies, Fee Negotiations and Price Structures for Altarpieces in 15th and Early 16th Century Italy," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 163-180; and Susanne Kubersky-Piredda, "Immagini devozionali nel Rinascimento fiorentino: produzione, commercio, prezzi", in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 115-125.

wealth as an expression of his "fervent desire to appear in every of his actions and sayings almost a true philosopher".[18] Rosa was compelled to reconcile a performance of Stoic privation with a desire for the economic clout that brought professional recognition and success. The tension between money, fame and self-worth and the fragile concept of "value" that conflict produced are recurring themes in Rosa's pictorial and textual *oeuvre*.

The Artist and Money: A Thorny Relationship

Rosa's frequent expressions of disdain for money express a philosophical (Stoic-Cynic) ideal, but they also belong to an *artistic* identity typical of the Renaissance. Many of Rosa's statements and the anecdotes of his biographers adhere to a set of ancient *topoi* of economic practices of artists prevalent in Renaissance biographies. This is not to deny Rosa's faith in these ideals, but rather to emphasize that their cultivation should be seen as part of a long-standing tradition.[19] The Renaissance ideal of the artist as both noble and intellectual, for whom money was a vile reflection of his former manual and commercial status, is encapsulated in Alberti's advice to the painter: seek "praise, favour and good-will" and cultivate virtue and learning, instead of troubling over the acquisition of riches. But like the painter-philosopher who morally disdained money yet required it for reputation, Alberti's noble painter, too, was told that money still mattered: by nurturing his honour and intellect he would gain access to the pockets of the rich, "a firm protection against poverty" and "an excellent aid to the perfection of his art."[20] According to Baldinucci it was Rosa's achievement of an honourable reputation during his early years in Rome that garnered the attention of clients like Count Carpigna, who bought a battle scene based "solely

[18] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 497; also see Ozzola, *Vita e opere*, 126-7. The idea is encapsulated in the sentiment of Rosa's *Crates Throwing his Money into the Sea* (c. 1642-44, private collection) [Fig. 22].

[19] On the self-conscious emulation and adoption of biographical anecdotes in the cultivation of artistic identity, and on the imitation of biographical anecdotes as a means for expressing aesthetic affinity, see Kris and Kurz, *Legend, Myth and Magic in the Image of the Artist*; and Michael Levey, *The Painter Depicted*: *Painters as a Subject in Painting* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1981), 42-46.

[20] Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. Cecil Grayson, Book III, 87-88. Dürer likewise considered "riches" to be the just and rightful reward of the outstanding artist. Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy*, 342.

on the testimony of the fame of Rosa's works".[21] The perennial issue was how to detach the value of the artist (and his work) from his mundane economic register while permitting him the achievement of fame and the monetary recognition that went with it. In Baldinucci's biography, Rosa's attitude toward money is essentially about preserving an "image" – a performance. During his decade-long sojourn in Florence, and for many years afterward, Rosa "never wanted to accumulate money", and "all the riches he gained were shared with his friends", as attested by the artist's own letters.[22] Generosity among friends is a key component of Rosa's evaluative system, intimately connected to the broader, long-standing quest among early-modern artists for a status of virtuous intellectualism and professional freedom. Many of Rosa's Renaissance precursors adopted a "generous" persona, habitually "leaving open purses lying around for anyone to help himself."[23] Since "lavish spending was one of the signs of superior status" among Rosa's contemporaries, its employment by the artist as a strategy of self-fashioning was inevitable.[24] The altruistic façade of the artist's charitable self-image betrayed its essentially self-interested nature: as Baldinucci noted, Rosa lent financial support to friends in expectation of a significant return.[25]

The notion of the artist as deserving of wealth despite his philosophical indifference to money is encapsulated in an anecdote from Baldinucci's life of Rosa that highlights the distance between the ideal and real consequences of the artist's rejection of riches. Refusing to put his

---

[21] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 441. Carpigna bought a battle-scene (previously owned by Jacopo Cortese) that Rosa had painted originally as an over-door for his own house on the Via Babuino on the basis of the general acclaim of Rosa's works in Rome and the attestations of his "intelligent friends".

[22] For offers of financial assistance to friends (or requests from them on the basis of "true friendship"), see Borelli, letters 36, 41, 46, 66 and 70. Rosa frequently offered money to Ricciardi in particular, from 1652 right up until 1672, the year before his death, stating that whenever he was flush Ricciardi should feel free to make use of his earnings. See Borelli, letters 137, 144, 163, 188, 246, 315, 316, 318, 347, 348, 358, 359, 375, 383 and 387.

[23] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 164.

[24] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 18.

[25] Baldinucci notes that Rosa often returned to this aim of appearing to have a philosophical disdain toward money and a generous attitude in its dispersal to others. He was unfortunate in this, however, often finding that those to whom he had been so generous forgot to repay the gesture and "then occupied a large place among his most sworn enemies and persecutors." Baldinucci associates these forgetful "friends" in particular with the critics of Rosa's paintings and poetry implying, perhaps, that Rosa's anger over a lack of reciprocation led to the assembly of his own band of detractors. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 501.

money into savings, Rosa had accused his friends of wanting to make him "greedy for money". But his attitude changed significantly in 1661 during one of his visits with his friend Paolo Minucci in Florence.[26] At Minucci's house, Rosa became reacquainted with a servant who had once been in his own service, a peasant of "large nature and rough comportment" who was nonetheless skilled at his work. Finding themselves alone on occasion, they would discuss all manner of philosophical principles: "the precepts of Stoic doctrine, the laws of friendship, the depreciation of riches, and other similar moral virtues". One day Rosa let down his philosophical guard and began bragging about his earnings:

> "You know, *filosofo nigro*, that I can earn, if I want to, one hundred *scudi*[27] an hour?" To this the servant replied "Then you are a great fool, not to put yourself to work five or six hours a day, for six months, to earn a good thousand *scudi*, and then to try to see how a lazy person lives." Then Rosa said to him, "And what do you make of money? It is a vile thing to work for money." The servant said, "I do not know if it is vile or not, and I do not try to. I do know this: with money many things can be done. I hear that you often complain of not having money. Either cripple or blind yourself, Salvatore, and say goodbye to everything but the wallet and cane, with all these old tricks of yours and with all your doctrine, which I do not understand at all." To this Rosa was stupefied and said, "You are right, *filosofo nigro*, you are right!"[28]

The "*filosofo nigro*", a nickname that Rosa invented, is in Baldinucci's story a veritable personification of the poverty and servitude antithetical to Rosa's desired professional self-image. The servant, whose indigence forbids him the luxury of subsisting on Stoic platitudes, cuts straight through the lofty infeasibility of philosophical poverty: Enough with the charade, he says, and, if you're so set against money, then get rid of everything you don't need in order to survive. (His

---

[26] Rosa was staying at Ricciardi's villa at Strozzavolpe when he was invited by his friends, the musicians Marcantonio Cesti and the abbot Giovanni Filippo Appolloni, on behalf of the archduke Ferdinand Carlo of Austria, to attend the wedding of the Grand Prince Cosimo III of Tuscany and Margherita Luisa of Orleans in Florence (with the ulterior motive of attempting to secure Rosa's service at the court of Innsbruck.)

[27] A Roman *scudo* is a silver coin of the legal weight of 31,788 grams. One scudo is equivalent to 100 *baiocchi*; 1 *giulio* is 10 *baiocchi*; and 1 *doppia* (or *doble*) is three *scudi*. The *ducat* (or *ducato*) is approximately equivalent to a Roman *scudo*. The *scudo*, or *ducato*, was also sometimes referred to as a *piastra*, and was divided into ten *giuli*. For useful notes on monetary equivalencies, see Spear, "Guercino's 'Prix-Fixe'," 592-602; Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi," 310-20; Angelo Martini, *Manuale di metrologia* (Turin: Loescher, 1883), 613; Edoardo Martinori, *La moneta. Vocabolario generale* (Rome: L'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, 1915), 394; and Jean Delumeau, *Rome au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1975); Delumeau, *Vita economica e sociale di Roma nel Cinquecento* (Florence, 1979).

[28] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 498-500.

words gain even greater significance when one considers that – as Rosa's former servant – he points to Rosa's own position of relative affluence.) Minucci dismissed the servant's comments, calling him an "outrageous villain" who should be given no heed. But Rosa was so deeply affected by his words that he began to rethink his attitude toward money. He returned to Rome and began to "take account of his gain," accumulating so much that by his death he had saved about twelve-thousand *scudi*.[29]

While Rosa was moved by the fear of poverty to pursue and cherish his wealth, he "did not banish from his heart the desire to appear a philosopher, by showing himself to care little about those pomposities".[30] The conflicted attitude toward money and freedom that emerges in Baldinucci's anecdote concerning the *filosofo nigro* also appears in the iconography of Rosa's pictorial and textual production. In his *"Genius"* etching of c. 1660-4 [Fig. 99], for example, Rosa proclaimed himself the "despiser of riches," indifferent to the cornucopia spilling its treasures onto the ground beside him. As Roworth has noted, however, this symbol performs a more complex function, representing – in combination with the virtuous wreath on the figure's head – not only the "scorn" of wealth but the very virtue of its acquisition.[31] Rosa's frequent desire for significant economic recompense from his clients, moreover, makes disingenuous his claim to be a "despiser of riches". Other images that signal the paradox implicit in Rosa's attitude include a drawing of the allegory of *Painting*, in which Rosa depicts the melancholic and poverty-stricken figure of *Pittura*, seated with her back to a group of canvases on the floor (one of which appears to be a self-portrait

---

[29] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 499-500. This amount was quoted to Baldinucci by someone working in Rosa's house. Passeri claimed Rosa left his son Augusto eight-thousand *scudi*, with paintings and books. Passeri, *Vite*, 438. On this anecdote's derivation from a more pervasive biographical *topos*, see 488, note 655, below.
[30] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 500. In 1669, eight years after his encounter with the servant, Rosa was still assuring Ricciardi of his attitude toward money: he had enough of it to "maintain life", he said, but he "never had, nor will have, the intention to make savings". For this he blamed the "ambitions of Glory", which he had come to regard as a maddeningly futile pursuit. Borelli, letter 373
[31] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 95, note 69.

of Rosa) surrounded by a swarm of flies.[32] Holding a flag with a rose on it, she intends to swat the flies away – a motif that likely derives from Andrea Alciati's emblem of "Hostilitas".[33] This image, along with two other drawings of the 1640's, a *Satire on Painting* [Fig. 52][34] and an *Allegory of Painting Begging for Charity* [Fig. 51],[35] may be intended to convey more a grievance over "the low state of contemporary painting" (in connection with the theme of Rosa's contemporaneous satire *La Pittura*) than a lamentation of Rosa's own fiscal state,[36] considering that Rosa was relatively well-off at the time these drawings were made.

The equation in Rosa's mind between monetary and personal value, however, made the image of financial poverty a potent symbol of his value as an artist. His most emphatic comment on the subject appears in the large and iconographically-complex *Allegory of Fortune* of 1659 [Fig. 98], the contradictory nature of which Roworth has succinctly characterized as a successful solicitation of "praise and blame".[37] Here, Rosa satirized Roman papal patronage with the image of blind and profligate "Fortune", prejudiced against Rosa from the outset, who spills the contents of her cornucopia haphazardly about, while his personal emblems of the rose and paintbrushes are

---

[32] Collection of Marquis de Calviere. For the drawing, see Roworth's forthcoming article, "Pittura, Invidia, and the artist's fortunes", in the conference Acts for *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, Biblioteca Hertziana, Rome, 2009.

[33] Alciati's personification of *Hostilitas* is shown swatting away flies, the symbols of his detractors. Roworth, "*Pittura*, *Invidia*, and the artist's fortunes"; Alciati, *Emblemata* (1531). Adam Elsheimer made a similarly self-referential allegory of "The Artist in Despair", in which he depicted a "putto…with one arm raised and winged, the other arm weighed down by a stone and disabled." This motif is derived from Alciati's *Poverty (Paupertatem Summis*), whose motto declares "Poverty hinders the greatest talents from advancing". Elsheimer's conceit argued that "poverty clips the wings of artistic creativity." Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi," 317. The "winged" motif also appears in Pietro Testa's allegorical prints of *Summer* and *Winter* (1644), which adopt the famous Platonic metaphor of the "winged soul" (interpreted by Testa as the "soul of the artist") that "struggle[s] to escape from the mortal bondage of time and its entrapment in the elemental coil of bodily existence." Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 52.

[34] This drawing may bear a connection with the lost painting of the same name described by Rosa's friend Antonio Abati and owned by Fabrizio Piermattei The drawing was once attributed to Pietro Testa. For the attribution to Rosa and the possible connection to the lost Satire on Painting owned by Piermattei, see Mahoney *Drawings*, 311.

[35] Here the poor figure of painting is accompanied by a putto holding a scroll with the words "Sig^{ri} fate La Limosina alla povera Pittura" ("Gentlemen, alms for poor Painting").

[36] Mahoney, *Drawings*, 291.

[37] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 193.

trampled by animals at her feet.[38] This painting shares with the *Umana Fragilitas* a thinly-veiled criticism of the Roman papal (Chigi) court, its authority, and its ignorance – the irony of which is apparent when one considers that it marks an important turning point in Rosa's career, during which he acquired the support and subsequent patronage of the very same family and art-economy he was critiquing.[39]

Rosa's satires and poems also express this conflict: in *Il Tirreno* he lamented the poet's struggle during times of unenlightened patronage;[40] in *La Pittura* and *La Babilonia* he castigated the moral decrepitude and dishonest practices of painters and their ignorant patrons; and in *La Guerra* he lamented the more general evils of tyrannical rule, a sentiment repeated in many of the maxims in his *Teatro della Politica*.[41] His disapproval, however, derived in large part from his anger at being excluded from the ranks of painters granted prominent and lucrative commissions by

---

[38] On the iconography of the painting and its close resonance with many of Valeriano's allegories, see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 38-40. Rosa seems to have planned another similar painting, suggested by two preparatory drawings on the theme of "Lo spolpato mondo" which depict three figures grouped around a sphere and identified as "Ambitio", "Interesse", and "Politica". Roworth interprets the *concetto* as "the depredation of the world through selfishness oppression, and unchecked ambition", which may be closely related to the anti-monarchical sentiment of Rosa's satire *La Guerra*. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 204-9; for the drawings, dated to the 1660's, see Mahoney, *Drawings*, nos. 84.6 and 84.7. Roworth also relates this unrealized project to the *Conspiracy of Catiline* ("implicitly a critique of the utility of friendship") and the aphorisms of the *Teatro della Politica*, in which "[s]everal of the maxims … adapt the same angry attitude about tyrants and monarchs as is portrayed in the two studies." She suggests that the maxims were "probably intended to be written into a political satire of the same type as Boccalini's *Pietra del paragone politico*, in the form of short dispatches or prose essays on political and moral subjects." Roworth, *ibid*, 220, 222 and 217.

[39] On the *Umana Fragilitas* and the *Allegory of Fortune* as "lamentations on the fate of the artist", see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 40. When Rosa was accused by the papal authorities for his lampoon, it was a member of the papal family – Don Mario Chigi – who came to his defense. See my discussion below on 371. Volpi describes the painting as a moment of "rebirth" for Rosa, emerging from personal problems and gaining the Chigi's protection and patronage (ie. *Christ casting out Devils* [Fig. 119] or *Pan and Pindar* [Fig. 126]) as well as contacts with prominent patrons, academics and artists in the papal circle. Volpi, *ibid*, 40. The *Arion on the Dolphin* of c. 1648 [Fig. 40] may contend that the "artist is valued more highly by a creature of nature than by his fellow men". See Mahoney, *Drawings*, 222. The painting seems to be connected to the satire *La Musica*, where Rosa refers to both Arion and Orpheus, the latter the subject of a pendant for Rosa's canvas by Lippi (Rosa, *La Musica*, vv. 211-222); the now-lost (and perhaps fictive) painting of a "Satire", celebrated in a poem by Francesco Berni, is directed at the ignorance of contemporary princely patrons. See Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 94-5.

[40] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 371.

[41] See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 208-9. Many of Rosa's maxims comment on the subject of misplaced, undeserved or misused control, patronage and wealth. See Rosa, *Il Teatro della Politica*, nos. 7, 11, 31, 54, 556, 624, 802, 803, 842.

(especially Roman) court patrons.[42] Many of Rosa's poems treat the themes of poverty, riches and the capricious nature of patronage: the "*Delle ricchezze*" and the "*Che la vera felicità non consiste nell'Abbondanza delle ricchezze, ma nella penuria de'desiderij*" bemoan the misplaced favour of wealthy patrons;[43] a poem beginning "*Vedendo solo al Trono*" declares that "servitude is a tyrannical invention";[44] and the "*Lamento*" for Ricciardi laments both the fortunes of the painter and the vicissitudes of the court.[45]

Rosa's letters, too, expose the tension between his abhorrence of money and patronage and his very real craving for the benefits they afforded. In 1666 he expressed concern over the morality of the pursuits of "glory" and "profit", consulting with Ricciardi on whether or not to accept an invitation to paint a vault in the Palazzo Farnese.[46] In 1653 he voiced his aversion to submission, asserting "I have a nature that extraordinarily detests begging," but conceded that he would be willing to do so in the service of a friend.[47] In 1664 he boasted that he had refused the French Ambassador's invitation to work at the court of Louis XIV, balking at the prospect as utterly averse to his "philosophy": "I esteem and will always esteem more a single moment of complete freedom than centuries, even if of gold, spent working in other people's command. We are made of dust,

---

[42] In *La Pittura* Rosa criticizes in particular the *Bamboccianti* and their "equally stupid patrons", who he attacks with a thinly veiled allusion to the Barberini, whose favourites (Bernini and Pietro da Cortona) were Rosa's great professional rivals. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 115; Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 247-8, 253-5, 259, 427-429. On *La Babilonia*, probably completed 1662-4, see Roworth, *ibid*, 200-203. "The first part attacks the theme of capricious fortune in a general fashion, while the last third focuses specifically upon the vices and weaknesses of rulers and those in power, it appears to be a more direct reproval of the Chigi Pope and his court."

[43] The *Delle ricchezze* was published by Ozzola, *Vita e opere*, 228, and an additional stanza was added by Limentani, "Nuovi Studi e ricerche," 36. The *Che la vera felicità* is Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, I: 142-5; Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 93. He writes with self-pity: "Segua ognun la sua Traccia,/ Io di mia Povertà, tù di ricchezze:/ Non conosco amarezze,/ Nè sò, che sia dolore, e pur son vecchio./ Mà taccio, che Impossibile è che piaccia/ Consiglio d'huom mendico à Regio Orecchio".

[44] Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, I: 158. "... La servitude un'invenzion Tiranna".

[45] See Appendix I.1.

[46] Borelli, letters 329 and 330. In claiming that glory might outweigh profit Rosa participated in a long-standing ideal of the artist's professional liberality, voiced for example by Vasari who described his paintings in the refectory of the Camaldolese church in Bologna as "experiments in the difficulties of art", accepting for them only two-hundred crowns since they were made for "glory rather than for gain". Vasari, *Lives*, trans. A. B. Hinds (London, 1927), 266, cited in Nagel, "Art as Gift. Liberal Art and Religious Reform in the Renaissance," in *Negotiating the Gift. Pre-Modern Figurations of Exchange*, ed. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner and Bernard Jussen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 341.

[47] Borelli, letter 169. "ho una natura che repugna straordinariamente a pregare". Also see letter 168.

and we die!"[48] But he admitted at the same time that the Ambassador's visit to his studio filled him with a certain childish glee – a sense of accomplishment that betrayed his otherwise Stoic aversion to pomp and ceremony.[49]

V.2. The Art of Mixing Business with Pleasure: Rosa and the New Economy of Art

In his influential account of *seicento* patronage, Francis Haskell made Rosa into the paragon of an emergent ideal: the "exceptional and inspired" artist, whose unconventional persona was cultivated in the service of attaining both a higher intellectual status and a greater professional freedom.[50] At the same time, Haskell noted the paradoxical nature of Rosa's "revolution," locating it in the ultimately conformist aim of his rebellion.[51] The paradox inherent in Rosa's "revolution," however, is significantly more complex than Haskell suggests. Of particular importance in this context are the contributions of Rosa's vast network of personal and professional relationships, including patrons, clients, merchants, art dealers, academics, collectors, artists and writers. Here, too, it fundamental to recognize the vital role traditional patronage continued to play in Rosa's career, despite (and to a great extent demonstrated by) his proclaimed defiance toward its control. As various scholars have asserted, patronage continued to be a key feature of *seicento* "social self-fashioning" for both willing and defiant beneficiaries. The evolving art market and the traditional system of patronage were not diametrically opposed as "free" and "controlled", as they are often presented, but were instead complex, fluctuating and often overlapping contexts.[52] Rosa employed

---

[48] See Borelli, letters 306 and 308.
[49] Borelli, letter 305.
[50] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 21. Haskell described Rosa as standing alone in his "attempts to change the pattern of art patronage".
[51] "[I]n so many ways", writes Haskell, "the whole point of his revolution was to establish his orthodoxy. At a time when amateurs were crying out for his small romantic landscapes he would only exhibit year after year large history pictures designed to show how well he could measure up to the traditional demands made on a serious painter."
Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII century Rome," *Studi secenteschi* 1 (1960): 119; *idem*, *Patrons and Painters*, 144.
[52] Verboven, "The Economy of Friends," 18. Also see John Brewer, "Positioning the Market: Art, Goods and Commodities in Early Modern Europe," in *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Simonetta Cavaciocchi ed. Atti

a variety of professional tactics in the service of achieving his goals, some of which have already been touched on by Haskell and other scholars of Rosa. Here they are explored specifically in connection with the rituals and discourse of friendship as a key strategy in Rosa's pursuit of professional liberty.

"*Amico et Padrone*". The Sincerity of Friendship versus the Flattery of Servitude, or Flattery will (Still) Get You Everywhere

As evidence for Rosa's unique position in seeking out a radical new independence, Haskell cited the artist's letter to his Sicilian patron, the prominent collector Don Antonio Ruffo, in which he makes perhaps his most well-known declaration of independence: "I don't paint for money but only for my own satisfaction, and I must let myself be transported by the impulses of enthusiasm and exercise my brushes only when I feel rapt."[53] But Haskell ignored an important feature of the letter: as I noted in chapter three, Rosa's proclamation is couched within the very language of the older system of clientage and flattery that it seeks to unhinge. The same mixture of flattery and sincerity is apparent in Rosa's other extant letters to patrons, including one addressed to an unidentified "marchese di Milano" and another to a certain ecclesiastical personage, perhaps the Canonico da Scorno.[54] These letters and their expressions of *superfluità* reveal Rosa as a willing

della 'Trentateesima Settimana di Studi', 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000 (Florence: Le Monnier, 2002), 140. Brewer outlines the interconnection between the emergent art market and traditional patronage: "changes in the art market affected the nature of existing transactions and relationships, but they do not necessarily render them redundant. It is not so much that patronage declines as that it changes its aim and nature"; and Biagioli, "Galileo's System of Patronage," 1-4, who describes the continued significance of patronage for Galileo and his Florentine circle of scientists and their professional identities.

[53] Borelli, letter 321; Appendix I. 5. A similar language is even more apparent in Rosa's other extant letter to Ruffo (letter 289; see Appendix I. 4) written in thanks for payment for the two *Pythagoras* paintings [Figs. 111 and 112]. Vincenzo Ruffo noted that it probably concerned Rosa's painting of the "due Satiri e tre Ninfe che scherzano," which appears in Ruffo's inventory on July 25 1663. Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," 170.

[54] For the letter to the "Marchese di Milano", see Appendix I.3. Floriana Conte suggested the "marchese" may have been connected with the commission for the altarpiece of the *Madonna del Suffragio* , which Rosa painted in 1661 for the Cardinal Luigi Alexander Omodei for one of his churches in Milan. Conte, "In margine all'epistolario di Salvator Rosa", *Aprosiana* 14 (2006 (2007): 194; on the painting see Borelli, letters 252 and 271. For the letter to the ecclesiastical addressee, see Appendix I. 6. It was found on the last page in a small book of drawings and notes by Rosa in the BiASA in Rome. Mariani, "Un album di appunti di Salvator Rosa," 340. It appears to have been written in solicitation of attention for Rosa and others in his circle, perhaps in connection

participant in the enduring epistolary art of dissimulation prescribed by the older patron-client relationship that continued to govern the conduct of artists well into the late seventeenth century.[55] Not only did patrons continue to determine the artist's professional esteem, but their favour and employment remained vital for protection, contacts, and promotion.[56] This was especially the case in Rome, where the artist's rewards were particularly great, and where the procedure of commission continued to dominate as a ritual of papal patronage and nepotism in the pursuit of propagandistic display.[57] Even after the decline of papal fortunes mid-century, the notion persisted that "to work without a commission was to damage one's reputation or status and 'cheapen' their position in society."[58]

The language of sincerity and servitude is constantly in flux throughout Rosa's correspondence. In letters to friends and social equals like Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei, the prevailing discourse of sincerity is often permeated with expressions of servitude that are intended to construct a system of power relations and a series of obligations.[59] In letters to patrons and social superiors the reverse is the case: the requisite language of flattery and adulation is punctuated with statements of sincerity that seek to place him on a level footing with his social superiors, and to

---

with the problems Rosa was encountering in Rome because of his satires and his illicit relationship with Lucrezia. There is also a large *Vanitas* painting recently attributed to Rosa but unlike any of his other images which contains a dedication to a cardinal as a "friend": "*Una Porpora Sacra amica e pia/ può immortalar la debil Rosa mia*". [Fig. 129] *Salvator Rosa. Tra Mito e Magia*, 180, cat. 48. Salomon and other scholars have confirmed my suspicions about its erroneous attribution to Rosa. See Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 494.

[55] On the art of epistolary dissimulation, see Morabito, *Lettere e letteratura*, 127; G. Resta, "Le Lettere del Tasso: Scrivere per esistere", in *L'Arte delle Lettere*, ed. Doglo, 159. Virgilio Malvezzi (*Tarquinio il Superbo* (1632)) and Torquato Tasso (*Il Secretario*), among many others, advised the courtier on how to write to one's equals and superiors. Also on the language of clientage, see Biagioli, "Galileo's System of Patronage," 9-11ff.

[56] Modesti, "Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 367.

[57] Volker Reinhardt, "The Roman Art Market in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, 82-91. Spear has also described dependency upon papal commission or support as a unique feature of the artist's economic experience in *seicento* Rome. Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi", 311. On the micro-political networking of the Roman Curia in Europe, see Wolfgang Reinhard, "*Amici e creature*. Politische Mikrogeschichte der romischen Kurie im 17. Jahrhundert," *Quellen und Forschungen, Aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 76 (1996): 308-334. Claudio Strinati likened the Roman patronage system to a "dictatorship". See Strinati, "La Roma papale del tardo Seicento: regola e trasgressione," in *Velazquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano. Le corti del Barocco*, ed. Fernando Checa Cremades (Milan: Skira, 2004), 57.

[58] Reinhardt, "The Roman Art Market in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," 82.

[59] Aulo Greco calls this the "art of adulation". Greco, *La memoria delle lettere* (Rome: Bonacci, 1985), 106.

democratize an otherwise hierarchical relationship. This strategy was employed by many of Rosa's precursors and contemporaries who cultivated friendship with patrons in the pursuit of retaining "personal and intellectual autonomy."[60] Essentially, the duality of self-interest and altruism that characterized letter-writing (and the relationships it represented) was so entrenched that either could be called upon at will, and in varying degree, in order to achieve the desired outcome.[61] This is the essence of the addresses "*amico et padrone*" or "*amico e servitore*" adopted by Rosa (and his friends and contemporaries) in letters to equals and superiors alike. It is also encapsulated in Rosa's proclamation to Antonio Ruffo that he will "be punctually obeyed from the heart" or his self-identification as "affectionate servant" – concise summations of the subtle capacity of language to combine obligatory flattery with sincerity and amity. In one sense, the older "evasive" language of clientage was employed in letter-writing in order to dispel any sense of a motive of pure utility on behalf of the lesser of the two parties.[62] The effusive nature of this language "underscored [the] patron's exalted position" while securing at the same time the client's "continued favour", even if he was unable to reciprocate to the same degree.[63] Formulaic epistolary language, then, is invested with a particularly potent and meaningful agency in both creating and fulfilling obligations – a kind

---

[60] As for example in Marsilio Ficino's epistolary relationship with his Medici patrons. See Bullard, "Marsilio Ficino and the Medici. The Inner Dimensions of Patronage," in *Christianity and the Renaissance, Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento*, ed. Timothy Verdon and John Henderson (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990), 468, 484.

[61] On the early-modern discourse of courtesy or clientage, see Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," 132ff; Lopez, "Writing a Letter, Writing the Self," 185, 187. In writing to patrons, clients could use the language of sincere friendship in order to implicate a similarity of experience, conveying an understanding on the part of the client that makes him or her "worthy of reciprocation" of the kind that operates within the parameters of true friendship. In writing to friends (or social equals), one could refer to a friend as a client would solicit a patron, or speak to a friend as a patron would to a client, depending on the circumstances and the desired outcome. Examples from Rosa's letters are too numerous to list here in full. See Borelli, letters 14, 19, 91, 130 and 197, for example.

[62] Toon Van Houdt, Jan Papy, Gilbert Tournay, Constant Matheeussen, *Self-Presentation and Social Identification of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 6. For an analysis of the use of evasive speech, in the context of literary patronage, see Arthur L. Herman, Jr., "The Language of Fidelity in Early Modern France," *The Journal of Modern History* 67 (1995): 1-24. Here it is important to note that an ideally affective relationship could also serve the interests of the patron or client, who especially benefitted if the artist had already attained a significant reputation of his or her own. Rosa's own reputation, Baldinucci implies, was partly the reason for his invitation to the Medici court in the first place. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448.

[63] Lopez, "Writing a Letter, Writing the Self," 167, also see 148-149, 152.

of contractual manner of speaking that ensures a friendship of utility produces the desired outcome for both patron and client. In another sense, however, both sincerity and utility could be at play.[64] In the early-modern patron-client relationship, it was increasingly the case that elements of both "friendship of utility" (the reality) and "perfect friendship" (the ideal) were linked together in an effort to make the ideal *into* a reality and to mask the presence of self-interest.[65]

Of significance in considering the nature of Rosa's relationships is their multifaceted and variable nature: some of his patrons (or clients, as he preferred to think of them) truly did become good friends, while others operated under a pretence of amity – a game in which gift-giving and the discourse of affection played central roles.[66] Rosa's conflicted attitude toward the vagaries of "patronage" are to a certain extent conveyed in the flexible nature of his use of the term "*padrone*",

---

[64] While Sharon Kettering separates sentiment from self-interest, seeing the latter as the primary motivation for most clients, Richard Trexler has argued that the effusive language of early-modern writers was the foundation for sincere emotion, and that even standard expressions "served to convey a much larger range of meaning, depending on each actor's manipulation of word and form." See Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers and Clients*, as cited in Lopez, "Writing a Letter, Writing the Self," 166, n. 41. Also see Paul D. McLean, "A Frame Analysis of Favor Seeking in the Renaissance: Agency, Networks, and Political Culture", *The American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1 (1998): 51-91; Arthur L. Herman Jr., "The Language of Fidelity in Early Modern France," *Journal of Modern History* 67: 1 (1995): 1-24. Trexler, *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), as cited in Lopez, "Writing a Letter, Writing the Self," 177 n. 67.

[65] On the role of friendship and kinship in patronage, and its discourse and rituals, see Verboven, "The Economy of Friends"; Paul D. McLean, "A Frame Analysis of Favor Seeking in the Renaissance: Agency, Networks, and Political Culture," *The American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1 (1998): 51-91; Anthony Molho, "Cosimo de'Medici: *Pater Patriae* or *Padrino*?," *Stanford Italian Review* I: i (1979): 5-33; Martin Gosman, "Princely Culture: Friendship or Patronage," in *Princes and Princely Culture 1450-1650* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003), I: 1-29; Dale Kent, "Illegitimate and Legitimating Passions in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Political Discourses," *Cultural and Social History* 2 (2005): 49-62; *idem*, "The Dynamic of Power in Cosimo de'Medici's Florence," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons (Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 63-77; F. W. Kent, "Ties of Neighbourhood and Patronage in Quattrocento Florence," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Kent and Simons, 79-98; Ronald Weissman, "Taking Patronage Seriously: Mediterranean Values and Renaissance Society," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Kent and Simons, 25-45; F. W. Kent and Simons, "Renaissance Patronage: An Introductory Essay," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Kent and Simons, 1-21; Francoise Robin, "Le rencontre du prince et de l'artiste: mise au point et etat de connaissances (France XIVe - Xve siecles)," in Cavaciocchi ed., *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, 593-602; Eisenstadt and Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends. Interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); *idem*, "Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22: 1 (1980): 42-77; Steffen W. Schmidt et al, eds., *Friends, Followers and Factions. A Reader in Political Clientelism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers, and Clients*; and *idem*, *Patronage in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century France* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).

[66] See Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," 132; Mousnier, *Les institutions de la France sous la monarchie absolue, 1598-1789* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974), I: 85-93; *idem*, "Les Fidélités et les clientèles en France aux XVIe, XVIIe, et XVIIIe siècles," *Histoire sociale* 15 (1982): 35-6, 45-6.

a word etymologically derived from "*padre*" (father) that refers not only to the "patron" in the strict sense of "sponsor" or "protector" but also more generally to the similar services provided by one's colleagues and friends.[67] The affective ideal of the patron as a "friend" is a feature of the concept of "*mecenatismo*".[68] Rosa uses the term "*padrone*" to refer to his employer Gian' Carlo de' Medici.[69] But he also uses it in reference to Ricciardi in order to mock his friend's pretensions, investing the word with an awareness of its artefice.[70] In a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1650, he gives the word again a more serious and sincere import: advising his friend on how to deal with the fallout of a fight over a sack of grain between Giulio's brother Marc'Antonio and a certain worker in his service named Pietro Antonio, Rosa concludes that servant should always obey the master [*padrone*]", an opinion he asserts on this occasion without even a hint of irony.[71] In a letter of 1647 to Lodovico Serenai, Giulio himself offers a further clue into the distinction (and connection) between the two terms: referring to their mutual and recently deceased friend Evangelista Torricelli, Giulio distinguishes between the "goodness" (*bontà*) of his friendship and the "esteem"

[67] The etymological connection between the two terms forms an alternative and popular *topos* – connected to that of the patron as "friend" – which conceives of patronage in terms of *familial* affective relations. Michelangelo famously referred to Pope Julius II as his surrogate "father". See Barolsky, *Giotto's Father and the Family of Vasari's Lives* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 127, 130 and *passim*. On familiarity between artists and patrons, see *ibid*, 40-42. In his *Trattato di architettura* (1463–64), Filarete referred to the patron as the "father" and the artist as the "mother" of the work of art. See Bernd Evers and Christof Thoenes, *Architectural Theory*: *From the Renaissance to the Present* (Cologne: Taschen, 2003), 13. Rubens wrote to his patron Chancellor Pecquius, "I commend to you the secret that I tell you with as much confidence as though I were dealing with my own father". Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 96. On the trope of the patron as "father-figure", see Walter L. Gundersheimer, "Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach," in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 14.
[68] On the Italian distinction between *mecenatismo* (patronage of the arts) and *clientelismo* (political patronage) see Kent and Simons, "Renaissance Patronage: An Introductory Essay," 2. The term "*mecenatismo*" is based on Gaius Plinius Maecenas, the famous and wealthy Roman cavaliere (69-8 BC), from the ancient and noble Etruscan family from Arezzo, who shared an intimate friendship with the poet Horace. See Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 223-25; Joseph William Hewitt, "The Gratitude of Horace to Maecenas," *The Classical Journal* 36: 8. (1941): 464-472; and Kenneth J. Reckford, "Horace and Maecenas," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XC (1959): 195-208. In his *La Civile Conversazione*, Stefano Guazzo "defends *mecenatismo* in the first place as a manifestation of friendship between princes and *letterati* and then as a sign of liberality and magnificence." Calitti ed., *ibid*, 225; Guazzo, *La Civile Conversazione*, II: 154.
[69] See for example Borelli, letter 7.
[70] For example, in Borellli, letter 49: "Sete il padrone, a questo non so che dirvi …"
[71] Borelli, letter 63: "… dico che il Signor Marc'Antonio have hauto cento raggioni, e mi maraviglio che non l'habbi conci[ato] in altra maniera, poiché deve il contadino et il servo haver sempre dieci parole meno del padrone, e non volerli rispondere del pari, tanto più che detto P.[ietro] A.[ntonio] era contumace per haversi preso senza licenza quello che non doveva."

of his patronage.[72] Relations with an "*amico*", then, are characterized by sincerity, while the bond with a "*padrone*" entails deference. The circumstances that facilitated the merging of "*padrone*" and "*amico*" are closely linked to a new economic valuation of art and artists, a development that encapsulates Rosa's conflicted position.

V.3. Rosa's Professional Paradox

One of Rosa's most intriguing visual essays on the subject of the artist's worth in the context of patronage is an engraving of c. 1662 that treats the well-known subject of *Alexander in the Studio of Apelles* [Fig. 115]. Apelles' relationship with his patron made him "the prototype of the court-artist's ideal", for Renaissance commentators.[73] Rosa, too, aligned himself directly with Apelles in his satire *L'Invidia*, alluding to the well-known story of the "Calumny" of Apelles in order to express his own experience of envious and unjust defamation.[74] Roworth has pointed to the resonance of the theme of Rosa's *Alexander and Apelles* with his attitude toward the court, suggesting that the etching was intended to be paired with the contemporaneous print of *Alexander and Diogenes* [Fig. 109].[75] In her interpretation, the figures of Apelles and Diogenes represent, respectively, the allegorical concepts of Painting ("Pictor") and Philosophy-Justice ("Aequus") that Rosa introduced in his "*Genius*" etching and that comprise the two most salient models of his identity as a satirist.[76] In both of the *Alexander* prints, the wealthy and powerful emperor is "taught

---

[72] BNCF MS Gal. 132. *1647-1651: Discepoli di Galileo, Tomo XXII, Torricelli Evangelista, Vol. 2, Carteggio Familiare*, 156r: "…la perdita ch'il Sig. Torricelli che via in Gloria, con ancora comuni' esser dove' il dolore, et la companione, poiche in vero, è' mancato a noi un Amico di tanta bontà et un P'rona di tanta stima."

[73] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 40. For example, Petrarch compared Simone Martini to Apelles for his skill. Warnke, *ibid*, 40. See Julius von Schlosser, *Quellenbuch zur Kunstgeschichte des abendlandischen Mittelalters* (Vienna: C. Graeser, 1896), 351f. Vasari compared Giotto's relationship with King Robert to Apelles and Alexander. Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Bettarini and Barocchi, I: 389ff. And Bellori referred to Poussin as the "Apelles of France" in the dedicatory letter of his *Vite* of 1672, addressed to Jean-Baptiste Colbert. Bellori, *Lives*, 47.

[74] Rosa, *L'Invidia,* vv. 473ff.

[75] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 303. Wallace proposed that the *Alexander and Apelles* be paired with the "*Genius*" etching. Wallace, *Etchings*, 92.

[76] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 303-304. "Rosa deliberately chose these characters to demonstrate his satirist's conception of the relationship between the royal patron, the talented painter, and the scornful philosopher. The

a basic lesson by one wiser than he" in terms that express a satirical and defiant mode of instruction. In the *Alexander and Apelles* etching, Rosa depicts the moment of the emperor's humiliation by the laughter of the artist's students; Apelles teaches Alexander the consequences of declaring his ignorant opinion about art. In the *Diogenes* print, the moral philosopher seated in his lowly barrel teaches the emperor a moral lesson in the Stoic ideal of a life of simplicity and a rejection of worldly possessions.[77] These highly self-referential images speak primarily to the ideal rather than the reality of the painter-philosopher's autonomy. In both cases there is a significant paradox at work: the artist's position of intellectual superiority is ultimately granted by his very proximity to his patron, while the philosopher's exaltation of a life of poverty and frugality belies the fundamental necessity of money and the persistent economic constituent of fame. This "professional paradox" is implicit in the contrast between Rosa's many declarations of freedom from the court on the one hand, and his active participation in many of its rituals on the other: he held two early positions as "purveyor of the court," he hungered after a papal contract in Rome, and he alluded to the significance of noble or princely recognition and recompense as vital constituents of his self-worth.

---

two etchings represent the two sides of the 'Pictor Succensor', - painting and moral philosophy." Roworth, *ibid*, 315.

[77] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 308, 310-13, 316-17. Roworth made the intriguing suggestion that the *Alexander and Apelles* was prompted by Pope Alexander VII, who may have seen in the adoption of Alexander the Great as a personal emblem a way in which to respond to King Louis XIV of France during their political quarrels of the early 1660's. An admirer of Rosa's work, the Pope likely saw the *Alexander and Diogenes* in 1662 and perhaps suggested to the artist the idea of the *Alexander and Apelles* as a companion piece. In this way, an image ostensibly intended to undermine the authority of patrons functioned on another level as a self-consciously satirical appeal to the Pope himself, and perhaps even to King Louis XIV as well (for whom Alexander was also a favourite personal allegorical emblem). See Roworth, *ibid*, 324-8. For the Pope's praise of Rosa's prints, see Borelli, letter 271 (July 1662): "Il Papa l'ha comendate a gran segno, e per mostrar quanto le stimava, le volse presso di lui, e di presente le tiene sopra un suo tavolino, e spienne dicendo questa è una gran fantasia, e spienne. V'è poesia e bizzaria straordinaria, e spienne."

Rosa as a "*Pittore del dissenso*"

Following Haskell, Luigi Salerno described Rosa as a "*pittore del dissenso*" – a painter characterized by his rebellion against the power structures of his time, the court in particular.[78] As I hoped to make clear in my discussion of Rosa's private academy, Rosa's position in relation to the court is rather more complex than Salerno's oft-cited epithet implies. More than a "dissenting" anti-courtier – a notion that has the unfortunate effect of perpetuating the Romantic persona that Salerno sought to dispel – Rosa occupied a contentious, liminal position between the court and "free" spaces variously attached to its influence. These included the private academy[79] but also the realm of public exhibition (staged alternatively with the support of the art academy or noble families), the art market (where the nobility and their voracious collecting habits played a crucial role[80]), and even the private studio, which was in Rosa's case frequented by curious noble *dilettantes* and foreign heads of state. More than this, the interests that Salerno suggests define Rosa's position of dissension, and that he contrasts to the "official, autocratic" culture that favoured Bernini or Pietro da Cortona, actually comprised a veritable *status quo* of intellectual pursuits in Rosa's day: impulses toward quietism, asceticism and solitude; Neo-Stoic social critique; the studies of natural science, astrology, alchemy, magic and the occult; the cultivation of eroticism and

---

[78] See Salerno, "Il dissenso nella pittura," 34-65.

[79] Ebert-Schifferer has also noted the irony that Rosa's private academies of friends offered him his own "court and theatre," both during his early years in Rome and among the *Percossi* in Florence. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 67.

[80] On *seicento* collecting, see especially Luigi Spezzaferro, "Problemi del collezionismo a Roma nel XVII secolo," in *Geografia del Collezionismo. Italia e Francia tra il XVI e il XVIII secolo*, ed. Oliver Bonfait et al (Ecole Francaise de Rome, 2001), 1-23; Spezzaferro, "Le collezioni di 'alcuni gentiluomini particolari' e il mercato: appunti su Lelio Guidoccioni e Francesco Angeloni," in *Poussin et Rome. Actes du colloque de l'Academie de France à Rome*, ed. Bonfait et al (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1996); Spezzaferro, "La cultura del cardinal Del Monte e il primo tempo del Caravaggio," *Storia dell'arte* 9/10 (1971): 57-92; Spezzaferro, "Caravaggio accettato. Dal rifiuto al mercato," in *Caravaggio nel IV centenario della Cappella Contarelli*, ed. Caterina Volpi (Rome: CAM, 2002); Spezzaferro, "Per il collezionismo dei Bamboccianti a Roma nel Seicento: qualche appunto a qualche riflessione," in *Da Caravaggio a Ceruti. La scena di genere e l'immagine dei 'pitocchi' nella pittura italiana*, ed. Francesco Porzio (Milan: Skira, 1998); Goldman, *Aspects of Seicento Patronage*, chapter 3; Valeria Pinchera, "Arte e consumo della nobilità fiorentina nel Sei e Settecento," in *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Cavaciocchi, 635-48. For *cinquecento* developments see Goldthwaite, "The Empire of Things: Consumer Demand in Renaissance Italy," in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Kent and Simons, 154-175; and Goldthwaite, "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture," *American Historical Review* 77 (1972): 977-1012.

an emblematic or cryptic form of allegory; satirical and anti-clerical art and poetry; and the promotion of an eccentric artistic personality.[81]

Rosa was also far from alone in expressing disdain toward traditional patronage. The claims for freedom that are often considered to distinguish him as the foremost "rebel" among the artists of his time are more pervasive than Salerno acknowledges. Caravaggio, for example, famously cultivated a polemical persona and style, and was described by Bellori as painting "according to his own inclinations" after leaving the studio of his early master, the Cavaliere d'Arpino.[82] Annibale Carracci, too, "assert[ed] a powerful individuality against the repressive hierarchies of the court."[83] The successful German painter Johann Carl Loth (1632-1698), preferred "wild" (*fiere*) and "vigorous" (*gagliarde*) subject matter, and was reputed to "take up the brush when the moon is good and when he wants to work",[84] an affirmation similar in tone to Rosa's proclamation to Don Antonio Ruffo. The Bolognese painter Emilio Savonazzi "esteem[ed] reputation and honour greatly" and was "so averse to profit" that he often found himself destitute, desiring to paint more for *genio* than for necessity.[85] Ciro Ferri wrote to Ruffo in 1672 that he

[81] Salerno, "Il dissenso nella pittura," 56, 60. Salerno's list of "dissenters" also includes Filippo Napoletano, Nicolas Poussin, Giovan Benedetto Castiglione, Pietro Testa and Pierfrancesco Mola, Jacques Callot, Monsú Desiderio and Angelo Caroselli. He argues that Rome was "always hostile toward dissidents". He locates the origins of this "dissent" among *seicento* artists in Caravaggio's cultivation of a rebellious, violent and extravagant identity – his "opposition to convention and independence from patrons" – an attitude taken up by many subsequent artists like Agostino Tassi or Borromini, with Rosa foremost among them. Salerno, *ibid*, 56. He identifies these activities as contrary to the "status quo": "Il dissenso, l'insoddisfazione, la ribelliene ai propri tempi non avendo altra possibilità di sfogo che la satira, non avendo alcuna speranza di un'alternativa allo statu quo, conduceva ad abbracciare l'atteggiamento stoico e certe forme di quietismo, alle quali già accennai che affermavano un misticismo naturista, un ritorno al contatto con la natura e alla meditazione." Salerno, *ibid*, 54.

[82] Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, 10. "Caravaggio may in part have calculated and even tried to control the perception of himself as an anti-social outsider … and therefore as an original whose own style, or anti-style based on a concept of realism that presented itself in polemical engagement against the traditions of past art". For Bellori's comment, see Langdon, *Caravaggio*, 68, 85.

[83] Langdon, *Caravaggio*, 294.

[84] Marco Pizzo, "'Far Galleria': Collezionismo e mercato artistico tra Venezia e Roma nelle lettere di Quintiliano Rezzonico a Livio Odescalchi (1676-1709)," *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova* 89 (2000): 70, doc. 30; letter from Venice, July 6, 1680. Also see 69, doc. 29. I wish to thank Philip Sohm for bringing these letters to my attention.

[85] Refusing the usual practice of pricing his paintings, Savonazzi preferred to give them away and to take the money offered to him as a "courtesy". When pressured into a contract, he showed his prospective client three brushes – one big, one medium-sized, and one small – and left it to them to choose the price. Savonazzi, who

preferred not to take money in advance in order to remain "free", while Benedetto Luini refuted the restrictive protection of "Great" patrons.[86] Bernini, too, had a more complex relationship with the traditional patronage than his stereotyped reputation as the consummate court-artist suggests.[87] Rosa's claims for freedom and prestige are buoyed by the many earlier assertions of artists who have a share in what Haskell deemed a virtually unaided rebellion. Rosa's pointed critique of the undeserved and indiscriminately wielded fortunes of wealthy patrons also reflects a much more generally pervasive attitude among his contemporaries in a climate of profound social, economic and political unrest.[88] What is most significant about Rosa's "dissent" (aside from its exaggeration by his Romantic enthusiasts) is that he turned this attitude into a programmatic mission, cultivating and publicizing a complex identity on its precepts.[89] This dissension, however, was further

---

studied with the Carracci, is described by his student Ottaviano Cambi in a letter to Malvasia of 1666, which the biographer included in his *vita* of the artist. Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice*, *Vite de Pittori Bolognese* [1678] (Bologna: G. Zanotti, 1841), I, *Vita* of Emilio Savonazzi. For the letter from Ottaviano Cambi, dated July 23, 1666, see 302-307. When he had money, he gave it to the poor, and even went so far in his charity as to bring the destitute to his house and visit prisoners in jail. Malvasia, *ibid*, 304-6. I wish to thank Philip Sohm for bringing this reference to my attention.

[86] Ferri wrote to Ruffo on September 19 1672: "è stato mio costume non pigliare danaro anticipato e questa per stare in mia libertà…" although, as Haskell notes, "the effect of this is somewhat modified by the phrase that follows": "tanto più sia detto a gloria di Dio, per la molteplicità degl'affari che tengo ….". Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 23; Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel secolo XVII in Messina," 298. Pascoli wrote of Luini: "Nè pur cercò mai protezioni de' Grandi, e siccome egli andava poco da loro, essi di rado givan da lui. Diceva, che la protezione dell'uomo dabbene esser doveva quella sola del bene oprare…". Pascoli, *Vite*, I, 233.

[87] Tomaso Montanari has re-evaluated the notion of Bernini as a complicit papal artist and diplomat, in light of his significantly more contentious experience of that role. In Bernini's fall from papal favour after the death of Urban VIII, and his frosty reception by Urban's Pamphilj successors, Montanari identifies a "traumatic experience" that triggered a profound change in Bernini's conception of his relationships with court patrons: he no longer bound himself in the same way to papal families as he had done with the Barberini and gradually "embraced the conviction of being more the artist of the papacy [and God] than the artist of the popes". See Montanari, "'Dar todo a uno es obra del diablo': Gian Lorenzo Bernini artista di corte?," in *Velazquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano. Le corti del Barocco*, ed. Fernando Checa Cremades (Milan: Skira, 2004), 89-98.

[88] The plague of 1656-7 in Naples wiped out half of the city's population. See Cipolla, *Fighting the Plague in 17th c. Italy* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1981). The political situation of the 1660's also took its toll. Haskell outlines the decline of Pope Alexander VII's reign, characterized by "anti-clerical literature and pasquinades". Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 153. On the economic decline in Italy during the *seicento*, see Cipolla, "The Decline in Italy: the case of a fully matured economy," *The Economic History Review* 5 (1952): 178-87; and Henry Kamen, *The Iron Century: Social Change 1550-1660* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971).

[89] Roworth links Rosa's desire for freedom to the broader political trends of the period, and to a tradition that pervades literary satire itself. "A satirist was not effective unless he reproved publically, and was expected to offend with his satiric diatribes, protected by the moral earnestness of his teachings…. Far removed from the image of an arrogant, aloof, genius, striving alone for recognition, Rosa used his-audacious opinions on politics and art to further his career as a satirist and painter." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 210, 225-6.

complicated by his continued participation, primarily at an early stage in his career but also at significant points throughout its entire duration, in the otherwise traditional modes of art patronage and in his reliance upon its ideals.

Rosa as "Purveyor of the Court"

Salerno's characterization of Rosa, which accepts the artist's ideals as keys to the actual nature of his person and his experience, makes little allowance for the significantly more complex and paradoxical reality of Rosa's position. As a young artist in Rome and Florence in the 1630's and '40's, Rosa held positions as a court artist in the employ of Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio and Gian' Carlo de' Medici.[90] Brancaccio granted Rosa a certain degree of freedom, a significant concession in view of Rosa's relatively young age at the time.[91] But it was in Florence that Rosa first made a concerted effort to remove himself from the strictures of court life. Martin Warnke has argued that the court played a central role in the Renaissance artist's achievement of a higher and freer status by removing him from the restrictions and lowly connotations of the guild and placing him in proximity to the prince.[92] Warnke's discussion of the development of the court artist are vital for contextualizing Rosa's ostensibly "unique" claims for personal and professional freedom and the conflicted nature of his position. Of particular significance is Warnke's assertion that the court's institutional framework, rituals, and ideals endure among its participants even after they leave the court or the establishment itself falls out of use. Rosa may have sought a "distance" from the strictures of court life, but the image of the court artist remained fundamental to his notion of liberty.

---

[90] Fumagalli is currently conducting research on Rosa's position as a "court artist" and his role in the Florentine economy of art. See her chapter in Spear and Sohm, *Painting for Profit*.
[91] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 7. Brancaccio permitted Rosa to live in his own house on the Via Babuino.
[92] This distinction lay at the heart of Vasari's vision for the Florentine Accademia del Disegno, which he conceived as freeing the artist from the medieval guild-system. Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 65.

In Warnke's view, the early-modern artist's economic condition is defined by the challenge to reconcile the "essential relationship between freedom and necessity."[93] His study of the development of the "free" artist reveals not only the courtly foundations of Rosa's ideal of liberty but also the significantly more pervasive nature of the attitude that informs it. Many of the circumstances of Rosa's experience that scholars give in evidence of his unique achievement of professional freedom are long-established conditions of the court-artist's experience: possession of a house outside the court; the permission from a courtly patron to work for other clients while under contract; the receipt of payments for additional works requested by a patron in addition to a fixed salary; and the cultivation of a philosophical identity.[94] Warnke asserts that the system of valuation that informs artistic practice and identity in the Renaissance and well into the *seicento* extends from the "freedom" granted to the artist by his unique experience at court. This phenomenon begins with the artist's acquisition of the title of "*familiaris*" – a position of inclusion within the family of the court and its leader, idealized in terms that aligned both parties in a corporeal sense – and its subsequent manifestation in the form of a close bond of friendship between the artist and his noble patron.[95] As a result of his (or her) close association with the prince, the court artist was consequently and by necessity himself both virtuous and noble, bound to a patron by an ideal of mutual obligation and loyalty that – in the terms dictated by the egalitarian ideals of friendship –

[93] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 249.
[94] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 124, 125-7, 144, 145, 164. On artists' houses see Hans Peter Schwarz, "Non visse da pittore, ma da prencipe" (PhD dissertation, Marburg, 1982); Roberto Paolo Ciardi, *Case di Artisti in Toscana* (Florence: Banca Toscana, 1998).
[95] From the fourteenth century to just after c. 1500 humanists and painters were included among the ranks of the "*familiaris*" or "*commensales*" at court. Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 22; also see 44, 111, 115. The corporeal conflation between the patron and his court-servants echoes the kind of union produced in friendship (though in a less egalitarian manner): "Even as a simple servant, the artist was '*pars corporis regis'*, a part of the royal body, with a share in its destiny. The relation of master and servant ended upon the death of the prince: when the prince died, the servant died too, as it were." Warnke, *ibid*, 111; also see Francoise Autrand, "Offices et officiers royaux en France sous Charles VI," *Revue historique* 242 (1969): 300-6. On the changing nature of the patron-artist relationship, also see Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn*, 34ff.

acknowledged the artist as special ("divine", eccentric, ingenious, indispensible, or irreplaceable)[96], independent or even self-governing.

Rosa emphasized this very "eccentricity" (or "*stravaganza*") in a letter to Ricciardi of 1664, reprimanding his friend for arguing with him about the subject of paintings he was making for him:

> "For painters of my condition and extravagant spirit [*genio stravagante*], it is necessary from the measure onward to leaving the rest free (as I have done in similar occasions with you) and to content oneself to not want to teach to fathers to be boys and … to go along with the spirit [*genio*] of the person who has to do the work, and to believe that every little thing made by the classical painter will receive both merit and praise from one who truly understands." [97]

Baldinucci made the artist's "*stravaganze*" a requisite component of the biographical enterprise, including it as a category in his list of characteristics that art-biographers should consider when devising their *vite*.[98] Various commentators of the *seicento* adopted the term in their descriptions of artists: Cardinal del Monte, for example, used it to defend the "driven and difficult" Caravaggio.[99]

---

[96] Benvenuto Cellini, for example, had played up his "indispensability" as an economic ploy to receive due payment during the debacle over the silver water jug commissioned by the Bishop of Salamanca: "Cellini takes his time making it, and the bishop threatens to give the commission to someone else. After the bishop finally gets his jug, he makes Cellini wait and wait for the payment. Then the handle breaks and Cellini uses the opportunity to show his indispensability, and finally gets his money, as well as important commissions from Clement VII, who 'is quite amused with Cellini's firmness'." Gosman, "Princely Culture," 11. Malvasia claimed Pope Paul V had said of Guido Reni: "*Pictoribus, atque Poetis, omnia licent*; we must put up with these great men because that excess of spirit which makes them great is the same that leads them to this strange behavior." Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 16, 21-22; Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice*, II: 27. The trope of the "*deus artifex*" and the god-like divinity of the artist as creator also received a significant impetus through the artist's experience at court, via his relation to the princely patron. Warnke, *ibid*, 238. On the development of the image of the eccentric, distinctive and individual artist, see Warnke, *ibid*, 249-252.

[97] Borelli, letter 303: "Ai pittori della mia condizione e genio stravagante, è forza dalla misura in poi lasciare il resto in libertà (così haverei fatto io in accidenti simile con voi) e contentarsi di non volere insegnare ai babbi a far figlioli e, come ho detto sopra, assecondare il genio di chi ha d'operare, e credere ch'ogni poca cosa di pittore classico, è per ricevere e preggio e lode da chi veramente intende." Rosa frequently used the term "*stravagante*" to refer to the strange, peculiar, wild, angry or distasteful nature of people, events or sentiments. See Borelli, letters 25, 100, 161, 178, 214, 222, 245, and 352. He famously used the proto-Romantic expression "un misto così stravagante d'orrido, e di domestico" when describing the "curioso e pittoresco" scenery on his trip to Terni. See Borelli, letter 265, May 13 1662. The word was also adopted by the Pisan *Accademia degli Stravaganti* to which many of Ricciardi's and Rosa's friends belonged, if not the two colleagues themselves.

[98] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, ed. Barocchi, VI: 564-5, Appendix CXCI, VI. "Questionario" (1685). BNCF MS Magl. II. II 110, 33. "Nota per aver le cognizioni che si richieggono nel descrivere le vite de i pittori …". Here Baldinucci lists the points of consideration for the prospective biographers: "Intorno alla vita: progresso/ genio, fantasia/ studi, maestri/ accidenti della vita/ stravaganze, facezie, burle…"

[99] Writing to Fabio Masetti, the agent of Cesare d'Este, Duke of Modena, Del Monte attempted to appease his anxiety over the receipt of a painting that had already been partially paid for, informing him that "one can give

As Warnke writes, "To serve a prince was essentially a 'free' activity, engaged in not for reward, but in the cause of virtue, and grounded in sworn mutual loyalty."[100] As a consequence, both the artist and his work came to be evaluated in relation to *virtù* or talent – inherently and essentially immeasurable qualities – a practice that resulted in the exaltation and detachment of both artists and their work from the mundane realm of monetary valuation, and that permitted Rosa (along with many of his forebears and contemporaries) to claim that he painted only "for my own satisfaction".[101]

With the emergence of new venues of artistic practice and economy in the *seicento* (the academy, the art market, the private collector), the bond between the artist and his noble patron became an increasing point of contention for the artist, desirous to transfer the freedom conferred by that relationship beyond its confines.[102] This tension is inherent in the true nature of Rosa's courtly position in Florence, which is best categorized not in the extreme terms of the "court artist" or the "anti-courtier" but rather in that liminal state of the "purveyor of the court". Defined by his simultaneous attachment to and freedom from the court itself, the purveyor represented "the most advanced type of artistic sovereignty, ostensibly opposed to the court, yet at the same time linked to it."[103] As I tried to make clear in my chapter on Rosa's private academy, Rosa's court position granted him privileges that, as Warnke contends, "set him apart from colleagues outside the court".[104] Carrying this distinction with him, he was given the luxury of both denying and decrying the very context that had invested him with the power to do so.

---

very few assurances about him … he is a very odd person [*stravagantissimo*]," noting "Caravaggio's rash rejection of the lavish sum of 6000 *scudi* to decorate a loggia for the Principe Doria." Langdon, *Caravaggio*, 302.
[100] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 34.
[101] Warnke, *ibid*, 135. Hence Filarete's claim that "not even the slightest talent can be bought for money". *Filarete's Treatise on Architecture: Being the Treatise by Antonio di Piero Averlino, Known as Filarete* (c. 1460 - c. 1464), trans. John R. Spencer. 2 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 431. For artists' claims to work "solely for pleasure", see Warnke, *ibid*, 137-143.
[102] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 259.
[103] Warnke, *ibid*, 70-74.
[104] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 65.

Rosa was far from unique in decrying the restrictions of the court. The theme has its ancient roots in the writings of Juvenal and Lucian (both of whom Rosa claimed a close, personal affinity[105]), and it is a continual theme throughout the early-modern discourse of art and artists.[106] Rosa is special, however, for his systematic treatment of the theme throughout the entirety of his *oeuvre* and for the duration of his career. The almost obsessive nature of Rosa's agenda of moral-satiric reprimand – the nature of which reveals itself as a conspicuous over-protestation – also makes Rosa a particularly revealing case-study for the contrast implicit between the philosophical ideals and the practicable and economic realities of *seicento* artistic practice. As Warnke points out, the continued association of ultimate prestige with court patronage, combined with the realities of financial need, provided a constant and ever-present counterpoint to the ideals of the artist's "anti-court" position and quest for professional autonomy.[107]

"Will Work for Food": Rosa as a Some-Time Artist for Hire

Rosa's infamous refusals of prominent commissions or the invitations of Queen Christina of Sweden, King Louis XIV, and Emperor Ferdinand of Austria to work in their service as court artist stand in sharp contrast to his early acceptance of a position as purveyor of the court for

---

[105] The problematic nature of the patron-client relationship is a recurring theme in Juvenal's *Satires*. On Lucian's "anti-court polemics", see Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 58. For Rosa's self-identification with Lucian, see Borelli, letters 146 and 198.

[106] Rosa's contemporary (and probable friend) Pier Francesco Mola was also an eager participant in the satiric critique of the Roman court, producing a number of caricatures of figures of the papal court and lamentations on the theme of the poverty and inappreciation of artists. On Mola's caricatures, see Kahn-Rossi, "Pier Francesco Mola e la caricatura", 121-133, 277-291; Bruce Davis, "Pier Francesco Mola's Autobiographical Caricatures: A Postscript," *Master Drawings* 29: 1 (1991): 48-51, 85-86; and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 215-216. Rosa's letters suggest Niccolò Simonelli shared Mola's resentment toward the Pamphili family and their patronage, which "frustrated his ambitions". Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 44. Antonio Abati, another of Rosa's friends, also critiqued both the court and the subject of war in his *Frascherie* (first published in 1651), a satirical work that exerted a significant influence on Rosa. See Limentani, "Nuovi studi e ricerche," 40. Warnke lists numerous artists who balked at the restrictions of (or expressed anxiety about) court appointments, including Andrea Mantegna, Raphael, Giulio Romano, Titian, Vasari, Poussin, Annibale Carracci, Francois Duquesnoy, Pier Francesco Mola. See Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 58-61, 120, 201. Rubens proclaimed his own "disgust" with the court in a letter to Jan Woverius of 1631. Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 371, letter 218, January 13 1631. The theme of a "withdrawal to private life" was frequently invoked in contrast to life art court, and Warnke points to the common reference in literature criticizing the court to the writings of Aristotle, Diogenes, Pythagoras and Horace, all of whom "chose to withdraw into private life". Warnke, *ibid*, 59.

[107] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 59-61.

Cardinal Brancaccio and Gian' Carlo de' Medici.[108] The animosity Rosa expressed toward the traditional, restrictive structures of patronage is tempered by a painful awareness of his inability to achieve success in the competitive contemporary art world without the prestige conferred by noble patronage.[109] In his letters to Ricciardi, Rosa frequently acknowledged that the maintenance of his reputation necessitated a certain submission to the requirements of his patrons or potential clients: in 1650 he was trying to finish a painting of *S. Giacinto* he had promised to Ricciardi, but wrote that, for the sake of his "reputation," he would have to put it on hold in order to carry out work for "some persons with whom I cannot exercise familiarity".[110] Above all, Rosa was conscious of the need to acquire an important and lucrative noble commission, especially a contract for a prominent Roman altarpiece.[111] The significance of this achievement for Rosa is conveyed in a letter to Ricciardi of October 11 1669, where he expressed relief and exaltation at having finally been granted the opportunity – an admission that, at this late stage in his career,

---

[108] For Rosa's refusal of the invitation of Queen Christina, see Borelli, letter 128 (March 30 1652). Christina's interest in Rosa is clear from her purchase of a large number of his drawings. Their relations must have remained intact, however, for in the 1669 exhibition of old master paintings at San Giovanni Decollato (to which Christina lent examples from her own collection), Rosa was the only living artist whose work was included. Mahoney, "Salvator Rosa Provenance Studies: Prince Livio Odescalchi and Queen Christina," *Master Drawings* 3 (1965): 387. Rosa's friend Marcantonio Cesti "persuaded the Archduke of Austria to invite Rosa to join his court, but characteristically the painter refused." Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 323; for Rosa's refusal see Borelli, letters 245, 246 and 254; Rosa told Ricciardi that he esteemed Innsbruck "as much as you do the hairs of your *coglioni*". Rosa also refused the invitation of Louis XIV in 1665 (see letters 306 and 308), extended on his behalf by his Ambassador the Duke de Crequy. James Patty argues that the invitation was more likely to have come from Cardinal Neri Corsini, who had commissioned a *Battle Scene* from Rosa for the King in 1652 [Fig. 60]. Patty, *Salvator Rosa in French Literature*, 7; Borelli, letters 144, 148-151.

[109] Salomon, Review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 494.

[110] Borelli, letters 46 and 51: "Fenire il San Giacinto vi dico di nuovo che non è possibile perché devo per mia riputatione non mancar di parola con alcune persone con le quali non posso usar confidenza et a questo rispetto vado rinunciando di molte cose da fare." The painting itself has never been identified.

[111] As Luisa C. Matthew notes, "one prominently-placed and well-received altarpiece could initiate a great deal of further business, including works in other genres." Matthew, "Focus on the artist and the middleman: materials, workshop production and marketing during an age of transition," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al., 15. Here it is worth noting that Rosa had also received a commission for a public altarpiece in Florence, the *Christ Saving St. Peter from the Waves* [Fig. 103] in S. Felice, painted not during Rosa's sojourn in the city (as Salerno originally supposed) but in about 1661. For the circumstances of the commission, which may have been conducted by the Baldocci family for their chapel in the church in 1660 or 1661, perhaps when Rosa had returned to Tuscany for a period (he was at Strozzavolpe between May and September 1661), see Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 75; Borelli, letters 246-251; and Passeri, *Vite*, 438, who records Rosa's brief return to Tuscany, which seems to have been entirely at Strozzavolpe with Ricciardi.

reveals Rosa's enduring conviction about (and obligation to participate in) aspects of the conventional commission as a measure of the artist's worth:

> "The bells ring out, as finally after thirty years of living in Rome and expressing an overwhelming hope full of continuous lamentations both to the heavens and men alike, there is set to appear in public an altarpiece [of my making]. Signor Filippo Nerli, custodian of the Pope, … intends to build a chapel in the church of San Giovanni de' Fiorentini, and in spite of the stars, wants me to make the painting … I have been a month and a half in continuous agony …This engagement has kept me not only far from the business of the pen, but from every other thing of this world, and I can tell you that I have forgotten even to so much as to eat, and my application has been so arduous, that towards the end it was necessary for me to spend two days in bed, and I did not help myself with vomiting … But, friend, forgive me if, for the reputation of the paintbrush, I have neglected to the debt that I had with you of the pen."[112]

As Haskell has noted, the cachet conferred by a major Roman altarpiece commission should be seen as an important, and permanent, alternative to the kind of self-promotive strategy offered by the venue of public exhibition.[113] In addition to Nerli's commission of 1669, Rosa had earlier secured the opportunity in 1659 to decorate a private chapel in S. Maria de Montesanto in the Piazza del Popolo – a commission, moreover, that was facilitated through the auspices of his most important friend and economic ally in Rome, Carlo de' Rossi.

Rosa's adherence to the older system of valuation is also apparent in the delight he expressed at receiving recognition and praise from members of the nobility.[114] His judgement of

---

[112] Borelli, letter 371: "Sonate le campane, che finalmente doppo trent'anni di stanza di Roma, e d'una trascinata speranza ripiena di continovate lamentazioni e co' i cieli e con gl'huomini, s'è pur spontato una volta di mettere al publico una tavola d'altare. Il Signor Filippo Nerli, depositario del Papa …ha voluto fabricare una sua cappella nella chiesa di San Giovanni de' Fiorentini, et a dispetto delle stelle ha voluto ch'io ci facessi la tavola …Qui son stato un mese e mezzo in continove agonie…. Quest'impegno mi ha tenuto non solo lontano dal comercio della penna, ma da ogni altra cosa di questo mondo, e vi posso dire che mi son dimenticato insin di manciare, et è stata così ardua la mia applicazione, che verso il fine mi necessitò a star due giorni in letto, e se non mi aiutavo col vomito …. Però, amico, compatitemi se, per la riputazione del pennello, ho trascurato al debito che dovevo con voi della penna."

[113] Haskell writes, "it was the opportunity to show a work in church - far more than occasions such as the Pantheon ceremonies - that provided the painter with his real ambition. This was the place that everyone would visit; the equivalent of a Bond Street gallery in our own day was a fashionable church." Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," *Studi secenteschi* 1 (1960): 120.

[114] An honour, moreover, that presents Rosa as a precursor to his eighteenth- and nineteenth-century successors, granted with a high enough social standing to "tempt the great into their studios." Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 120. Rosa's "secret" love of noble favour – and his admission of its inconsistency with his Stoic persona – is clear, for example, in two of Rosa's letters to Ricciardi, of 1664 and 1666, where he expresses his joy at receiving a visit from the French ambassador, the Duke de Créquy, to his "hovel" of a studio. See Borelli, letters 305, 328 and 335. Rosa had expressed delight in 1652 at his privilege in receiving a commission

this delight as paradoxical to his philosophical inclinations, however, is disingenuous: it is clear that Rosa regarded (and craved) these accolades as representative of the ultimate gauge of the *seicento* artist's successful acquisition of fame, reputation and potential wealth. More than this, when he told Ricciardi about the French Ambassador's visit, Rosa admitted that he would have to be "satisfied with the smoke" if not the "roast" itself – a declaration that contradicts the mockery he had levelled at Carlo Dati's courtly affectations as "all pretension, all smoke".[115] Rosa had similarly derided his friend Cosimo Brunetti for his courtly airs, apparently oblivious to his own display of many of the same pretensions in his dress, comportment, and professional inclinations.[116] In another letter to Ricciardi of 1652, Rosa noted with a discernible satisfaction the visit to his house of "three Cardinals, Brancaccio, Amodei, and Ottobono", lamenting that they had not settled on purchasing anything from him.[117]

V.4. Friends in High Places: Rosa and his Clientele

Rosa made paintings on commission as well as producing them "for his own pleasure" or for purchase on the art market, without a guarantee of sale – a practice that has made it hard to

---

from Neri Corsini for the *Battle Scene* for Louis XIV, boasting to Ricciardi that his name had made the news and his fame had spread across the country (letter 158).

[115] Borelli, letters 328 and 115. See chapter two, 95. Rosa also uses the trope of "smoke and roast" in the *Il Tirreno*, in reference to Naples: "nazion di gran fumo e poco arrosto,/...A chi nulla mi diede io nulla devo". (vv. 186 and 214)

[116] See Borelli, letters 120, 122, 163. In 1653 Brunetti was ambitious for an appointment as one of the new papal *Nunzii* of Pope Innocent X, a position that Rosa derided in connection with his more general disdain for courtly servitude. See Borelli, letters 290, 209, 258, 358, and 363. Both Baldinucci and Passeri refer to Rosa's affectatious comportment and attire: "Era allora graziosa cosa il vedere il pittore passeggiar le strade di Roma in posto di gravità con un bene addobbato servitore per accompagnatura di sua persona: ed esso con ispada al fianco, con guardia di sodo argento, e con altre si fatte boriose dimostranze, che tutt'altro facevanlo parere da quel ch'egli eravi stato conosciuto per avanti". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 441. Passeri contradicts himself in his account of Rosa's carriage as alternatively pretentious and unaffected: "Stanco il Rosa di star lontano da Roma, e trovandosi terminato il servigio del Principe Mattia, si risolvè di tornarvi, ed avendo avanzata una certa quantità di denari, vi giunse pomposo di abiti con servitore a livrea, che conduceagli lo spadino appresso colla guardia d'argento, e tutto pieno di sfarzo" (Passeri, *Vite*, 425) and "vestiva galante, ma non alla cortigiana, senza gale, e superfluità" (Passeri, *ibid*, 436-7).

[117] Borelli, letter 136. The Milanese Luigi Alexander Omodei (1608-85) was named Cardinal by Innocent X in 1652, and in 1661 he commissioned the *Madonna del Suffragio* from Rosa (see letter 252). The Venetian Pietro Ottoboni (1610-91) was also made Cardinal in 1652, and became Pope Alexander VIII in 1689.

establish the provenance and chronology of many of his canvases.[118] The early biographies and Rosa's letters reveal much about the nature of his exchanges with the panoply of named and unnamed patrons and clients who either commissioned or purchased Rosa's paintings or received them as "gifts". These documents articulate a "friendly" art economy, cultivated in the service of an autonomous practice.

The nebulous space of the art market, where professional relationships were less clearly defined than at court, was vital to Rosa's friendship-based business strategy. The art market was a particularly challenging commercial route for the painter – it offered a certain freedom to paint as one pleased, but it lacked the financial assurance of working to commission and was consequently not always the most lucrative path to take.[119] Many of Rosa's precursors and contemporaries took advantage of the market as a venue for the achievement of fame (and occasionally wealth) some more willingly than others.[120] Like Caravaggio and Artemisia Gentileschi, Rosa seems to have used it at an early stage in his career, prior to attaining his positions as "purveyor of the court": both Baldinucci and Passeri recount Giovanni Lanfranco's felicitous discovery of the talented young Rosa in a local *bottega* in Naples.[121] Travelling to Rome for the first time in 1635, Rosa found success in these early years with landscapes and genre scenes in the *Bamboccianti* vein.[122] This influence carried through to his Florentine period of the 1640's, when he continued, as he had

[118] Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 42, note 17.
[119] Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 5. Cavazzini notes that in early *seicento* Rome, ambitious painters generally preferred to work "on commission for a nobleman or prelate", usually more profitable than working for the market.
[120] Paul Bril, Hermann Van Swanevelt, Pieter Van Laer, Johan Wilhelm Baur, Vincent Adriaensen (known as Manicola), Agostino Tassi, and Giovan Benedetto Castiglione were among the artists who "worked for the market." Jusepe Ribera also sold some of his early paintings through shops. Cavazzini, *ibid*, 150-1.
[121] Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 12. Lanfranco was painting the cupola of the Gesù in Naples. Passing by one of the local *botteghe* in the Strada della Carità in his carriage one day, he was intrigued by a small "rustic landscape" of four *palmi* depicting the story of Hagar and her son Ishmael languishing of thirst in the desert; unaware of the author, he purchased it and every other painting by the as-yet unknown young *Salvatoriello*, a triumph of recognition that allowed Rosa to raise his prices. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438-9; Passeri, *Vite*, 417-18.
[122] Passeri says that Rosa first traveled to Rome, from Naples, in 1635, in a felucca. Passeri, *Vite*, 418.

reputedly done in Naples, to paint landscapes and advertise himself as a landscape painter.[123] During his second phase in Rome, however, from 1649 onwards, Rosa's desire to engage in the academic and predominantly classicist style of painting (an interest that had begun to take root in Florence) required him to quash his association with the *Bamboccianti* style – a mode of painting that, as Passeri was quick to point out, would have otherwise given Rosa an unrivalled success.[124] In 1652, he even went so far as to announce that he would never again paint another battle picture if he was not paid "on par with Raphaels and Titians", Old Masters whose work Richard Goldthwaite has identified as fetching higher prices on the *seicento* market than that of contemporary artists.[125] In Rome, Rosa again turned to the art market as a venue for self-promotion and sale, but was unwilling to produce the kinds of paintings that would have been most lucrative. Instead, spurred by the more pervasive disdain among Roman classicists toward the *Bamboccianti*'s genre scenes,[126] Rosa used the public exhibitions and his merchant friends as alternative paths toward successful commerce, promoting himself with complex and novel histories. Not only the subjects but the owners of his paintings were of concern for Rosa as an index of his value: Passeri may have echoed

---

[123] As Struhal notes, "in Florence …[Rosa] was clearly primarily appreciated as a painter of landscapes, and the large number of paintings in this genre that he produced in Florence also suggests that he promoted himself as such." Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 281-2. Baldinucci notes that Rosa used to sketch the countryside and the coast around Naples until his father's death, after which he painted landscapes no longer solely for pleasure but in order to make a living. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438; Scott notes that since Rosa was only six years old when his father died, the precociousness of this activity is unlikely. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 5.

[124] Rosa famously ridiculed Van Laer and his followers in his satire *La Pittura*, and lamented his fame as a painter of battle-scenes and landscapes. For Rosa's complaints in this regard, see Passeri, *Vite*, 433; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 478-9, 485; and Borelli, letter 334. To the Florentine prior Francesco Ximenes, who had asked to see some of Rosa's landscape paintings and complained when he was instead forced to view a series of figure paintings, Rosa said: "I do not know how to make landscapes: I know very well how to make figures, which I bring out to be seen by students of art and persons of optimal taste … to remove once [and for all] from the mind of men this fantastic humor, that I am painter of landscapes, not of figures." Baldinucci, *ibid*, 479.

[125] Borelli, letter 144. Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market," 436.

[126] On the objections of Pietro Testa, Andrea Sacchi, Francecso Albani and Rosa to both the subjects and style of the *Bamboccianti*, see Cropper, *The Ideal of Painting. Pietro Testa's Düsseldorf Notebook* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 248-50; *idem*, *The Domenichino Affair* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 158; Catherine Puglisi, *Francesco Albani* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 51-53; and Thompson, "'Pigmei Pizzicano di Gigante'". Rosa's praise for Albani in two of his letters to Ricciardi (letters 104 and 144) may have been inspired, in part, by his shared opinion in this matter of aesthetic theory. On the disdain of the Roman *Accademia di San Luca* toward the production of cheap genre scenes, see Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 48ff; on the academy's relationship with the Roman art market, see Lorizzo, "Il mercato dell'arte a Roma nel XVII secolo," 325-336.

Rosa when he complained that his paintings, "worthy of princes", had by the whims of fortune landed in the hands of less exalted persons.

Rosa and his Two Cardinals

Despite his protestations against the constraints of court life – and his moral admonishments of its deceptive and self-denying rituals – Rosa's early positions at court and his relationships with Cardinal Brancaccio and Gian' Carlo de' Medici were essential to the cultivation of a "free" identity. Rosa's relationship with Brancaccio, who Volpi describes as keeping an ever-watchful "amicable eye" over Rosa throughout his career, was founded in part on Neapolitan *campanilismo*.[127] Rosa's youthful pride in his nationality is signalled in the signature of his altarpiece of the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* [Fig. 1a], executed in 1638 for the Chiesa dell'Orazione e Morte in Viterbo during his stay with the Cardinal's retinue in Viterbo: the autograph "*Salvator Rosa neapolitanus f.*" is placed in close proximity to his self-portrait.[128] Rosa's association with the Cardinal was facilitated through the introduction of friends who were already in Brancaccio's service, Girolamo Mercuri and Niccolò Simonelli.[129] No comments by Rosa or his contemporaries convey the specific nature of his relationship with the Cardinal, but, as Volpi has argued, Brancaccio's literary, poetic, scientific, academic and "avant-garde" or "anti-conformist" interests likely encouraged Rosa's own.[130] The paintings that Rosa executed for Brancaccio are few in

[127] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e cardinale Brancaccio", 131, also 120-4. Also see Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 19; and Festa, "*Uno scolopio mancato ed uno vero: Salvator Rosa e il fratello*," *Napoli Nobilissima* II (1963): 73-4.
[128] On the painting, see Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 14; Mahoney, *Drawings*, 165-171; Anna Forlani Tempesti, "Un disegno giovanile di Salvator Rosa," in *Studi di storia dell'arte in onore di Mina Gregori*, ed. Elisa Acanfora et al (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 1994), 285-88.
[129] It is unclear whether Mercuri came into contact with Brancaccio through the *Accademia degli Oziosi*, of which Rosa's brother-in-law Francesco Fracanzano was a member. De' Dominici claims that Mercuri met Rosa in 1633 in the "*compagnia della morte*", the band sympathetic to the cause of Masaniello. This was the same year Brancaccio left Naples for Rome. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 120-4.
[130] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 121. Volpi notes that the Cardinal's encyclopedic, "avant-garde" interests also align him with "anti-conformists" like Queen Christina of Sweden, Cardinal Livio Odescalchi, Cardinal Clemente Rospigliosi, and Athanasius Kircher. Brancaccio's library contained works by many authors who appear to have exerted a profound influence on Rosa, from Galileo, Marino and Descartes to Bartoli and Kircher. Volpi, *ibid*, 122. Brancaccio was involved in both the Neapolitan *Accademia degli Oziosi*,

number, and Baldinucci is rather disparaging about their quality.[131] It thus seems perfectly plausible to suppose that Rosa occupied his time with other activities tied to the literary and theatrical tastes of the Cardinal. Brancaccio may also have had a formative role in spurring Rosa's dramatic and poetic proclivities.[132] It was in the service of Brancaccio that Rosa met the poet Antonio Abati, whose work exerted a profound influence on his own.[133]

Rosa's relationship with Cardinal Gian' Carlo de' Medici was also influential on the artist's development. Renowned as much for his hedonistic behaviour and "strange temper" as for his devoted support of the arts,[134] Gian' Carlo shared many of Rosa's interests, the theatre foremost among them. If Baldinucci and Passeri are to be believed, they also shared a certain affection for each other, guided in part by the "friendly" ideal of patronage cultivated by the later Medici as part of their Golden Age ideal.[135] Gian' Carlo's (and his brothers') interest in not only the Stoic-Cynic vein of philosophy but also the Platonic-Socratic school may have exerted an impact on Rosa, whose philosophical interests I have suggested were perhaps more flexible and inclusive than scholars have proposed.[136] Rosa's relationship with Gian' Carlo was informed by a profound desire

---

the Roman *Umoristi* and the Roman *Intrecciati*. Volpi, *ibid*, 120. It was probably in these early years that Rosa first became associated with the *Umoristi*. His academic associations provided Rosa with potential clients and eventual patrons. Volpi, *ibid*, 127.

[131] Passeri says Rosa painted certain "overdoors" with landscape scenes and a "*scherzo*" of nymphs, *putti* and marine monsters for Brancaccio's palace in Viterbo. Passeri, *Vite*, 419. Baldinucci records that Rosa painted for Cardinal Brancaccio "various works in public places in oil and fresco", among them probably the *St. Jerome* [Fig. 4] and the *St. Nicholas of Tolentino* of c. 1639 for the church of San Venanzio in Fabriano and the *Incredulity of St. Thomas* for the Chiesa dell'Orazione e Morte [Fig. 1a]. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 439; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 13.

[132] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 126. Volpi notes further that Rosa's satire *La Musica* seems acutely directed at mocking the theatrical and musical world sponsored by Brancaccio and Mercuri. Volpi, *ibid*, 127. Rosa mentions Mercuri's musical tastes with a certain disdain in a letter to Ricciardi of 1651. Borelli, letter 106.

[133] On Abati's relationship with Rosa and his influence, see Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 127-8; and Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 45ff. On Brancaccio, see G. Lutz, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 13: 774-6

[134] See Acton, *The Last Medici*, 88-9.

[135] Eager to emulate the Golden Age ideal of their illustrious forebear Lorenzo "*il Magnifico*", the later *seicento* Medici cultivated themselves as "*amici alle arti*" and promoted an ideal of "friendly" patronage, regarding the artists, scientists and writers in their employ more as friends than as subjects. Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 8. For Gian' Carlo's and Mattias's affection welcome of Rosa, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448 and Passeri, *Vite*, 424.

[136] On the Aristotelian-Platonic heritage of the Medici, and its cultivation among the artists in their employ, see Del Bravo, "La 'fiorita gioventù' del Volterrano," 50-64.

both to "escape" the court and at the same time profit from the advantages and ideals afforded by its authority. That the benefits of this bond continued even after Rosa's departure from Florence is apparent in a letter of 1655: anxious over Lucrezia's safety in returning to Florence, "without fear" of her estranged husband, Rosa turned first to Ricciardi and Volunnio Bandinelli for help; if these friends could not help him, however, he would have to turn to Gian' Carlo de' Medici or "another similar personage" to help him secure the situation.[137]

Gian' Carlo employed Rosa from 1641 to 1645, and he gave the artist both a monthly salary and payments for individual works. The Cardinal's ambitious artistic tastes are reflected in his collection and decorative commissions for his official residences which display his interest in both "great masters" of the preceding generation and contemporary Florentine luminaries.[138] For Gian' Carlo's collection at the Casino, Rosa painted the large *Battle Scene* [Fig. 9a], two grand *Marine Seascapes* (now in the Palazzo Pitti) [Figs. 7 and 8a], two large landscapes with *Justice* (*Astraea*) *among the Shepherds* and *Peace Burning the Arms of War* (both of which were commissioned from the Cardinal as pendants [Figs. 21 and 20]), the *Alexander and Diogenes* [Fig. 29], the *Cincinnatus Called from the Plow* [Fig. 32], the *Landscape with Travellers Asking the Way* [Fig. 6] as well as two small landscapes and a painting of "*pittura*" – probably the same painting owned by the Cardinal's dealer, Fabrizio Piermattei.[139] As he had done in the *Incredulity of St.*

---

[137] Borelli, letter 192. Rosa made a similar concession to the benefits of court association in another letter to Ricciardi of 1661, noting that the Grand Duke's authority would help in serving the interests of their mutual friend Marc'Antonio Cesti. See letter 255:
[138] In his palace at Mezzomonte, Gian' Carlo employed Francesco Albani and Giovanni da San Giovanni to complete the ceiling paintings, and collected about 250 paintings by artists like San Giovanni, Cesare Dandini, Giovanni Bilivert, as well as still-lifes and landscape scenes, portraits, paintings by Bolognese artists and a small Madonna attributed to Leonardo. His inventory also lists paintings by Raphael, Piero di Cosimo, Filippino Lippi, Parmigianino, Paris Bordone, Paolo Veronese, Correggio, Albani, Poussin, Rubens, and Guido Reni. At his second residence in the Casino on Via della Scala, where he transferred his collection in 1644, he employed Cortona and the Bolognese fresco painters Agostino Mitelli and Michelangelo Colonna to decorate the interior. Mascalchi, "Giovan' Carlo de' Medici", 269, 271, 272; Mascalchi, "Anticipazioni sul mecenatismo di Giovan Carlo de' Medici," 41-82.
[139] The *Battle Scene* is mentioned by Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448. The *Landscape with Travellers* is now in the Denis Mahon collection, London; it appears in Gian' Carlo's inventory of 1647. See chapter three, 191. The other paintings are listed in Gian' Carlo's inventory of 1662. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 64.

Thomas, in Gian' Carlo's *Battle Scene* Rosa included his own self-portrait in homage to his court position. Not listed in the Cardinal's inventory, but likely painted for his collection, are the *Temptation of St. Anthony* and the so-called *La Menzogna* [Figs. 30 and 34], which Baldinucci implies may have been intended as a pair.[140] Gian' Carlo also commissioned Rosa – alongside Pietro da Cortona – to decorate the mezzanine apartment in the Palazzo Pitti, for which he made four over-door frescoes of biblical subjects, including stories of Hagar, Moses, and Tobias.[141]

Commissions, Clients and Dealers

There are many others who made significant contributions to Rosa's career, among them cardinals, ambassadors, prelates, court attachés, admirers and collectors, many of whom also acted as advisors, antiquarians and art dealers. Some shared particularly close friendships with Rosa, such as the aforementioned Giambattista Ricciardi, Niccolò Musso, Girolamo Mercuri and Niccolò Simonelli, or the Roman banker Carlo de' Rossi, the pope's brother Don Mario Chigi, and the dealer Francesco Cordini. The relationships of others – collectors like Don Antonio Ruffo[142] or agents like Fabrizio Piermattei, for example – are harder to define. These bonds were often shifting, variable and context-dependent. Even Ricciardi, who was a close friend, was also an advisor, dealer and client. Many of these associates acted as important go-betweens in the negotiation of contracts as well as in the establishment of connections with prospective patrons or clients. Their transactions were vital to the new, more "free" type of exchange that Rosa was attempting to make his own.

---

[140] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 449. The biographer describes the *La Menzogna* as an "accompaniment" to the *St. Anthony*, hanging together on the walls of the Palazzo Pitti as part of the collection of Ferdinand II. The *Portrait of a Poet* [Fig. 35], however, may alternatively have been intended as a pendant to the *La Menzogna.*

[141] See Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 35, figs. 38 and 39. The subjects included *Hagar in the Wilderness, The Finding of Moses, Moses and the Burning Bush,* and *Tobias and the Angel*.

[142] On Ruffo, his collection, and his relations with artists, see Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 209-210; and Vincenzo Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," *Bollettino d'Arte*, 1916.

Sybille Ebert-Schifferer defines Rosa's client base as "anonymous" – that is, Rosa painted throughout his career primarily for dealers or *ex post* clients.[143] She is referring to Rosa's immersion in the art market, whose customers are conceived as a nebulous and nameless mass in contrast to the named specificity of the patronage contract.[144] However, as Warnke notes, even in the transfer of valuation to the "anonymous public" or market, the early-modern artist "retained their former consciousness of a higher destiny for the arts."[145] This is a significant point for Rosa, for to characterize his clientele as primarily "anonymous" is to deny his own profound and enduring mission to be acknowledged and solicited by the same prominent, wealthy and utterly identifiable individuals whose conventions of artistic commerce adhered to the type of patronage practice that he longed to undermine, but whose favour continued to define the *seicento* artist's fortunes. It is also to obscure the intimate significance of these figures to Rosa himself, many of them close friends (and some of them sworn enemies). The art market was a volatile economy for a painter who continued to define himself according to older standards and refused to engage more profitable genres and their clientele. Friends were essential in navigating this precarious situation.

The Utility of Friendship: Girolamo Mercuri, Niccolò Simonelli, Don Mario Chigi, Carlo de' Rossi, Francesco Cordini and Ricciardi

In a letter of 1667 to Ricciardi, Rosa distinguished between the true friendship of his companion and relations with art dealers and merchants who – occasionally defined in the terms of genuine amity – were at base bonds of utility: "I tell you (and this is the evangelical truth) that the

[143] Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68. She notes that Baldinucci conveys a sense of Rosa's 'anonymous clientage' "when he notes with determination that one of his paintings 'were given to' [*fu mandato a*] or 'were had by' [*lo ebbe*] someone, differentiating between these works and those acquired by patrons." Ebert-Schifferer, *ibid*, 68.
[144] The anonymous public has also featured as a measure of the artist's worth ever since Apelles first displayed his paintings for the assessment of casual observers on the street. The story of Apelles inspired numerous instances of the practice among artists, from Alberti, Leonardo, Dolce and Vasari to Velazquez and Bernini – the last of whom "noted with approval that Annbiale Carracci always sought the common man's opinion of his pictures first", stating "the people never err and never flatter." Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 241; Pliny, *Natural History*, XXXV: 84; Paul Fréart de Chantelou, *Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini's Visit to France*, ed. Anthony Blunt, trans. Margery Corbett (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 135ff.
[145] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 259.

Roman friends you suppose have bewitched me don't equal a dry fig in your comparison … you don't take second place, even with all the kindnesses shown to me by the Carlo Rossis and the Simonellis, who all serve me in order to canonize you … By God that you remember this on the day of the judgment."[146] But Rosa was also fully aware that even true friendship had a utilitarian dimension. His access to a new, "freer" economy of art was facilitated by his "solid network of professional relations and friendships with the new type of artistic-commercial mediators", including "professional administrators" like Niccolò Simonelli or Girolamo Mercuri, or "merchant art-lovers" like Carlo de' Rossi.[147] Not only did these friends and associates facilitate the commerce of Rosa's art, but they also provided his clientele.[148] Their exchanges – especially with Ricciardi and Cordini – encapsulate the tricky, dual nature of friendship as alternatively affective and instrumental.

Girolamo Mercuri and Niccolò Simonelli both played key roles in Rosa's early career in Rome, helping him to secure patrons and to establish his professional reputation.[149] Like Francesco Cordini and Ricciardi, they were among the many amateurs or connoisseurs who collectively "began to actively shape taste in the *seicento* through their collections, writings, purchases, and advice to artists and other patrons."[150] With their collections, sponsorship, and advice they provided an "outlet for artists who could not function in the normative styles of seventeenth century

[146] Borelli, letter 337: "Vi dico (e questa è vangelica verità) che gli amici di Roma che voi sopponete che vagliano ad incantarmi non vagliano un fico secco in vostra comparazione…voi non havete il secondo presso di me con tutte le finezze da me essercitate con i Carli Rossi e con i Simonelli, i quali tutti oggi mi servono per canonizar voi: né dico di vantaggio per non assospettar la vostra modestia. Ma viva Idio che così è a mantenervelo nel giorno del giudizio." Elsewhere Rosa made a similar distinction in the case of Francesco Cordini, who he described in a letter to Ricciardi (letter 292) as having a different "spirit" (*genio*) or temperamental affinity to Ricciardi and himself.
[147] Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68.
[148] Salomon, review of *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*, 494. While "most of the great patrons of his day bought his paintings, the core of people who collected his pictures remained a close network of friends."
[149] These friends were vital contacts upon Rosa's return to Rome in 1649. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 35.
[150] Goldman, *Aspects of Seicento Patronage*, 1.

art" – eccentric painters and print-makers like Pietro Testa, Giovan Benedetto Castiglione and Rosa, who benefitted from their aid in the pursuit of "extremely personal and recondite iconography".[151]

Rosa first met the young priest and art-dealer Mercuri during his youth in Naples around 1633, a couple of years prior to his first move to Rome in 1635. Mercuri seems to have been instrumental in introducing Rosa to his first and most formative patron, Cardinal Brancaccio, during his early years in Rome.[152] In Baldinucci's account, Rosa first left Naples with Mercuri, "a young man of optimal taste in these arts", but fell ill shortly after arriving in Rome. After returning to Naples for two more years he again made the trip to the Eternal city in 1638, where he was welcomed "in the house of his great friend Girolamo Mercuri" who was by that time the *maestro di casa* of Cardinal Brancaccio.[153] Rosa relied on Mercuri's hospitality once more when he returned to Rome from Florence in 1649.[154] Mercuri remained close friends with Rosa from the 1650's onward, and his subsequent position as *maestro di casa* of Cardinal Flavio Chigi (1631-1693) provided an important link to the papal family.[155] He is mentioned often, and with affection, in Rosa's letters. Mercuri was a witness to Rosa's marriage to Lucrezia on the artist's deathbed, and became the protector and friend of Rosa's son Augusto.[156] He was particularly helpful to Rosa during his numerous bouts of illness, providing him with a pair of eyeglasses in 1664 when his

---

[151] *Ibid*, 239, 244.
[152] As Warnke notes, "Artists had only a remote chance of obtaining a court appointment through their own efforts, since applications, competitions and dedications were rarely successful." Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 101. There is an MA thesis on the subject of Mercuri's relationship with Rosa by Maria Lina Renna, entitled "I Sodali e Amici di Salvator Rosa", at the University of Rome, 'La Sapienza', in 1984-5. An attempt to find a copy of the thesis in the University library, with the kind assistance of Dott. Luigi Spezzaferro, proved fruitless.
[153] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 439. Baldinucci then says that Rosa returned again to Naples after a period of time in Rome, after the fiasco with Bernini, with the sole object of seeing whether it had changed at all, staying there for "a little time" and making paintings to send back to Rome, and then returning once more to Rome. He claims that Rosa "never saw his native land again", although he likely did return to Naples. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 440-441.
[154] See Borelli, letter 23: "Doppo un viaggio vituperosissimo, finalmente ci siamo condotti a salvamento in Roma, dove al presente godiamo la cordialissima vista e conversatione del nostro Signor Don Girolamo ..."
[155] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 439; on Flavio, see E. Stumpo, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 24: 747-751.
[156] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e cardinale Brancaccio," 124. "Rev. D. Hieronymo Mercurio" is named as a witness in Rosa's last will and testament of March 17 1673. ASR MS Archivio Capitolino, Auditor Camerae Notari AC 1671-1678. sez. 45, tomo 71, Tomaso Paulutius, 570v. Rosa refers specifically to Mercuri's friendship in a letter of 1649 to Giulio Maffei. Borelli, letter 29.

eyesight began to falter and offering his houses to Lucrezia and Augusto by way of respite.[157] In May of 1659, Rosa wrote to Ricciardi of his deep affection for Mercuri and his concern over his friend's own suffering of illness.[158] Mercuri was also friends with Niccolò Simonelli, and together with Rosa the three of them formed a genial triumvirate in Rome, often enjoying each others' company.[159] Mercuri had an extensive and renowned art collection, comprised of works by some of the most noteworthy artists of the age, including a number of paintings by Rosa.[160] His collection

[157] For Mercuri's gift of eyeglasses, see Borelli, letter 305: "nostro Don Girolamo m'ha provveduto d'un paro d'occhiali, che quando l'ho sul naso, sembro, giusto Tartaglia di comedia". For Rosa's comments on his failing eyesight, also see letters 304 and 315. In February 1665, Rosa's illness has caused him to put Lucrezia and Augusto in Mercuri's house. Borelli, letters 306 and 325.

[158] Borelli, letter 222: "essendo questo amico mio di 26 anni d'esperienza; e l'ho sempre trov[ato] huomo fedele e da bene."

[159] See Borelli, letters 23, 88 and 224. Both Mercuri and Simonelli also appear to have been on quite intimate terms with Rosa's closest friends, Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei. See Borelli, letters 27, 29, 30, 34, 80, 81, 86, 88, 95, 157, 160 and 165. In his letters to both Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei, Rosa often included the united greetings of himself, Mercuri and Simonelli.

[160] Mercuri's inventory of June 25 1682 lists the belongings in both his house on the Via del Corso and his residence at S. Giovanni in Laterano. His large collection of paintings, drawings, prints and sculptures included works by many of the period's most prominent artists, and various genres. Landscapes and religious figurative subjects predominate, but there are also many still-life and portrait paintings (predominantly of dignitaries from the papal Chigi family and other major figures like Cardinal Mazarin and Cardinal F. M. Brancaccio). There are paintings and drawings by Bernini, Pietro da Cortona, Giovan Battista Vanni, Giovanni Apelman, Pietro Rotini (a particular favourite), Bernardino Mei, Paolo Albertoni, Vincent Adriaenssen (Manicola), Giovanni Stanchi, Palma Vecchio, Francesco di Maria, Giovanni Apelman, Giovanni Ghisolfi (another favourite), Anton Angelo Bonifazi, Fioravanti, Fabio della Corgna, Ribera, Matthaus Greuter, Bernardo Strozzi, Angelo Caroselli, a follower of Viviano Codazzi, Anton Angelo Bonifazi, Pier Francesco Mola, Domenico Napolitano, Paul Bril, Jan Both, "Olandese", Pieter van Laer, Giovanni Angelo Canini, Pietro Testa, and Paoluccio Napoletano (Paolo Cattamara). He also owned many copies of paintings by artists, including Lanfranco, Annibale Carracci, Federico Barocci, Pietro da Cortona, and Raphael. Rosa's paintings appear in both of Mercuri's residences, but most hung in the *stanza grande* of his residence at S. Giovanni in Laterano along with paintings and drawings by Bernini, Testa, Van Laer, Mola and Ghisolfi. Among them are a "testa della Madonna" (690r), a *Hagar and Ishmael in the Wilderness* (714r), two heads of philosophers (714r), two small landscapes (714r), a marine seascape (714r), two larger landscapes (714r), a small landscape with two shepherds and four sheep "from the life" (714v), nine drawings on paper executed in pen and lapis, all hung in gilded frames under glass (714v), and a watercolour drawing on wood in a gilded frame (714v). Mercuri also owned numerous copies of paintings by Rosa (including a copy of a *St. Jerome* (probably a copy of the Fabriano painting) (694v), a copy of a *Penitent St. William of Acquitaine in the Desert with a Landscape* (702v), two oval copies of landscapes and seascapes by Rosa (703r), two copies of small landscapes by the artist (704), and a copy of a larger landscape painting with grottoes (704r). He also owned paintings by Rosa's son Augusto (two small landscapes (690r)) and his brother Giuseppe (identified only as "il fratello del Sig. Rosa"), mainly of religious figurative subjects. He also owned two printed portraits of Rosa, one of them Bonacina's print of the artist (695r, 703v), both of which were hung in frames. For Mercuri's inventory of 1682, see the Getty Provenance Index, ASC MS not. Cap. M. Vitellius, sez. XI, t. 53 e t. 64 cc.n.n. On his collection also see Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 51.

of books, too, may indicate the kinds of texts Rosa consulted or perhaps acquired for his own personal collection, frustratingly passed over in his own inventory as "*diversi libri*".[161]

The art dealer and connoisseur Niccolò Simonelli was, along with Cassiano dal Pozzo, a crucial figure in the "revival" of art and letters during the Chigi papacy.[162] He was, as Volpi describes, "the 'omnipresent' arbitrator of taste" in a period defined by collections of "scientific, literary and aesthetic curiosities."[163] It is to Simonelli that Rosa owed his first exposure in Rome at the Pantheon exhibition on the festival of S. Giuseppe in 1637 (or 1638), where the success of his strikingly emotive *Tityus* [Fig. 5] encouraged him to return to the city.[164] Referring explicitly to Simonelli as Rosa's "friend", Passeri considered that the art dealer was responsible for the creation of a mature artistic identity for Rosa: in combination with his regard and esteem as a connoisseur, Simonelli's poetic ekphrasis on the painting and his acclaim for Rosa as the "Demosthenes of Painting" won "universal renown and tumultuous applause for the name of Salvator Rosa, with the aim of blotting out that of 'Salvatoriello' which had been in use until then."[165] In addition to his association with the "*famiglia*" of Cardinal Brancaccio, Simonelli was made *guardaroba* ("administrator and curator of possessions") for Prince Cardinal Camillo Pamphili (1644-1654) in

---

[161] Rosa's inventory names only "una scansietta con diversi libri". Inventory of Salvator Rosa, in Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 96-7, 665v. Mercuri's inventory lists a vast number of books by title, many of them religious and secular histories, but also poetry, literature and ancient philosophy. Among them are books that were generally popular among his contemporaries but held a particular importance for Rosa's personal interests: Giambattista della Porta's *Fisonomia* (700r); Guazzo's *Civile Conversazione* (700v); poems by Tasso, including the *Gerusalemme Liberata* (700v, 709v); Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (701v); Vasari's *Vite* (707v); various works by Daniello Bartoli (709v); Pliny's *Natural History* (710); numerous histories, such as Guicciardini's *Historia d'Italia* and Baronio's *Annali ecclesiastici*; Boccaccio's *Decameron* (708); and Plutarch's *Vite* (708v).

[162] On Cassiano dal Pozzo and his friendships with artists in Rome, see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin*, esp. chapters three and four. Also see Goldman, *Aspects of Seicento Patronage*. Cassiano's correspondence "is filled with requests [from artist friends] for him to intercede with his friend, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, for a commission. On Simonelli, see Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 124 and 135; Alvar González-Palacios ed., *Fasto Romano: dipinti, sculture, arredi dai Palazzi di Roma* (Rome: Leonardo-De Luca, 1991), 119-120; and Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 43-9.

[163] Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini," 78; Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 40-59.

[164] There is documentary evidence for Rosa's presence in Naples in 1637: a payment order for 10 ducats, dated September 25 1637, is recorded in return for funds made over by Niccolò Simonelli. See Antonio Delfino, "Documenti inediti per alcuni pittori del '600," in *Ricerche sul '600 napoletano* (Milan: L & T, 1985), 104.

[165] Passeri, *Vite*, 420: "diede una fama strepitosa al nome di Salvator Rosa, volendo distruggere quello di Salvatoriello fin allora praticato."

1645, and in 1657 was elected to the same position in the service of Cardinal Flavio Chigi – a post that proved useful for Rosa in his own relations with the papal family.[166] Simonelli cultivated both affective and business relationships with many of the artists in Rome, as well as prominent theorists, connoisseurs and collectors among the papal families and the nobility.[167] Rosa appears to have expressed an interest in Simonelli's opinion about his work.[168] The complexity of their relationship and the tension elicited by the attempt to reconcile a true and useful friendship is evident in Rosa's letters.[169] (The conflicted nature of Simonelli's relations with his artist friends, in fact, as a mixture of sincere and instrumental friendship, is especially apparent in a letter written to the dealer by Pietro Testa.[170])

---

[166] A portrait of Simonelli attributed to Giovanni Maria Morandi shows him surrounded by objects from Flavio Chigi's Museo di Curiosità. See Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 47. Simonelli was first elected as the *aiutante di camera* of Prince Camillo in 1644. His subsequent post as *guardaroba* was "a position that constituted the secure encouragement for his artist friends, like Pierfrancesco Mola, Pietro Testa, Grechetto and Rosa." Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 35. Rosa remained close friends with Simonelli even after he had moved into the service of Chigi. This continued friendship is signalled by a letter to Ricciardi of January 29 1650, which reveals Simonelli must have been ill at the time. Borelli, letter 50; also see letter 161.

[167] These included Bernini, Poussin, Pietro Testa, Giovan Benedetto Castiglione, Pier Francesco Mola, Claude Lorrrain, Herman van Swanevelt, Dario Ferro, Giovanni Antonio Brocchetti, Michelangelo Cerquozzi, Gaspard Dughet, Alessandro Salucci, Giacinto Brandi, Domenico Viola, Giovan Pietro Bellori and Francesco Scannelli. See Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 11. Simonelli apparently lent money to Testa, while Castiglione dedicated his print of the philosopher *Diogenes* to him, and Mola poked fun at his friend in a number of caricatures. He also played an important role in instigating commissions for Poussin and Claude Lorrain. On the interesting relations between Mercuri, Simonelli and Mola, see Kahn-Rossi ed., *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*; Capitelli, "'Connoisseurship' al Lavoro: la carriera di Nicolò Simonelli (1611-1671)," *Quaderni Storici* 39: 116 (2004): 375-401; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e cardinale Brancaccio". On the possibility of a "tempestuous" relationship between Mola and Simonelli, as conveyed by some of the artist's caricatures, see Davis, "Pier Francesco Mola's Autobiographical Caricatures," 49. That Rosa may have shared in Mola's contempt for Simonelli is suggested by his reference, in a letter of 1650, to Simonelli as "asinine". Borelli, letter 50. In Rosa's other letters of the early 1650's he refers to the dealer as "coglione", "stolido", "amico universale" and "cortigianello". Borelli, letters 46, 54, and 139.

[168] The first painting Rosa made after returning to Rome in 1649 (interpreted by scholars as a proclamation of his talents to the city's art establishment) was the large *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62]. He finished the painting in October of 1650, asking for the opinions and suggestions of his friend Ricciardi, but not permitting anyone to see the work itself – except, perhaps, for Simonelli. Borelli, letter 86: "posso dire d'haverlo ridotto a qualche segno di perfettione, havendoci agiunte alcune altre notomie, con un tripode antico et acordatolo a meraviglia… quel che importa è che a quest'ora non l'ha veduto altra persona che Simonelli".

[169] In 1649, Rosa wrote to Giulio Maffei of the "disgraceful state of affairs" on his own part and that of Simonelli, with regard to this deal he is trying to sort out with a church with the assistance of both Mercuri and Simonelli. Borelli, letter 29. In 1650, Rosa called him a "coglione, stolido, amico universale". Borelli, letter 46. In 1651, Rosa mocked Simonelli's financial troubles, contrasting them with Mercuri's apparent state of comfort and self-gratification. Borelli, letter 106; also see letters 81, 139. On Simonelli also see Borelli, letters 71, 75, 81, 86, 88. 106, 139, 160, 161 and 165.

[170] See Cropper ed., *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650*, 217-218, cat. 100; and Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 44. Written on the back of a study for "The Feast of Midas", the letter fragment has an

But it was a member of the Chigi family who would prove to be one of Rosa's most crucial allies. Don Mario Chigi, the brother of Pope Alexander VII, came to Rosa's rescue when his acerbic *Allegory of Fortune* [Fig. 98], which critiqued the blind and ignorant favour of papal patronage granted to incompetent artists, landed him in prison.[171] The irony was not lost on Baldinucci, who noted that "this [painting of] Fortune was to be an ill fortune for Salvatore". Accused of having "impudently intended" to conceal within the painting a "most solemn Pasquinade", Rosa was briefly imprisoned and interrogated as to the meaning of the painting. It was thanks to the defense of Don Mario and the two prelates who had seen the painting in Rosa's studio (monsignor Bandinelli and monsignor Rasponi), and who were "already aware of Rosa's intentions," that he managed to escape a conviction.[172] In this instance Rosa must have fully appreciated the value of having "friends" in high places. As both Roworth and Volpi have noted, the coincidence of critique and solicitation implicit in the Getty *Fortune* – an image that seeks to undermine the very same authorities whose acknowledgement and support Rosa craved – is a particularly revealing instance of the tension implicit in Rosa's professional paradox, his desire to be both "independent, aloof, [and] virtuous, and yet at the same time "recognized by the mainstream

---

unclear date; Cropper situates it stylistically "anywhere between 1639 and Testa's death." In the letter, Testa angrily complains that Simonelli has failed "to live up to his expectations of their friendship by trying to pay him off with money." Testa likens him to a tyrant, "swept along by the tempestuous torrent of so many Midases", protesting his affection for him has nothing to do with money.

[171] The *Allegory of Fortune* was exhibited at S. Giovanni Decollato on August 29 1659, or 1658 as Scott has argued. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 124. Rosa intimated the dangerously provocative and satirical nature of the iconography in a letter to Ricciardi. See Borelli, letter 225. As Scott notes, "the frank satiric aspect of the painting, which depicts a figure of Fortune intent on pouring out her copious gifts to an ox, an ass draped in red, a ram, a wild boar, an eagle, a wolf and a cow, would not have been welcome to some courtier or prelate of the Roman court, and Rosa risked receiving the much-feared denunciation of the Holy Office." Rosa encountered various problems in these years, particularly in connection with accusations that he had plagiarized his satires, and made an enemy of the Chigi court-writer Agostino Favoriti. See Scott, *ibid*, 108-10; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e cardinale Brancaccio", 129-30.

[172] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 447. Baldinucci is quick to point out that, although Rosa did not suffer during his detainment, the situation was one that "necessitated the exoneration of his friends". The biographer also claimed to have in his possession "a very learned apology" made in Rosa's defense at the time of his pardon, although the text of this apology has not been found.

of the art world". It also points to the significance of friendship in directing that conflict toward a successful outcome.[173]

Another of Rosa's most important Roman friends bought the *Allegory of Fortune* for his private collection: the wealthy banker, merchant and art collector Carlo de' Rossi.[174] De' Rossi may be characterized first and foremost as a true friend – described by Rosa in the terms of intimate affection (the closeness of which he was on at least one occasion forced to explain to a jealous Ricciardi[175]). But he was also a patron and client who commissioned paintings from Rosa and purchased works the artist made "on spec". As Baldinucci recounts, De' Rossi had a policy of buying Rosa's unsold paintings without any condition on the price – a significant practice in the broader context and evolution of Rosa's valuation of his art and professional identity.[176] Baldinucci makes De' Rossi central to the success of the unorthodox gift-based pricing strategy that was so fundamental to Rosa's self-estimation as a "free" artist:

> "No one could ever get [Rosa] to agree on a determined price prior to [the work] being finished. And for this he gave a most ingenious reason: he was not able to command his paint-brush, which made the painting, if the work was not valued at a large amount; and that, however, when he had executed them, he would give them the esteem they deserved; and then he would then put it to the will of the client [*l'amico*] to take them, or to leave them. In this strategy, however, he made a certain game, because having formed a great friendship with Carlo de' Rossi, who was most partial to his works, when he had made the pictures, he gave them prices: and not finding anyone who thus wanted them, as a solution he gave them [*gli dava*] to him: and in this way he supported large prices. Thus it happened that whoever wanted his pictures was forced to pay him what he wanted; it being his habit, particularly in the later part of his career, to hold as ransom the many paintings he had made in his youth, which, while they had then sold with great effort for three and four *doble* each, a little later were sold for twenty-five to thirty."[177]

It is significant here to note Baldinucci's use of the term "*amico*" in reference not only to De' Rossi but to Rosa's potential clients in general, suggestive of the artist's more pervasive, ideally "affective" characterization of his clientele. Very little evidence survives of Rosa's exchanges with

---

[173] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 217, 225; Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 39.
[174] On De' Rossi and Rosa, see Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 356-7; Limentani, "Nuovi Studi e Richerche," 39, 52ff.
[175] See Borelli, letters 344, 345.
[176] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 483-84.
[177] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 483-84.

other patrons and clients, but his letters (together with Baldinucci's comments) reveal much about his relationship with De' Rossi and the affective dimension of artistic commerce.[178] The dual nature of De' Rossi's role as friend and business associate is succinctly conveyed in Baldinucci's repeated reference to the banker as Rosa's "*grande amico*", the superlative nature of which conveys both his wealth and influence and the intimacy of his affection for the artist.[179] Rosa boasted to Ricciardi about the extravagant spending of his wealthy friend: "every time that Signor Rossi was willing to deprive himself of it," he writes, "four hundred *scudi* could appear in his hands."[180]

De' Rossi's collection of paintings and "museum" of curiosities, located near S. Andrea della Valle, was among the most prominent and highly-regarded of its time.[181] Volpi notes that De' Rossi's collection was systematically arranged "according to the aesthetic principles of the period", and subdivided into different rooms: one displaying works by contemporary artists like Giovan Benedetto Castiglione, Muziano, Lanfranco, Annibale Carracci, Mola, and Michelangelo Cerquozzi; another room with paintings by the great masters, including Sisto Badalocchio and Correggio; and the "museum" of curiosities.[182] Rosa's paintings featured prominently in the collection, among them "landscapes, seaports, battles, histories, poetic fantasies, incantations, and caprices" that were "too numerous to recount" in full.[183] De' Rossi's acquisition of Rosa's works

---

[178] Baldinucci cites De' Rossi among a long list of Rosa's friends who provided the biographer with information about Rosa. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 463-4; also see 454-55.
[179] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 464. Elsewhere Baldinucci describes De' Rossi as a life-long "*cordialissimo amico*." Baldinucci, *ibid*, 441-442.
[180] Borelli, letter 335.
[181] De' Rossi's "museum" was devoted entirely to natural and ethnological curiosities, including a crocodile, horns, armour, and six painted "*coccie di tartaruga*" [turtle shells], one of which was decorated with the image of a seven-headed Hydra and another with the head of Medusa, 'by the hand of [Pier Francesco] Mola'." Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini," 79. His collection was dispersed at his death and divided amongst various other collections. Evidence for the prominence and extent of De' Rossi's collection is provided by a manuscript note in Rome that records the visits made by the Spanish Ambassador, the Marchese del Carpo, to various galleries and collections in Rome, which included De' Rossi's "gallery and museum" as part of the itinerary for June 12 1677; the note records that the collection was valued at about thirty-thousand *scudi*. See Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 190, citing "Roma Ignorata," *Roma*, XIX (1941): 308 (Roma, Ms. Barb 6417: Roma, 12 giugno 1677)
[182] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 357.
[183] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 447 and 466. Volpi calls Rosa the "protagonist" of De' Rossi's collection. Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini," 79.

began perhaps with the large Corsini *Prometheus* [Fig. 43].[184] To this he added the enigmatic *Scene of Witchcraft* [Fig. 41], which he covered with a taffeta curtain in order to enhance its dramatic and provocative potential, the Getty *Fortune*, which Baldinucci claims he greatly hungered after for his collection, and paintings on the themes of *Jove Nursed by the She-Goat Amalthea*, *The Death of Socrates* [Fig. 59], *The Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus*, *The Prodigal Son*, a *Portrait of Music*, *Lot and his Daughters*, *The Finding of Moses*, and *Mercury and Argus*, as well as a number of obscure philosophical subjects and religious themes.[185] He also seems to have owned a portrait (perhaps a self-portrait) of Rosa, described in his inventory as "a drawing of one *palmo* and a quarter with a frame, which depicts the portrait of Salvator Rosa, covered in glass."[186] It was also to De' Rossi

[184] The Corsini *Prometheus* may correspond with the work listed in De' Rossi's inventory, remaining in his collection until his death in 1683. This, Caterina Volpi suggests, was likely the first contact between the rich banker and Rosa, mediated by the "far-sighted" Simonelli. Volpi, "L'ordine delle immagini," 79.

[185] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 445. On the *Scene of Witchcraft* and its curtain, see Rosa's letter to Ricciardi of 1666. Borelli, letter 335. For De' Rossi's particular desire for the *Allegory of Fortune*, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 447. The *Jove* is identified by Salerno as last located in the Marlborough Fine Arts Gallery, London. Salerno, *L'opera completa*, no. 190. Rosa refers to the *Regulus* as in De' Rossi's possession in a letter to Ricciardi of 1666. Borelli, letter 333. The *Prodigal Son* is probably a different version to the painting of the same subject in the Hermitage (Salerno, *L'opera completa*, fig. 127) which Baldinucci says was owned by Agostino Correggio. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 362, note 16. Fumagalli notes that a "Prodigal Son" by Rosa is also recorded in the guide to Florence by Bocchi and Cinelli of 1677 as in the house of Del Rosso, "la cui vivezza, e bizzarria è tale, che rende meravigliato l'occhio, ed è lungo braccia sei." Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 69. The *Portrait of Music* is identified in De' Rossi's inventory as a woman with brown hair, meaning it cannot be the *Allegory of Music* in the Palazzo Barberini [Fig. 18]. It could be identified with the so-called *Allegory of Poetry*, also in the Palazzo Barberini [Fig. 19]. Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 362, note 19. The *Lot and his Daughters* is identified by Salerno with a painting in the Di Castro collection in Rome. Salerno, *ibid*, no. 220. The *Mercury and Argus* is identified by Salerno with a painting in a Roman private collection. Salerno, *ibid*, no. 204. For the inventory of October 27 1683, see Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, doc. CLXXII, 77-82; Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 364-373. Interestingly, De' Rossi's inventory reveals many more religious-themed works than Ricciardi's, which contains more of Rosa's philosophically-themed images.

[186] Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 82, c. 170. "Un disegno di palmi uno et un quarto con cornice debano dove vi è il ritratto di Salvatore Rosa con il cristallo sopra." Meroni notes that a letter from Baldinucci to Apollonio Bassetti, dated June 11 1681 "there is mentioned a 'Nota di ritratti di pittori veduti in Roma' destined for the Grand Duke of Tuscany, in which there is recorded a 'Ritratto di Salvator Rosa, stato suo amicissimo' in the house of Carlo de' Rossi, Rosa's friend. From the context of the letter it is not clear whether the note refers to portraits in oil or drawings, or whether they are self-portraits. It is therefore possible that the drawing with the portrait of Rosa was that seen by Baldinucci and that it may therefore be a self-portrait." Meroni, *ibid*, note 21; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, ed. Barocchi, 488, Appendix VI. Julius Held observed that "portrait drawings were considered to be cheap substitutes for painted portraits in the seventeenth century." Held, "The Early Appreciation of Drawings," Studies in Western Art, Acts of the 20th Intl. Congress of the History of Art (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 3: 76; cited in
Goldman, *Aspects of Seicento Patronage*, 103.

that Rosa dedicated his *Figurine* etchings – a gesture that is closely tied to Rosa's strategy of gift-giving as part of his conception of free artistic commerce, a practice I will explore in detail below.

Haskell argued that De' Rossi provided negligible "encouragement and intellectual stimulus" for Rosa or his work, but the banker's interests in art, literature, poetry, and music were nonetheless on a par with the artist's own, and his desire to promote Rosa seems to have known few bounds.[187] Rosa felt free, for example, to avail himself of his friend's acquisition of a chapel in S. Maria di Montesanto, one of the twin churches in the Piazza del Popolo, for the purpose of displaying his artistic talents as a painter of sacred history subjects.[188] Baldinucci says that Rosa offered to paint the canvases for the chapel for free, but in his letters to Ricciardi of 1659 he lamented that the project was suffering from a lack of funding.[189] Rosa frequently relied on De' Rossi's financial support, and, in spite of the largesse he expressed to his wealthy friend by offering to work for free. This expectation may have contributed toward a rift in their relationship. In November of 1667, Rosa was embroiled in an argument with De' Rossi and Ricciardi over the possibility of having a copy made of the *Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus* in De' Rossi's collection. Ricciardi had asked Rosa for a copy, but De' Rossi had apparently refused his consent.[190] True to form, Ricciardi turned it into a personal affront, accusing Rosa of favouring the banker's friendship over his own. Rosa responded with his usual hyperbolic stream of protestation, adding for emphasis his own remorse at a lack of appropriate reciprocation on De' Rossi's part for being made the dedicatee of the *Figurine* etchings. But Rosa's threat to withdraw both his friendship and

---

[187] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 144.

[188] Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 359. On the chapel and its decoration, see Volpi, *ibid*, 358-361.

[189] See Borelli, letters 225 and 227. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 465-6. Rosa died before the project was finished. Baldinucci writes that, in order to honour his deceased friend, De' Rossi placed in his chapel (the Chapel of the Crucifix) five paintings by Rosa, including *Daniel in the Lion's Den*, *Geremia Rescued from the Pit*, *The Resurrection of Lazarus*, *The Story of Tobias*, and *The Risen Christ* – all of which were exhibited by Rosa much earlier in 1662 at the S. Giovanni Decollato. De' Rossi also erected a memorial inscription that read: "*Carolus de Rubeis Civis Romanus / Pietatis ET amicitiae memor / Plurimis e tabulis a Salvatore/ Rosa depictis / Quas diu inter domesticas habuit / Has Christi patientis figures / Privatis ab umbris / Publicam / in lucem / Exposuit / Anno Domini 1677*." On the chapel, see Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 357-61. The paintings were acquired in 1802 from Prince Leopoldo di Borbone, and are now in the Musée Condé, Chantilly.

[190] Borelli, letters 332 and 333.

commerce from De' Rossi expresses as much a desire to appease the constantly jealous Ricciardi as it does anger toward their mutual friend.[191]

When it came to relations with the market and its dealers, Rosa's letters reveal a mixed opinion. He seems to have regarded the relationship as potentially profitable on certain occasions, for both his pocket and his reputation, as in the case of the dealer that Francesco Cordini found for him in Rome in 1651.[192] In 1662 Rosa was availing himself of merchants in the sale and distribution of his etchings – probably the *Figurine* – in Flanders and Paris, which he gave to them for half a *scudo* (that is, 5 *giulii*) each but which sold for 6 *giulii* "in the hopes that they would in time increase in price, and certain veneration".[193] In other instances, Rosa derided the market as the source of his poverty, financial and otherwise, complaining about the vices of "*mercanti*".[194] Rosa's conflicted attitude is reflected in his relationship with Cordini, his Florentine art dealer. Cordini can be characterized as Rosa's friend and business associate, and their relationship continued even after Rosa returned to Rome in 1649. A courtier in the service of the Medici, Cordini was a member of Rosa's *Accademia dei Percossi* and a poet and actor on close terms with many of Rosa's Florentine companions, including Ricciardi, and he shared professional and personal relationships with other artists like Francesco Furini, Baldassare Franceschini ("il

---

[191] See Borelli, letters 344 and 345.

[192] Borelli, letter 92. Rosa wrote to Ricciardi that Cordini had found a merchant in Rome who "ha dato ordine qui in Roma ad un mercante che ad ogni mia domanda mi sborsi ducento scudi d'oro ad una mia semplice ricevuta, e questo lo fa a ciò venendomi occasione mi prevaglia non d'altri che di lui. Che ne dite Ricciardi, non son motivi questi da predicarli conforme ho fatto e lo fo' per Roma?"

[193] Borelli, letter 271.

[194] In 1653 Rosa called Ricciardi "*Signor mercante*," mocking his unreasonable request for expensive copies as a sign of his squandering inclinations and comparable "wealth," pointing out that "poor young people" are forced to spend as little as possible since the cost of living preoccupies them more than matters of art. Borelli, letter 159. He mocked his friend again in 1666 for his naivety in the practical and financial matters of making copies. Borelli, letter 332. Rosa also lamented the vices of "*mercanti*", this time in reference to Carlo de' Rossi, who had reneged on a promise to secure an investment for him (with a six percent return on an investment of four-thousand *scudi*, at twenty *scudi* a month), confessing to Ricciardi in 1666 that "the spirits [*anime*] of merchants are very different from our own." Borelli, letters 305, 315, 316, 328. Pascoli accused Rosa's early art dealers of attempting to control his practice and keep him away from potential collectors in order to reap the profits of sales of his paintings. But he is the only biographer of the artist to make this claim, one that may well have been coloured by his more general disdain toward art dealers. Pascoli, *Vite*, 135; cited in Marshall, "Dispelling Negative Perceptions," 366.

Volterrano"), Cecco Bravo, and Elisabetta Sirani.[195] He acted, as did Ricciardi on occasion (particularly after Rosa had his first falling out with Cordini[196]), as a mediator when Rosa sent paintings from Rome to some of his client-friends back in Florence.[197] In his letters of 1651 it is apparent that Rosa trusted his friend to make both business and technical decisions on his behalf.[198] He frequently provided Rosa with pigments and other tools of his trade.[199] Like other merchants of

---

[195] Cordini married Ortensia Leoni in 1658, a descendent of a noble Bolognese family. He suffered various misfortunes, but never seems to have lost support of Medici family. He was still alive in 1684: his name appears in the testament of the cavaliere Matteo Zeffi, who left Cordini four paintings by Cecco Bravo in his will of January 3 1685. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 66; Gerhard Ewald, "Hitherto Unknown Works by Cecco Bravo," *Burlington Magazine* 102: 689 (1960): 348 (ASF, Notarile Moderno 19121, Notaio Filippo Vezzi di San Miniato, Testamenti dal 1666 al 1692, 25v- 30r). Thanks to Leopoldo de' Medici's protection, in 1659 Cordini was nominated for one year with the charge of the '*sottoprovveditore'* of Livorno, but then, because of some badly conducted affairs, he was forced to leave Florence. In 1664 he wrote to Leopoldo from Venice, asking for his help to return to the city and assuring him of his unconditional fidelity. Fumagalli, *ibid*, 129, n. 141. Volpi notes that Rosa's relationship with Cordini was "one of the most stable and lasting" of his friendships, as Rosa's own letters demonstrate. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 44. (Rosa mentions Cordini in eighty-five of his extant letters, from 1648-1670, spanning almost the entire duration of the extant correspondence.) In a letter by Cosimo Brunetti to Carlo Dati of 1652, Cordini is identified as Rosa's "amicissimo". BNCF MS Bald. 258 II 35, 139. On Cordini's friendship with Furini, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, IV: 639, 644; Volpi, *ibid*, 44, note 71; Goguel, "Francesco Furini dans le prisme du dessin," in *Un'altra bellezza. Francesco Furini*, 87. Cordini also traded in Baldassare Franceschini's works, and he requested a portrait of the young artist from the collection of padre Bonaventura Cavallo. Del Bravo, "La 'fiorita gioventù' del Volteranno," 158. Cordini was in contact with Elisabetta Sirani, who painted for him in 1661 the portrait of his wife Ortensia as *St. Dorothy* (Madison, Elvehjem Museum of Art, University of Wisconsin) and also an "Amorino". Babette Bohn, in *Elisabetta Sirani: una virtuosa del Seicento Bolognese*, ed. Adelina Modesti (Bologna: Compositori, 2004), 201-2, cat. 48; Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 129, n. 145. He was also friends with Francesco Brunetti and Volunnio Bandinelli.

[196] Before becoming a reader in Philosophy at University of Pisa, Ricciardi dealt in paintings that Rosa touched up for him. Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 91-92. Rosa referred to Ricciardi as "Signor mercante" in a letter of 1653, a comment that Scott proposes as evidence that Rosa had stopped employing Cordini as his dealer after this date. Borelli, letter 159; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 95, also see Borelli, letter 173. There are no other specific references to Cordini receiving or selling new works by Rosa after this date. In May 1670 Rosa sent his painting of *S. Torpè* for Pisa Cathedral via Ricciardi from Rome. Borelli, letter 380.

[197] When Rosa left Florence and returned to Rome, where he was based for the rest of his life, Cordini became Rosa's agent in Florence and he "sold some pictures which had been left behind in Tuscany as well as new ones sent from Rome and he seems to have increased the supply by the judicious use of copyists." Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 95. In 1651, Rosa sent some "*Teste*" or portrait-head paintings to Ricciardi from Rome, which arrived first to the care of Cordini, and were intended for Luigi Lanfreducci and Pietro Pandolfini. Borelli, letters 84, 85, 86. Lanfreducci was a cavaliere of Santo Stefano and dedicatee of "a poetic joke" by Ricciardi. Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 70, note 13. Pandolfini had commissioned from Rosa also a picture for one of his chapels. Borelli, letter 65, note 1.

[198] See Borelli, letters 86, 92, and 100.

[199] See Borelli, letters 62, 64, 73.

his kind, Cordini seems to have commissioned paintings directly from Rosa for both his own collection and for sale.[200]

Rosa's dealings with Cordini reveal the tricky procedure of mixing business with friendship – or, seen in a different light, the advantage to Rosa's autonomy of defining commerce in affective terms. The dilemma of Rosa's relationship with Cordini rests in part on Baldinucci's identification of a number of the paintings Rosa made for his friend as "gifts". Rosa painted the large *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31] for his "dear friend" Cordini "as a gift" (*dipinse in dono*), the painting lauded in an ode by their mutual friend Jacopo Salviati.[201] Rosa also painted "for" Cordini the *Arion on the Dolphin* [Fig. 40], the tondo with *Democritus and Heraclitus* [Fig. 38], the *Pan and Syrinx* [Fig. 37] two seascapes, five other small pictures, some landscapes, and some "*teste* in imitation of ancient painters".[202] The first mention Rosa makes of Cordini's role in his professional activity is in a letter to Ricciardi of January 1650, where he discusses both the *Arion on the Dolphin* and the *Pan and Syrinx*.[203] In August of the same year, Rosa asked Ricciardi (who was then in Florence) to "not forget to indicate to Signor Cordini my obligations and to point out to him that

---

[200] On this practice, see Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 5; also see Costello, "The Twelve Pictures Ordered by Velazquez and the Trial of Valguarnera," 261; a similar procedure is outlined by Christopher Marshall in his account of a Neapolitan merchant's dealings with Luca Giordano, who "speculated in Luca Giordano's pictures by commissioning and paying for them in advance with the intention of selling them after completion." Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market," 434; Marshall, "*Appagare il pubblico*: The Marketing Strategies of Luca Giordano, 1678-1684," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al., 245-52. Collectors, too, often bought paintings as investments, intending to re-sell them at some point. Cavazzini, *ibid*, 118. "Collectors could also use works of art as cash, or less frequently, to raise cash, nourishing a huge secondary market; they could pawn paintings, use them as security deposits in business deals, as payment of debts or dowries, or in exchange for objects they coveted. If, in the past, we might have thought that art connoisseurs like Giulio Mancini, Niccolo Simonelli, or Ferrante Carlo assembled art only for their pleasure, we might have been disabused of that notion. Mancini was more than willing to sell his collection; Simonelli was involved in many deals, some of them rather suspicious; and Carlo was heavily involved in trading." On Mancini, see Capitelli, "'Connoisseurship' al Lavoro: la carriera di Nicolò Simonelli (1611-1671)," 375-401; Michele Maccherini, "Caravaggio nel carteggio familiare di Giulio Mancini," *Prospettiva* 86 (1997): 73, 80; for collections assembled for profit, see Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistic romano," 44-49; and Spezzaferro "Le collezioni di 'alcuni gentiluomini particolari' e il mercato: appunti su Lelio Guidoccioni e Francesco Angeloni," 241-56.

[201] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 455. For Salviati's poem, see Appendix VII. 4.

[202] *Ibid*, 456. Baldinucci erroneously identifies the figure of Arion as an "Adonis". He does not identify the *Pan and Syrinx* outright, although Rosa's letters indicate it was among the works he made for Cordini.

[203] Borelli, letter 48: "E pur voi mi scrivete che v'ha chiesto 60 scudi dell'Arione, e l'Arione non vale per la metà della Siringa, sì per essere altrettanto grande, come per essere ancora assai megliore."

business of the *Syrinx*."[204] This "business" would turn out to be one of the first instances of conflict between the two friends, for, in March of 1656, Rosa complained to Ricciardi that Cordini had been having copies made of the *Pan and Syrinx* without his permission and was dealing them outside of Florence. Rosa resolved, however, that since the copies resulted "for the most part in favour of my praise and reputation" he would forgive his friend the offence.[205] Matters came to a head in May of 1659, when Rosa maligned Cordini as the "perverse Judas of my incomparable loyalty",[206] perhaps in response to Cordini's sale of the works Rosa had entrusted to him as "gifts" (including the *Democritus and Heraclitus*, the *Pan and Syrinx*, the *Arion on the Dolphin*, and the *Moral Philosophy* among other paintings) to the Archduke of Austria. Baldinucci recorded the transaction: "after being enjoyed for many years" by Cordini, the art dealer sold the paintings to the Archduke Ferdinand Carlo for eight-hundred *scudi*, a price, determined by Justus Sustermans and Mario Balassi, that Rosa probably deemed an insufficient sum.[207]

In May of 1660 Rosa was still angry with the dealer, citing with irony the admonition in Ricciardi's poem for Cordini, *Il Tempo*: "do not live alone and give your days from friends to fate/ be reborn in the Arno".[208] By August of that year the ongoing peccadillo with Cordini had tipped Rosa over the edge: "Cordini, together with that *sogettino* of proud Saturn, has given the finishing

---

[204] Borelli, letter 67.

[205] Borelli, letter 86. Rosa informs Ricciardi that a certain Signor Cavaliere Andrea Leoni "who dined with us in Bologna" had been inquiring with Rosa about the *Pan and Syrinx*, having told Rosa that he had seen a painting of the same subject in Bologna by Rosa's hand. Rosa was thus led to believe, to his dismay, that Cordini had been making copies of the original painting, causing him to write to Cordini angrily about it. However, Rosa found that "poiché la cosa è andata diversamente dal sospetto concepito, anzi in maggior mia laude e riputatione", he felt obliged to retract his resentful remarks and "chiedendoli cento volte perdono se forse la mia impatienza havesse corso più del suo dovere in concepir concetto sinistro della sua lealtà", adding that "nelle cose che s'appartengono alla riputatione della mia arte vivo soverchiamente geloso, e sospettoso." Cordini likely took particular advantage of the Bolognese art scene, where he must have had connections as a result of his wife's family. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 66. That reputation endured as a factor in the valuation of art well into the later *seicento* is signaled by Baldinucci's admonishment to his reader to assess art "with the eyes and not the ears". Spear, "Di Sua Mano," 98.

[206] Borelli, letter 222.

[207] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 456. It is unclear whether or not Rosa received any payment from this sale. No mention of the details of the transaction appears in the biographies or Rosa's letters.

[208] See Borelli, letters 235, 236. Rosa cites stanzas 33 and 37 of Ricciardi's poem *Il Tempo*. See Appendix II. 2.

touches to my volition, and convinced me for the rest of my life to hate that kind of men."[209] This was not the first time Cordini had "betrayed" him by (as Rosa put it), "keeping works only in order to give them away". In July of 1653 Rosa had written to Ricciardi in frustration over losing money on the sale of a group of paintings, receiving only a "meagre" sixty *scudi* for them. On this occasion, Rosa had taken the high road, claiming he did not mind the loss so much if it helped a friend like Cordini who was then in financial difficulty.[210] (The munificent painter-philosopher, indifferent to riches, once again rears his head.) As Fumagalli has argued, Rosa's regard for Cordini as a friend on an equal footing, who shared his intellectual interests, was likely at the root of his dismay over the problems that plagued the business side of their relationship.[211]

Rosa's anger at Cordini over the sale of his paintings suggests that they usually arranged some form of agreement, although perhaps not always formalized. It is unclear whether or not Rosa and Cordini (or Rosa and his other dealer-friends) drew up contracts with each other, as was frequently the practice among artists and dealers in the period.[212] Riccardo Spinelli's discovery of payment documents for Rosa's paired *Landscapes with St. John the Baptist* (1656-7, Art Gallery, Glasgow), bought by the Marchesi Guadagni,[213] suggested to Fumagalli clear evidence of Rosa's and Cordini's working procedure: in October of 1656, Cordini collected the deposit of thirty *scudi* on behalf of Rosa, who received the final sale payment of two-hundred *scudi* himself almost a year later. The initial thirty *scudi* was likely the price Rosa paid to Cordini "for his brokerage services."[214] Many artists regarded this form of contract as yet a further restriction on their

---

[209] Borelli, letter 238: "Il Cordini assieme con quel sogettino del fiero Saturno, hanno dato l'ultima mano alla mia volontà, e confirmatomi per tutto il resto di mia vita ad odiare il genere degl'huomini …"
[210] Borelli, letter 173: "questo l'ho fatto per levar l'amico da impaccio, non curandomi di perderci venti scudi di borsa che pagai di più al pittore d'essi."
[211] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 74.
[212] Lorizzo, "People and Practices," 354. .
[213] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 457.
[214] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 74-5; Spinelli, "Indagini sulle decorazioni secentesche del Casino Guadagni 'di San Clemente' a Firenze'," *Quaderni di Palazzo Te* 4 (1996), 59, 65, n. 154.

professional freedom.[215] Rosa's cultivation of an affective relationship with Cordini (and his other dealer-friends) was pursued with this very liberty in mind; the same ideal also worked in the favour of the dealer, who benefitted financially from maintaining (and exploiting) that bond of friendship with his artist-clients.[216] In "giving" his paintings to Cordini, and in emphasizing the emotional aspects of his relationship with the dealer, Rosa infused the procedure of art commerce with an affective dimension that engendered the requisite freedom of his desired professional identity. But Rosa's expectation that Cordini would sell the paintings for a high price – rather than "give" them away for a pittance[217] – shows that this discourse of "giving" was always at base about the expectation of gain (both monetary and reputational), in which the value the artist and his art was defined not merely by an ideal "freedom" from financial limits, but by the upper-most bounds of that monetary threshold. It was (and still remains) a truism that only the most wealthy among us are truly "free".

V.5. Making a Brand. The Art Market, The Exhibition, the Gift and other Individualizing Strategies of the "Free" Artist's Professional Practice

In the valuation and sale of his art, Rosa availed himself of a number of strategies that explicitly allied his trade, his wares, and his person with an ideal (if not always real) image of professional liberty. The *seicento* art market was regarded as an "open" economic venue in contrast to the traditional system of patronage. Other artists had used the market as a strategy for both sale and self-promotion: the experiences of Caravaggio and Ribera, for example, are cited by Haskell as

---

[215] Lorizzo, "People and Practices," 355.

[216] Lorizzo notes that most dealers and artists did not form this kind of close relationship; those who did, however, occasionally reaped the economic benefits that such a friendship could offer. For the Genovese dealer Pellegrino Peri (1624-1699), for example, "commercial success was based above all on his ability to establish personal relationships with his artists, who were bound to him also by loans of money." The inventory of the picture-seller Francesco Saluzzi describes the painter Francesco Raspantino (who was a student of Domenichino) as his "amico confidentissimo". Lorizzo, "People and Practices," 359, 356, 358.

[217] Rosa made the same distinction when he discussed the sale of his *Democritus in Meditation* [Fig. 62]: anxious to sell the painting, rather than "give it away" ("li voglio vendere, e non donare"), he was waiting to receive a higher offer than two-hundred and fifty *scudi*. Borelli, letter 129.

primary examples of the role played by art dealers and the market in the "careers of young and unknown artists" in early *seicento* Rome.[218] The professional art dealer emerged from the "cultural agents" of the courts, whose responsibilities included the solicitation and employ of artists in the service of their rulers.[219] Artists could profit from a dealer's services in making a name for themselves, particularly in cases where the artist was "unable to fit into the established system". Once that was achieved, however, the dealers were no longer desired or in many cases required. They were generally regarded with distrust by artists and the public alike, who questioned their wisdom and judgment.[220] By Rosa's time, the artist-dealer relationship offered both the promise of freedom for the artist and the danger of relegating the art object to a mere commodity rather than a product of genius – an association in which the opportunity for making reputation threatened at the same time the very ideal on which that reputation was founded.[221] But the dealer's specialized knowledge and contacts were often invaluable to artists, especially at an early point in their careers.[222] It was to the benefit of dealer and artist alike to cultivate a young artist's reputation, and for each partner to take full advantage of the large network of relationships they had formed with collectors, patrons and a wide variety of intermediaries.[223] Defining the artist-dealer relationship as a "friendship", as Rosa did with Cordini, was a frequent source of strife, since the negotiation of prices could occasionally threaten both the personal relation as much as the sale. In this they were

---

[218] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 120; Mancini, *Considerazioni*, I, 249-251; Lorizzo, "People and Practices," 352.
[219] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 75.
[220] Vasari referred to one art dealer as an "ignoble second hand dealer [*rigattiere*] and cheapskate two-penny trader". Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Bettarini and Barocchi, V: 317. The "shady business" of art dealing is suggested by the records of the criminal archives that Cavazzini explored as the basis for her own study of the early *seicento* Roman art economy, providing "some justification" for Passeri's "disparaging remarks about the art market". Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 131; see Passeri, ed. J. Hess, 96-7, 277, 289, 322, 392. For negative assessments of dealers, and an alternatively more positive view, see Christopher Marshall, "Dispelling Negative Perceptions: Dealers Promoting Artists in Seventeenth-Century Naples", in *Mapping Markets for Paintings*, 363-4, 366, 367, 372, 373.
Also on the relations of dealers and artists, see Montias, "Art Dealers in Holland," in *Economics of Art and Culture*, ed. V. A. Ginsburgh (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2004), 76-7.
[221] See Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 80; and Brewer, "Positioning the Market," 141.
[222] Cecchini, "Troublesome Business: Dealing in Venice, 1600-1750," in *Mapping Markets for Paintings*, 131.
[223] Marshall, "Dispelling Negative Perceptions," 375-77.

both caught up in the game of "constant social positioning" that defined *seicento* professional experience.[224]

Rosa's comments on the market, and his relationships with its professional purveyors, show a conflicted attitude toward both its pitfalls and benefits. Interestingly, Rosa dabbled in a little dealing himself, searching the Roman art market for appropriate paintings to fulfill the requests of Ricciardi, Giulio Maffei and other Florentine friends.[225] In this he exhibited a disposition that was more pronounced in the careers of other artists like Guido Reni, who was inspired by the market's lucrative promise to announce his plan to "quit" painting for art dealing.[226] Together with the venue of the exhibition, the practices of making copies, the circulation and sale of etchings (some of which were made in solicitation of commissions), the pursuit of novel iconography, the creation of a professional self-image based in the principles of autodidacticism, philosophical poverty (countered by practicable gain), secretive working habits and speed of execution, and a variety of interconnected pricing strategies aimed at freeing the work of art from its fiscal limitations (yet simultaneously ensuring its high monetary value), Rosa's professional *modus operandi* comprised an "entrepreneurial performance" (to borrow from Goldthwaite[227]). Rosa's practices are rarely of his own invention. In his hands, however, they comprise a programmatic mission unlike any other – as Ebert-Schifferer puts it, a "niche of market propaganda with a specific promotional attitude, a true and proper brand."[228]

---

[224] Neil de Marchi, Hans J. Van Miegroet and Matthew E. Raiff, "Dealer-Dealer Pricing in the mid-Seventeenth-Century Antwerp to Paris Art Trade," in *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, ed. North and Ormrod, 115, 118.
[225] In 1650 Rosa wrote to Giulio to tell him he had found certain paintings for his Gallery. Borelli, letter 53; also see letter 57. In 1652 he sent two still-life paintings to Ricciardi. Borelli, letter 138. In 1660 Rosa told Ricciardi he had found a copy of a painting by Van Laer (Bamboccio) for him. Borelli, letter 234. And in 1662, Rosa wrote to Ricciardi that he had sent two paintings of "flowers" (*fiori*), as requested, to one of Ricciardi's friends in Turin. Borelli, letter 261.
[226] Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 156; Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice*, 2: 16-17.
[227] Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market," 434.
[228] Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 67.

Finding a Middle-Ground: The Contentious Practices of the Art Market and the Public Exhibition

The public art exhibitions that became such a popular feature of *seicento* Rome from the 1650's onward offered Rosa a critical setting for both the display and valuation of his art. His epistolary comments show that he regarded the exhibitions as an essential route toward professional success. Rosa worked hard, even to the detriment of his health, to make an impressive annual display.[229] As Roworth argues, Rosa may well have regarded the permanent exhibitions in Rome, which he used "more than any other contemporary artist," as an opportunity to respond to the criticism of his professional detractors, especially those among the ranks of the Roman academies.[230] These exhibitions, held on the occasion of saints' festivals, played a key role in defining the new autonomous status of both artists and their art.[231] The exhibitions organized at the Pantheon by the *Congregazione dei Virtuosi*, a confraternity made up primarily of artists held annually on the festival of S. Giuseppe (March 19), began in the early seventeenth century with the primary purpose of promoting charity, but by the middle of the century they were being used by artists (especially Rosa, but also others like Diego Velazquez) as a venue for self-promotion.[232] Rosa's habitual use of the exhibition, and his comments about it in his letters, has provided scholars with much of their knowledge of the phenomenon in *seicento* Rome.[233] Already in 1654, Rosa was

---

[229] See Borelli, letters 224, 225, 272, 277, 325, 328 and 359.
[230] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 354. Rosa's faith in the exhibitions as a venue for making his reputation is clear from his comment in a letter of 1652 to Ricciardi: "La settimana passata rinuntiai d'andare in Svetia e tutto naqque dall'applauso del mio ultimo quadro esposto in San Gioseppe in Rotonda." Borelli, letter 128. Rosa's intention was "to increase his reputation rather than bring in immediate cash, for pictures were not sold on the spot and admirers waited for the artist to take his canvas home before making an offer." Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 126; *idem*, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 109; citing Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 443: "ove avveniva sempre, che appena se le fosse egli [Salvator Rosa] riportate a casa, che ell'erano chieste e ben ricompensate ...". Only then did a potential client make an offer, suggesting that the primary intention of the work's display was self-promotion rather than an immediate sale. Haskell, *ibid*, 112.
[231] Pelles, "The Image of the Artist", 127; Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 125.
[232] "Each artist could submit one picture and a selection was made by the members of the Congregazione. The pictures chosen were then arranged under the colonnade of the portico, while above the balustrade was hung a large *Dream of St. Joseph* and probably tapestries. Both old masters and contemporary works were shown." Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 126; also see Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 126. On Velazquez's use of the Roman exhibition venue in 1650, see Haskell, *ibid*, 126.
[233] Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 113.

boasting to Ricciardi that he was "usually a great success" at the Pantheon exhibitions.[234] The other principal annual exhibition in Rome was held at the cloisters of San Giovanni Decollato on the festival of S. Giovanni (August 29). These exhibitions, traceable to at least 1603, were defined by a competition organized by leading noble Roman families and thus "redounded to their credit … as much as to that of the artists represented."[235] It was here that Rosa exhibited his infamous *Fortune* in 1659. In 1662, the Sacchetti family sponsored the exhibition and, although they gave special privilege to their favoured painter Pietro da Cortona, Rosa managed to include two paintings of his own.[236] In 1668, it was the Rospigliosi's turn: endeavouring to outdo all previous exhibitions, they decided to focus on old masters rather than contemporary painters, borrowing works from the prominent collectors of the city including Queen Christina of Sweden. Rosa managed to enter three of his own paintings into the mix, boasting to Ricciardi that he "alone among living artists" had secured a place in a venue he likened to the "Valley of Jehosephat".[237]

Originally intended as occasions for religious devotion,[238] the more regular exhibitions at the Pantheon and S. Giovanni Decollato were gradually turned into sites for the display and

---

[234] Borelli, letter 176.
[235] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 127.
[236] The paintings included the *Pythagoras Emerging from the Underworld* and *Pythagoras and the Fishermen* [Figs. 111 and 112], a *Jeremiah Freed from the Pit* (later purchased by Carlo de' Rossi; now Chantilly, Musée Condé), and two other paintings that Rosa does not identify by subject. (Borelli suggested they could be the *Landscape with Pythagoras and the Fishermen* (formerly London, Christie's; see Salerno, *L'opera completa*, 98, no. 166) and the *Landscape with Tobias and the Angel* (Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum; Salerno, *ibid*, 103, no. 238) since they "have identical measurements and can also stylistically be considered *pendants*." Borelli, letters 272 and 277. In 1666 Rosa exhibited his *Pan and Pindar* [Fig. 126], *The Conspiracy of Catiline* [Fig. 121], a *Centaur Chiron teaching Achilles*, and an *Aethra showing Theseus the sword and shoes of Aegeus*. See Borelli, letter 328.
[237] Borelli, letter 359. Rosa boasted that this coup would secure his fame in Rome. The paintings were the *Saul and the Witch of Endor* and a *St. George and the Dragon*. Passeri, *Vite*, 392. Rosa also exhibited at S. Giovanni Decollato in 1663 and 1666. It appears that Rosa exhibited only one painting at a time at the Pantheon, while he showed multiple canvases at a time at San Giovanni Decollato. This provoked Haskell to presume that *all* artists who exhibited at the Pantheon only exhibited one work a year. Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 112. Baldinucci records that Rosa also exhibited at the cortile of S. Bartolommeo de' Bergamaschi. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 443.
[238] These exhibitions were primarily intended to promote good works in the form of charity and to glorify religion, and were "not designed to serve the artist's desire for recognition and were at first rarely so used." This throws into sharper relief the significance of Rosa's adoption of these exhibitions as a venue for self-promotion. Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 110.

promotion of artists themselves, borrowing in part from earlier, more "casual" exhibitions of paintings carried out by patrons who publicly displayed the works they had commissioned – a practice that engendered competition among artists and produced an opportunity for self-advertisement.[239] The practice of temporarily displaying works of art in the storefronts of artist's or *bottegari*'s workshops – long in use prior to the development of the more permanent church exhibitions in Rome – also provided an important precursor for public presentation. Rosa availed himself of this practice during his youth in Naples, where the related ritual of independent public exhibition was also gaining ground.[240] Passeri claims that Rosa also made paintings expressly for the Roman *botteghe* during his early years in the service of Cardinal Brancaccio.[241]

"Performance" is once again a key concept for understanding the appeal of both the local *bottegari* storefronts and the church exhibition (as well as the public altarpiece commission) for Rosa: opportunities for cultivating "public spectacle", these sites of display are connected to the ideal of the "*verifica pubblica*", the public debut and judgment of the work of art (the "public" being first and foremost the art establishment) upon which Rosa placed such a high premium as the qualitative barometer of both his work and person. Rosa's concern over the public assessment of his art is apparent in his anxiety in 1652 concerning an *avviso* – a proto-newspaper report often

[239] For example, the 1607 exhibition of Caravaggio's *Death of the Virgin* by the Duke of Mantua's Roman agent, who was pressured by painters of Rome to put it on display. Malvasia notes that Guido Reni showed his *Twelve Apostles* at the church of Sant'Agostino in Rome, and that Cavaliere d'Arpino "advised a Theatine priest from Sant'Andrea della Valle to buy them." Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 126. In 1603, Orazio Gentileschi displayed his painting of the *Archangel St. Michael* at "S. Giovanni de' Fiorentini" (which Haskell interprets as S. Giovanni Decollato, a Florentine church), at the same time as his (and Caravaggio's) rival Giovanni Baglione displayed a painting of *Divine Love,* made, apparently, in explicit competition with Caravaggio's earlier painting of *Earthly Love.* Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 113.

[240] Marshall, "Markets, Money and Artistic Manoeuvres: Bernardo Cavallino and the Grand Manner", in *The Italians in Australia*, ed. Marshall, 45. Ribera, Cavallino and Micco Spadaro all practiced independent public exhibitions in the first half of the century. See Marshall, "*Appagare il pubblico*," 245-52. On Rosa's use of the *botteghe* in Naples, see Passeri, *Vite*, 419; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438-9.

[241] Passeri, *Vite*, 418. The *bottegari* were one of a number of categories of art dealer, painters who sold both their own work and that of other artists from their own workshops, and which were particularly active in Naples. Marshall, "Dispelling Negative Perceptions," 368.

[241] Passeri, *Vite*, 418. The *bottegari* were one of a number of categories of art dealer, painters who sold both their own work and that of other artists from their own workshops, and which were particularly active in Naples. Marshall, "Dispelling Negative Perceptions," 368.

recording as news the public unveiling of a work of art – which neglected to mention the *Battle Scene* he had painted for the King of France [Fig. 60].[242] The ekphrastic panegyrics of Rosa's friends, such as Simonelli's poem in honour of Rosa's *Tityus*, also exemplify the kinds of poems that often complimented the occasion of a painting's exhibition and aimed at promoting the artist's fame.[243]

Pascoli interpreted Rosa's exhibition habits as in keeping with the artist's own philosophical ideals: "not caring whether he sold [his paintings], despising riches and making little account of requests, and desiring to give greater resolution to their craving, he would occasionally put them on public view, doing this only for his own purposes rather than to be deprived of the [paintings] themselves."[244] Pascoli's comment, however, stands in marked contrast to his earlier observation that Rosa, during his youth in Naples, exhibited his paintings in the public *piazze* "for

---

[242] Borelli, letter 158. See note 554 below.
[243] On the "*verifica pubblica*", see Modesti, "Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna," 373. Modesti describes Elisabetta Sirani's procedure of self-promotion, which shares much in common with Rosa's. Like Rosa's *Tityus* of 1638 or 1639, a show-piece displayed by Simonelli at the Pantheon in order to re-introduce Rosa to the Roman market, the large *Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew* [Fig. 2a] (dated alternatively to Rosa's Neapolitan years of the 1630's or to his Roman period of c. 1650 or c. 1660) may also have been expressly intended for public display. The painting shares a close iconographic affinity and professional purpose with two paintings by Jusepe de Ribera and Bernardo Cavallino intended for self-promotion: Ribera's *St. Bartholomew*, publicly exhibited upon his arrival in Naples from Rome in 1616, a successful ploy of self-marketing that caught the attention of the viceroy, the Duke of Osuna; and Bernardo Cavallino's version of the same subject (Capodimonte, Naples), a self-conscious "re-staging" in the 1630's of Ribera's earlier performance that was intended to achieve the same outcome. Marshall, "Markets, Money and Artistic Manoeuvres," 45-47; De' Dominici, *Vite*, 3: 4. See Marshall for Ribera's and Cavallino's paintings. Marshall suggests that Rosa's *Prometheus* – both its subject and the possible circumstances of its display – also emulated Ribera's example, although this painting has now been convincingly re-dated to the 1640's by Volpi. The *Tityus* is the more likely candidate, sharing both the overtly gruesome imagery of Ribera's and Cavallino's paintings as well as their self-promotional intent. See my discussion of the ongoing confusion over the relative dating of Rosa's *Tityus* and *Prometheus* in chapter three, 184, note 94. The close parallels between Cavallino's and Rosa's paintings suggested to Marshall the two artists were "both looking over each other's shoulders as they produced these pictures"; the possibility of re-dating of the *Prometheus* to the 1640's complicates this observation, although Marshall's observation remains valid if we substitute the now-lost *Tityus* as the painting in question. Marshall, "Markets, Money and Artistic Manoeuvres," 46. Rosa's *St. Bartholomew* also seems highly appropriate in this context as a work that deliberately emulates Ribera's initial tactic: nothing is known of the circumstances of the painting's origins, but it seems plausible that it was intended (whether at the outset of the young Neapolitan's career in the 1630's, or at a later stage of financial or reputational struggle in the 1650's or 1660's) to re-launch the artist's reputation with a bold, large-scale public work.
[244] Pascoli, *Vite*, 71: "Non si curava di venderli, disprezzava le richieste, poco conto faceva de'richiedenti, e per dar maggior Martello alle lor brame, ne andava di quando in quando esponendo a pubblica vista, e diceva d'averli fatti per uso suo, e di non volere privarsene."

the greater facility of the sale".[245] Rosa clearly regarded the exhibitions as a site for the acquisition of fame and reputation, akin in many ways to the other characteristically performative aspects of his professional practice. In reality, Rosa's expectation of a significant financial recompense for his work (which he idealized as a measure of its intrinsic merits and skillful virtuosity) was also about a basic need and a fundamental desire for money.

Printmaking, Performance and Propaganda

The category of painter-printmaker or "*peintre-graveur*" may be added to those of poet, philosopher and painter as one of Rosa's panoply of professional identities, actively cultivated in the pursuit of an autonomous practice.[246] Rosa's intensified habit of making copies of his paintings in the late 1650's and 1660's coincides with his foray into the medium of printmaking. His participation in this medium had at least a three-fold purpose: it offered an independent practice, free from the jurisdiction of patronage; it was an instrument for the dispersal and advertisement of his skills of *novità* and *invenzione* and, in particular, his talent as a draftsman and painter of figures (a skill that caused him significant angst when it came to painting);[247] and its prospect for dedication offered the means to cultivate and repay the debts of friendship and to solicit the commission of paintings.

From the earliest stages of its development, printmaking offered the artist a vehicle free from the restrictions of the traditional patronage structure. Albrecht Dürer, for example – among the most important and influential printmakers of the sixteenth century (whose impact was felt in both the art and professional self-conception of his followers) – found an autonomy in printmaking

[245] Pascoli, *Vite*, 64.
[246] As Warnke has pointed out, the development of the reproductive technique of engraving is closely allied to the professional artist's desire to find alternative routes to success beyond the confines and restrictions of court patronage. Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 239-240.
[247] Wallace, among other scholars, has argued that Rosa's "chief motive" for making etchings was as "an ideal means of publicizing himself as a figure artist." Wallace, *Etchings*, 16. He considers the *Figurine* particularly significant in this context, but also other prints like the "*Genius"*, which may be interpreted as "a kind of *pronunciamento* that his real genius lay in depicting the human figure."

that he was deprived of as a painter, working on commission. In combination with their ability to promote the artist's identity and *invenzioni*, prints could also offer the artist a certain financial benefit.[248] Rembrandt, for example, only managed to sell his prints for a relatively low price (as did Rosa), but their wide dispersal drew him both a broad viewership and supported higher prices for his paintings.[249] But printmaking was not lucrative for every artist: in *seicento* Rome, it entailed "high production costs and slow financial returns" and was likely the cause for Pietro Testa's frequent complaints of poverty.[250]

Rosa's pride in his etchings, and his intention that they circulate broadly as a means for self-publicization, is apparent from the relish he took in informing Ricciardi in 1662 of Pope Alexander VII's praise for their "fantasy", "poetry" and "extraordinary eccentricity (*bizzaria*)", keeping copies of them "on one of his small tables".[251] His faith in printmaking as a device for self-promotion is apparent in his adoption of it at crucial points in his career. As Antony Griffiths has noted, save the "few unidentified etchings" Rosa made in 1651-2, his prints were made in "two bursts": firstly, the *Figurine* etchings of c. 1656-8, and secondly the various figurative prints made between 1660 and 1663. This "concentrated activity" of printmaking suggested to Griffiths, as it has to other scholars, that it was intended as part of a program of self-advertisement during moments of particular anxiety over reputation and finances.[252] In the early 1660's Rosa ran into trouble finding buyers for his paintings, and it is in this context that his self-celebratory etching the

---

[248] Suzanne Boorsch and Nadine M. Orenstein, *The Print in the North. The Age of Albrecht Dürer and Lucas Van Leyden* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997), 7.
[249] This strategy of seeking "added value" was also tantamount to the "franchising of an idea" and the declaration of intellectual property. De Marchi and Van Miegroet, "Pricing Invention: 'Originals', 'Copies', and their Relative Value in 17th century Netherlandish Art Markets," 32.
[250] Consagra, "The Marketing of Pietro Testa's 'Poetic Inventions'," in *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650*, ed. Cropper, lxxxviii. Evelyn Lincoln also discusses the potentially high cost of print publishing. See Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 149.
[251] Borelli, letter 271. See note 77 above.
[252] Wallace, for example, "has shown well how the themes of the large plates together display the full range of Rosa's philosophical interests and personal outlook … [serving] as a form of self-promotion." Griffiths, "On Some Albums of Etchings by Salvator Rosa," *Print Quarterly* 9: 3 (1992): 260; citing Wallace, *Etchings*.

"Genius" of Salvator Rosa should be partly understood.[253] In 1664, when his eyesight began to fail, he complained to Ricciardi that he was no longer able to work in the medium.[254] Rosa's desire to be known as a skilled draftsman and painter of figures is most evident in the *Figurine* etchings of 1656-8, his first significant production in the medium. These etchings also made money for Rosa – in 1662 Rosa noted to Ricciardi how much they were making abroad – but this was not the primary motivating factor for the *Figurine*, nor for Rosa's printmaking activity in general.[255] Instead, their incentive lay specifically in the print's potential to advertise the artist's mastery of *disegno* and *invenzione*. The close connection made between drawings (regarded as the site of the artist's originary invention[256]) and prints is apparent in the writings of Rosa's contemporaries.[257] The etching, in particular, as a "spontaneous" medium, allowed the printmaker to "fully express the individuality and graphic inventiveness of his hand".[258] Vasari had made the practice of printmaking, like drawing, the medium by which to "*sfogare i capricci*", "to give free reign to one's

---

[253] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 69.
[254] Borelli, letter 304.
[255] "Le stampe son venerate e richieste, et a quest'hora pellegrinano per tutto." Borelli, letter 277; also see letter 271.
[256] Simonelli's collection of drawings, for example, conveys his interest in the "initial moment" of artistic activity – that moment of invention in the artist's practice. Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 46. Simonelli's view reflected the convictions of other *seicento* commentators on the subject like Giulio Mancini.
[257] Caroline Karpinski notes that both Baldinucci and Malvasia "imply not hierarchy by parity among the three forms of graphic art (drawing, printing of invention, and printing of reproduction)." Michael Bury has shown that "the same level of technical achievement was perceived as characterizing both" prints and drawings in early-modern discourse on the subject." In his *Discorso sopra l'arte del disegno*, Benvenuto Cellini was "thoroughly confident that a drawing's *invenzione* and *disegno*, in the senses of manner, design and drawing, can be transcribed into engraving". Giulio Mancini, too, makes the connection in his *Considerazioni* (1614-21). Karpinski, "The Print in Thrall to its Original: A Historiographic Perspective," in *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, ed. Krauss et al (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1989), 102-4. As Rosand writes, "From the very beginning of its modern development, the printed image declared itself a model of invention. Engraving, in particular, became the special field for demonstrating and disseminating the painter's *invenzioni*." Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 44, 49. The inventive basis of the print is bound up in the printmaker's mark "Invenit". Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 5. Not all early-modern commentators, however, drew such a close connection between prints and drawings: the printer Ludovico degli Arrhigi (1475-1527), for example, argued that "printing cannot fully represent the living hand". Rosand, *ibid*, 146.
[258] Wallace, *Etchings*, 20. On the centrality of *disegno* to Renaissance art, see Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 184.

inventions".[259] This emphasis on *disegno* is also apparent (as Peter Lukehart has carefully observed) in one of Rosa's most self-celebratory prints, the *Alexander in the Studio of Apelles* [Fig. 115]: here, the students of the famous ancient artist are not shown grinding colours, as Pliny described them, but drawing.[260]

Rosa's conception of the *Figurine* as a venue for the display of novelty and "originality" is also in line with a growing *seicento* appreciation of "inventive" printed images, a preference over previously popular "reproductive" prints.[261] Rather like Domenico Beccafumi's prints of figures, which Evelyn Lincoln interpreted as his "personal mannequins, ready to be moved into any number of positions",[262] Rosa's *Figurine* represent the range of types he was capable of producing in his paintings. Many of the poses and gestures of the *Figurine* are replicated in his canvases. Rosa identified these etchings explicitly as "*figurine*" in a letter to Ricciardi,[263] a name that resonates with the more pervasive, generic title given to "printed images": "*figure stampate*".[264] In this sense, then, the name chosen by Rosa signals their non-specific iconographic intention as "little prints", as well as "little figures".

Rosa was not alone in regarding printmaking as a method for displaying novelty. Antonio Tempesta (1555-1630), for example, the first Roman *peintre-graveur* to exclusively take up the practice of etching (and an artist to whom Rosa owed certain artistic debts[265]), established in his

---

[259] Vasari was speaking in particular of Dürer's Apocalyptic woodcut series which "were not images made on commission or to serve any other function than to demonstrate the artist's talent as both *disegnatore* and *inventore*." Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 172.
[260] Lukehart, "Introduction", in *The Artist's Workshop*, 12.
[261] Marcus S. Sopher and Claudia Lazzaro-Bruno, *Seventeenth Century Italian Prints* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978), 5. Peter Parshall noted that the desire for novelty in prints was most apparent in their "quasi-scientific" appeal. Parshall, "Prints as Objects of Consumption in Early Modern Europe," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 28:1 (1998): 28, 31.
[262] Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 107.
[263] Borelli, letter 203.
[264] Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 123.
[265] Langdon, for example, notes the impact of Tempesta's prints – particularly of battle scenes, but also other works – on Rosa's own pictorial production. Langdon, *Salvator Rosa: His Ideas and Development*, 104-7, 117, 359; also see Pasquale Maffeo, *Salvator Rosa com'era* (Naples: Fausto Fiorentino Editrice, S. p. A., 1975), 48;

printmaking both novel iconography and a new, individual style – a kind of "Tempesta brand" aimed at establishing a "secure niche in a highly volatile sector."[266] In Sara F. Matthews-Grieco's opinion, novelty and innovation offered themselves to artists as "potent commercial strategies."[267] The *Figurine* can also be seen in this light, displaying not only his talents as a draftsman and painter of figures but demonstrating his virtuosity in devising *concetti* and in depicting *affetti*. These prints represent a range of male and female figures, predominantly soldiers (the subject of which, as I note in chapter three, is integrally linked to a display of artistic virtuosity[268]), but also fishermen and philosophers, both clothed and nude, in domestic and exotic costume, alternatively solitary and engaged in conversation. As Roworth has noted, the wording of the dedication to Rosa's friend Carlo de' Rossi implies that the *Figurine* "were created with pleasure and great ease", and were presented essentially as "examples of Rosa's inventiveness and ingeniousness." She singles out one of the prints in particular as a representation of "*Invenzione*" [Fig. 90b], likely evidence of Rosa's intentions for the series as a whole.[269] The *Figurine* function primarily as "*capricci*", a term that is implicitly about novelty. Rosa's intention that these prints be perceived as "*capricci*" is signaled by

---

Ozzola, *Vita e Opere*, 26-7. Both Wallace and Scott note the likely influence of Tempesta's *Metamorphoseon* (1606) on Rosa, a book of illustrations of Ovid's tales. Wallace, *Etchings*, 47; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 173.

[266] Matthews-Grieco, "The buyers' end of the market: demand, taste and consumption in Renaissance and Counter-Reformation Italy," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 18. On Tempesta's practice, see Eckhard Leuschner, "Censorship and the Market. Antonio Tempesta's 'New' Subjects in the Context of Roman Printmaking, c. 1600," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 65-71. Leuschner notes that "[i]n the early 1590's Tempesta added 'new' subjects such as landscapes, animals and hunting scenes to his repertory, some of which had never been introduced to the Roman public." He was also the first artist to represent the battle theme in original etchings.

[267] Matthews-Grieco, "The buyers' end of the market," 18.

[268] See chapter three, 232-33.

[269] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 357. This print "shows a youth supporting a large tablet on which appears a representation of a herm of Diana of Ephesus … a well known symbol of Nature, and according to Ripa, a woman holding a '*simulacro della Natura*' such as this represents '*Invenzione'*. The artist looks to Nature as his guide, thus his inspiration or 'invention' must begin there. … Rosa's etching represents one version of the artist philosopher studying Nature, but the series of 'Figurine' as a group exhibits the many facets of his own 'Invenzione'." The motive of the *Figurine*, as illustrations of the artist's "inventiveness," was also transferred to the production of a series of large-scale etchings, c. 1660-1664, including the patently self-celebratory *"Genius" of Salvator Rosa* and a number of ancient historical, mythological and biblical subjects, many of which were selected either for their self-referential pertinence or for their obscure novelty. Roworth also aligns the encyclopedic impulse of the *Figurine* with Rosa's preoccupation with satire, which Juvenal described as conveying "all the doings of mankind, their vows, their fears, their angers and their pleasures, their joys and goings to and fro". Roworth, *ibid*, 359-60.

their dedicatory inscription, addressed to Carlo de' Rossi [Fig. 90a]: "SALVATOR ROSA/ Has Ludentis otij/ CAROLO RUBEO/ Singularis Amicitiae pignus/ D.D.D." ("Salvator Rosa dedicates these prints of playful leisure to Carlo de' Rossi as a pledge of outstanding friendship"). Scholars have suggested that the expression "*ludentis otij*," or "playful leisure," signals the prints' meaning as "imaginative caprices", codified in contemporary definitions of the "*capriccio*".[270] In Baldinucci's definition of the term, for example, it is "to make 'by invention' [*a capriccio*] or '*di fantasia*' [by imagination], that is, of one's own thought or invention."[271] (Passeri characterized Rosa's innovative *invenzioni* as "*capricci*" on more than one occasion.[272]) Cesare Ripa's influential emblem of *Capriccio* [Fig. 209] encapsulated the same definition, closely aligning it with not only imaginative *invenzione* but – even more significantly – a certain freedom of expression:

> "a young man dressed as a jester, his many colors representing his inconstancy, the feathers in his hat being the diverse ideas sprouting from the imagination [*fantasia*]; he holds a bellows in one hand, indicating his readiness to celebrate virtue, and a sharp spur in the other, ready to pierce vice: *Capricciosi* are those whose actions follow ideas that differ from the ordinary ideas of others, but who shift from one idea to another of the same kind; and, by way of analogy, ideas in painting, in music, or in other media that appear far from the ordinary are called *capricci*."[273]

Roworth, David Rosand and Nancy Rash Fabbri identify the figure on the frontispiece of Rosa's *Figurine* as a derivation of Ripa's personification of *Capriccio*, in particular, with his feathered hat.

---

[270] See for example Salerno, *Salvator Rosa*, 48; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 125, 356-7; Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Figurine*," 47; Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 329; Cropper, "Printmaking in the Seicento," *Print Quarterly* 11: 2 (1994): 183; and Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 300.

[271] "Proprio pensiero e invenzione. Quindi, fatto a capriccio o di fantasia, cioè di proprio pensiero e invenzione. E dicesi anche capriccio talvolta alla cosa stessa fatta, cioè questo, o pittura, o scultura, o altro che sia, e un mio capriccio." Baldinucci, "Capriccio", in *Vocabolario Toscano dell'arte del disegno*, 28. On the conceptual link between *capriccio* and *fantasia*, which has its roots in musical theory, see Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 298, 300. Baldinucci aligned "novelty" with imagination in his definition of *fantasia*: "La potenza imaginativa dell'anima. ... I nostri Artefici dicono far di fantasia, o di capriccio, quando, senz'esempio, vanno operando di propria invenzione; ed opponesi al ricavare o fare dal Naturale." Baldinucci, *ibid*, 59.

[272] Passeri, *Vite*, 426, 433, and 438.

[273] Ripa, *Iconologia*, 46-7: "Giovanetto vestito di varii colori, in capo porterà un cappelletto simile al vestimento, sopra il quale vi saranno penne diverse, nella destra mano terrà un mantice, & nella sinistra un sperone. Capricciosi di dimandano quelli, che con Idee dall'ordinarie de gl'altri huomini diverse fanno prendere le proprie attioni, ma con la mobilità dall'una all'altra pur del medesimo genere, & per modo d'Analogia si dicono capricci le idée, che in pittura, o in musica, o in altro modo si manifestano lontane dal modo ordinario: l'incostanza si dimostra nell'età fanciullesca, la varietà nella diversità de i colori. Il capello con le varie penne, mostra che principalmente nella fantasia sono poste queste diversità d'attioni non ordinarie." English translation from Rosand, *Drawings Acts*, 300.

[Fig. 90a] But it is tempting to suggest that the rest of Rosa's figures, too, were inspired by the solitary, emblematic character of Ripa's icons, which also gesture emphatically and reiterate the same encyclopaedic and didactic erudition that Rosa sought to convey in his own graphic display.[274] This is the same ideal that informed the influential "suites" of figure etchings by Jacques Callot (who used the term in the title-page of one set of self-promotional prints), Jacques de Gheyn II, and Stefano della Bella, part of a tradition of producing prints as models for other artists to follow.[275]

Ripa's description of *Capriccio* also produces a list of traits that suggest the emblem's strong appeal for Rosa as a consolidation of many of his own salient characteristics: he is a performer, an improvisationalist, a prankster, a virtuous moralist, a multi-talented *virtuoso*, and an inventive, imaginative and exceptional original who follows his own path. The implicit "freedom" of the *capriccio*, moreover, helps to explain the enigmatic nature of Rosa's prints, which have long resisted a specific iconographic or narrative interpretation.[276] Like many of Rosa's paintings, the

[274] Rosand, *Drawings Acts*, 300; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 358-60; Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 330. In the first state of the dedicatory frontispiece (the only impression of which is now in the Gabinetto Nazionale delle Stampe), the inscription is written in pen in Rosa's hand, and there is a bellows lying on the ground between the main figure and Envy, an object which appears to have been almost completely burnished out in successive states. Wallace, *Etchings*, 17. Fabbri noted that Ripa gave "Capriccio" the attributes of a bellows and a spur in order to indicate that "the capricious man is ready to praise other people's virtue or to prick their vices." Fabbri, *ibid*, 330. Wallace claims Rosa later chose to burnish out the bellows, and leave out the spur entirely, considering them "iconographically heavy and visually awkward." Wallace, *ibid*, 18.

[275] Callot used the term on the title page of a series of 50 small etchings ("*Capricci di varie figure ... in aqua forte*") published in Florence in 1617, depicting "a capricious combination of disparate themes". As with Rosa, the primary purpose of Callot's etchings was "to demonstrate the artist's inventiveness as a designer and his skill as a printmaker". Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 300; on Callot's etchings, see Posner, "Jacques Callot and the Dances Called Sfessania," 203-16; A. Hyatt Mayor and Leonard Baskin, "The Etchings of Jacques Callot," *The Massachusetts Review* 3: 1 (1961): 121-132; and Reinhold Grimm, "From Callot to Butor. E.T.A. Hoffmann and the Tradition of the Capriccio," *Modern Language Notes* 93: 3 (1978): 399-415. On the history of the "suite" of prints as a didactic tool, see Rosand, *ibid*, 298, 300, and Brewer, "Positioning the Market," 144.

[276] See especially Tomory's interpretation of the *Figurine* in "Battles, war and soldiers," 256-67. As Wallace noted, "Rosa, more than any other printmaker of the period, seems to have realized the possibilities of the *capriccio*, that it could allow the artist to display his imagination and invention in the most direct way possible, without the intervention of traditional subject matter". Wallace, *Etchings*, 20. The Figurine are "as Rosa declared in his frontispiece, simply *capricci*, and as such were undoubtedly meant to be free of the encumbrance of specific meaning." Wallace, *ibid*, 17 n. 21. Cropper also points out the intentional "non-specificity" of Rosa's prints who seem to "gesture without purpose." Cropper, "Printmaking in the Seicento," 183. Rosand notes that "*capriccio* in the vocabulary of Renaissance artistic discourse, carried connotations of license, of freedom from the rules of art, from the decorum of imitation"; he identifies this "freedom" as a motivating factor behind Piranesi's *Prisons* (*Carceri*) series. Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 299, 286.

enigmatic ambiguity of the *Figurine*'s "subjects" was part of their appeal. These prints, then, are more than simply inscrutable images that defy iconographic interpretation, but vital documents of Rosa's attitude toward his professional and economic practice. In this context it is important to note, too, that they were dedicated to a close friend – Carlo de' Rossi – highlighting the role played by friendship in facilitating that practice. I will return to the dedication to De' Rossi later in the chapter.

In the 1660's, when Rosa was particularly eager for work, he used a number of his etchings in a unique way in order to garner attention. Inscribing them with the signature "Salvator Rosa, Inv. pinx, scul.", he implied that he had designed, painted and engraved the work in question when in reality not all the images had yet been painted, hoping to solicit a commission from an admiring prospective client. In 1663, Rosa explained his method to Ricciardi, noting his own awareness that – as a strategy for fame – it contradicted the moral-philosophical precepts he frequently espoused:

> "In order to satisfy you concerning the *Pinx* of my prints [*carte*], I have put it there for my courtesy and in order to suggest that I have etched it as well as painted it**.** But the truth is that from the Attilius onward, among the large ones of *Democritus* and *Diogenes* with the bowl and among the medium-sized [prints], nothing else has been painted [*collorita*] by me. Nor did a fantasy such as that of the *Giants* suffice to move my volition at all to see it painted [*collorita*]. I would be able to write a Bible about this subject, not only sacred, but most sinister [*scommunicatissima*]; I do not do so because the generosity of my mind and my (perhaps not damnable) pride say so. Oh how much we are held to the school of the *Stoics*, who have taught us an effective medicine for every human difficulty!"[277]

The term "*pinx*," an abbreviation of "*pinxit*," appears on the etchings of the *Crucifixion of Polycrates*, the *Death of Atilius Regulus*, the *Fall of the Giants* and the *Rescue of the Infant Oedipus*, the last two of which Rosa identifies as "large" engravings.[278] Both the *Crucifixion of Polycrates* and the *Death of Atilius Regulus* existed in painted form prior to the execution of their

---

[277] Borelli, letter 296: "Per sodisfarvi circa a quel Pinx delle mie carte, ce l'ho messo per mia cortesia e per far credere ch'io intanto l'ho intagliate, in quanto l'havevole dipinte. Ma la verità è che dall'Attilio in poi, tra le grandi, del Democrito e Dioggene della scodella, fra le mezzane, nessun'altra è stata da me collorita. Né è stato bastante una fantasia come quella de' Giganti a movere la voglia a nessuno di vedersela collorita. A questo proposito haverei occasione da scriverne una Bibia, non già sacra, ma scommunicatissima; non lo fo' perché così mi detta la generosità del mio animo e della mia (forse non dannabile) superbia. Oh quanto siamo tenuti alla scuola degli Stoici, i quali ci hanno insegnata un'efficace medicina per alcune humane difficultà!"

[278] Borelli, letter 288.

corresponding etchings, but the *Giants* and the *Oedipus* did not.[279] In 1663 Rosa told Ricciardi that, although the design for the *Giants* was "simple," it was achieving its goal in earning the praise of his contemporaries.[280] Three years later, however, in 1666, Rosa informed his friend that he had "not yet painted the Giants and the Oedipus, although it is very true that I had thought one time to paint them".[281] As Roworth notes, Rosa chose dramatic compositions "which would show off to advantage his talents for large, impressive subjects filled with dynamic figures", in response to the "economic downturn as a result of the war in France" that was frustrating his attempt to gain commissions and sell paintings.[282] Wallace made the interesting proposal that, aside from this rather underhanded motive, Rosa may have intended his etchings as a form of study and development, a way to devise interesting and ambitious compositions, before turning their subjects into paintings.[283] In this context it is also important to note that Rosa frequently sent his engravings to Ricciardi – in their nascent form as designs, in the form of copper plates, or in their finished state as prints.[284] But they remained first and foremost a self-promotional device. Other artists pursued similar practices: Pietro Testa, for example, made plates before searching for patrons to whom he might dedicate them.[285] For both Rosa and Testa, who shared a disdain toward patronage, the print's potential as a demonstration of *invenzione* and independent *ingegno* took priority over its sale.[286]

---

[279] Rosa's large etching of *Glaucus and Scylla*, c. 1661, is almost identical with (although in reverse to) the painted version in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Brussels, although Wallace argues that there is evidence that the painting follows the print chronologically. Wallace, *Etchings*, 49.
[280] Borelli, letter 290.
[281] Borelli, letter 335.
[282] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 362-3; see Borelli, letter 300. Also see Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 52.
[283] Wallace, *Etchings*, xx.
[284] See Borelli, letters 117, 119, 252, 288, 290, and 296.
[285] Cropper, *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650*, xiv. Testa could have used his etching and draughtsman skills to make a living, but he chose instead to work independently, "often looking for patrons to whom he could dedicate his work only after he had produced an ambitious and time-consuming invention on the plate."
[286] Cropper, *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650*, xix. See Cropper for Testa's attitude toward the constraints of contemporary patronage, and his complex relationships with clients and patrons.

The potential of printmaking to convey an artist's novelty and invention, however, seems – by modern standards at least – to be threatened by the very reproductive nature of the medium. Rosa has very little to say on the matter, but he seems to have shared in the conception (popularized by his Renaissance forebears) of the invention itself as the crucial component, one that was not threatened by duplication.[287] The concept of "ownership" of an artistic idea is implicit in the emergence, in the context of printmaking, of both the signature and the establishment of copyright. The artist's signature, along with a declaration like "*invenit*", signaled both authorship and ownership.[288] In the sixteenth century, printmakers (who were occasionally also the authors of the prints) could apply to obtain a copyright "privilege" from a governing authority (in Rome, the pope) that granted them sole control over their publication and the right to claim it as property against the threat of competitors, copyists and pirates. Any violation resulted in a range of punishments for the unlawful copyist, from a significant fine to excommunication.[289] These privileges were originally intended to guard financial investment and labour rather than the right of invention or the artist's "intellectual property." But the recognition of this latter component was given increasing impetus in the second half of the century: Louis XIV's decree of 1659, the Edict of St. Jean de Luz, proclaimed etching and engraving liberal arts, "subject only to the imagination of their authors," an assertion that gave legal significance to the earlier possessive impulses of "*capriccio*".[290] As Cropper notes, the *seicento* discourse concerning whether or not two artists could devise the same idea produced a distinction between novelty and originality that characterizes the modern idea of

[287] See Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 5.
[288] Clara Gebert, *An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications & Prefaces* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933), 24.
[289] Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 49; Ilja M. Veldman, "The Business of Prints in the North (c. 1575-1650) and the Publishing House of Crispijn de Passe," in *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Cavaciocchi, 805. On Diana Mantuana's acquisition of a papal privilege for her prints, see Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 124. Rubens industriously pursued and enforced royal patents in copyright protection of his published engravings. Wernick, "The Work of Art as Gift and Commodity," 183. On the institution of copyright also see Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communication and Cultural Transformation in Early Modern Europe*, 2 vols, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
[290] Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 301; also see Brewer, "Positioning the Market," 143.

copyright.[291] The concept of the work of art as both intellectual and material property also enters the practice of printmaking via the copper plate – the ownership of which was a financial necessity.[292] Rosa's concern over retaining his copperplates suggested to Griffiths that the painter himself controlled his plates, and that he printed and marketed his etchings himself, without the help of a publisher. This was an unusual practice.[293] If Rosa wanted to maintain control over his own plates, he likely oversaw the printing itself.[294] When Rosa told Ricciardi in 1662 that his prints were selling in Flanders and France, for "6 *giulii* a piece", he implied that he was marketing his own prints, sending not the original copperplates but prints from them in order to join the "rest" that he had already sent there at an earlier date.[295] From this letter, Griffiths inferred that Rosa was working through dealers, "who were marking up the prices by twenty to thirty percent"; and, while the dealers in question are nowhere identified, it is possible that Rosa was again availing himself of

---

[291] Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 200. It elicited "the separation of a definition of aesthetic persona, which finally brought legal protection to artists as persons, from that of legal personality enjoyed by copyright holders."
[292] Veldman, "The Business of Prints in the North (c. 1575-1650) and the Publishing House of Crispijn de Passe," 809. Also see Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 152. In this context, it is significant to note that Rosa entrusted them on occasion to Ricciardi. In December 1651, Rosa received copper plates he had lent to Ricciardi, presumably in order to solicit his opinion on them prior to being engraved. Borelli, letter 117: "I due rami, che si tornano in mio potere dal vostro per intagliarsi, si faranno, né credete ch'io dimentico le cose vostre, massime donde si tratta di cose che dipendono da me." In November 1661, Rosa again sent Ricciardi his copper designs for the *Saint William of Maleval*, the *Saint Albert*, the *Glaucus and Scylla* and the *Apollo and the Sibyl*. Borelli, letters 251, 252. In 1662 he sent Ricciardi drawings for his engravings of the *Crucifixion of Polycrates*, the *Alexander and Diogenes*, the *Ceres and Phytalus*, and the paired *Democritus* and *Diogenes* which he had designed at Strozzavolpe. Borelli, letter 261. In 1663 he sent Rosa either the coppers or engravings for the *Fall of the Giants* and the *Rescue of the Infant Oedipus*. Borelli, letters 288, 290, 293.
[293] Other artists heavily engaged in printmaking, such as Pietro Testa and Giovan Benedetto Castiglione for example, "never tried to keep all their plates together, and were quite prepared to sell some of them more or less immediately to publishers." Griffiths, "On Some Albums of Etchings by Salvator Rosa," 250. That the original plates remained in Rosa's hands, and were then passed to his heirs, is signaled by Lady Morgan's biography. She notes in her list of Rosa's etchings that "The original plates, nearly worn out, were sold by the present family (descendants of Rosa) to the Roman Gov't for 1000 dollars, and are now in the Papal Calchographic Office." Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, 377. Cropper noted the difference "between Rosa's skilful strategy of selling prints in series and keeping the plates under his control, and Testa's indecisive marketing practice, which involved only a few series …and the sale of plates before their full value had been exploited." Cropper, "Printmaking in the Seicento," 182.
[294] Griffiths, "On Some Albums of Etchings by Salvator Rosa," 258. "The moment he let the plates out of his sight, any printer could have run off dozens of illicit impressions … This implies that Rosa had his own press (which would in any case have been essential for proofing), and acquired his own ink and paper."
[295] Griffiths, "On Some Albums of Etchings by Salvator Rosa," 258. Borelli, letter 271. Griffiths also deduces from this letter that Rosa intended his prints for sale in groups: "The fact that the new plates were joining 'all the rest' … leads to another consideration. As any modern print publisher will agree, it is much more profitable to sell sets of prints, whether in portfolios or books, than single sheets. Rosa, with his well-attested business acumen, kept his work together to make this possible." Griffiths, *ibid*, 259-260.

Carlo de' Rossi's friendship and his network of contacts. For Rosa, the print medium offered the opportunity to disseminate a unique, novel and often highly self-referential *invenzione*. The iconography of Rosa's prints (especially the *Figurine*), his discourse concerning them, his concern over the copper plates, and his use of a signature and personalized dedications to friends, collectively signaled his conception of these images as intellectual property. Rosa's printmaking practice raises important questions about his position on the potential conflict between novelty, invention and "originality" on the one hand, and copying, duplication, and imitation on the other.

"*Né tocchi mai da nessuno*": Novelty, "Originality" and the Practice of Copying

In addition to making prints, Rosa engaged in the practice of making copies of paintings as a strategy for self-promotion and financial gain. While Cordini was apparently having unauthorized copies made of Rosa's paintings at least as early as 1656, we know that Rosa had himself initiated the procedure and seems to have used it throughout his career: the earliest mention of a copy, made by Rosa's friend the amateur artist Raffaello Landini, comes in a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1642, where Rosa informs his correspondent that Landini "has made a small landscape for you, a copy of mine, and within a few [days] I believe he will send it to you in order that you cherish the memory of his friendship".[296] In 1652, Rosa was having copies made for the decoration of Giulio Maffei's palace in Volterra on the occasion of a family wedding.[297] In addition to Landini, Rosa also employed from 1663 onwards a young painter from Casale Monferrato, a friend of Ricciardi's

[296] Borelli, letter 5: "Il Signor Landini vi ha fatto un paesino, copia d'un mio, e fra pochi [giorni] credo ve lo manderà a ciò serbiate memoria della sua amicitia …". Also see also letters 11, 17, 18, 20, and 22. In 1646, Landini was perhaps making another copy of a painting by Rosa for Giulio. Borelli, letter 18: "Sono in villa dal Signor Raffaello ove sto dipingendo il vostro Paese, mentre un altro ne sta facendo il Signor Landini per portarvelo a suo tempo." In this instance, the painting by Landini could be a copy or an independent composition. If it was a copy, then it was being produced apparently concurrently with Rosa's original – a notion that brings a rather incongruous image to mind in view of Rosa's later expressions of disdain toward students, imitators, and company while working, but that also points up the significance of friends and the license granted to them by our frequently truculent and suspicious artist.

[297] Borelli, letter 128: "Ho fatto fare due quadri di 12 palmi l'uno da un giovine che non si porta male per donarli al nostro Signor Giulio, quali serviranno per la sala di Volterra e credevo che li faranno servire in quest'occasione di nozze oltre certe altre copie che non faranno male in casa loro."

named Francesco Martinotti (1636-1679), as a copyist and collaborator to produce works for private collectors in Rome. Rosa seems to have taken him under his wing almost as a "student", offering his personal, financial and professional aid to the young painter upon his arrival in Rome.[298] In 1671 he had Martinotti paint a copy of Girolamo Mercuri's *Hagar and the Angel*.[299] Mercuri's collection was in fact full of copies of Rosa's paintings, possibly executed by Martinotti or Rosa's son Augusto.[300]

Reproduction was a fundamental component of the development of the art market.[301] The practice of copying became rampant among early *seicento* artists, particularly in Rome, in the service of both making money on the art market and spreading the artist's fame.[302] For Rosa, as for other artists, the problem with copying lay primarily in exercising control over the production of copies and in finding an appropriate copyist capable of replicating his unique artistic identity. When Cordini commissioned the copies of Rosa's *Pan and Syrinx* in 1651, it was their unauthorized manufacture that bothered Rosa the most, allayed only by the fact that the outcome resulted in the

---

[298] See Borelli, letters 348, 349, 372, 374, 375, 377-380, 382-387, 389, 390. Rosa offered Martinotti his assistance upon the young artist's arrival in Rome. Borelli, letters 348, 349, 372, 374, 387.
[299] Borelli, letter 385.
[300] See Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il Cardinale Brancaccio," 124-6; also see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 41.
[301] Brewer, "Positioning the Market," 142.
[302] Veronese, Rubens and Guido Reni engaged in an almost assembly-line workshop reproductive practice. On Veronese's family-workshop, and their practice of producing copies for the open market, see Beverly Louise Brown, "Replication and the Art of Veronese," in *Retaining the Original*, ed. Krauss et al, 111-121. Caravaggio's copies are well known. See Keith Christiansen and Denis Mahon, "Caravaggio's Second Versions," *Burlington Magazine* 134: 1073 (1992): 502-504; Christiansen, "Some Observations on the Relationship between Caravaggio's Two Treatments of the 'Lute-Player'," *Burlington Magazine* 132: 1042 (1990): 21-19; Mahon, "Fresh Light on Caravaggio's Earliest Period: His 'Cardsharps' Recovered," *Burlington Magazine* 130: 1018 (1988): 11-25; Karin Wolfe, "Caravaggio: Another 'Lute Player'," *Burlington Magazine* 127: 988 (1985): 451-452; and Daniele Benati and Antonio Paolucci eds., *Caravaggio. I 'Bari' della collezione Mahon* (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2008). Spear has cast doubt on the theory that Caravaggio painted "identical replicas". Spear, "What is an Original?", 19. Pier Francesco Mola, like his teacher Andrea Sacchi, was particularly keen to capitalize on the lucrative potential of copies, retouching them and selling them as originals. Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistic romano," 40-59. Passeri noted that Mola was disillusioned by his failure in the litigation with the Pamphilj for payment for his frescoes at Valmontone, so he permitted copies to be made of his paintings which he would then retouch with his own brush and sell as originals, "creating confusion over what is 'la leggitima verità del suo pennello'." Spear, "What is an Original?," 22; Passeri, *Vite*, ed. Hess, 373. Davis notes further that these copies had a detrimental impact on Mola's reputation, "when connoisseurs and collectors could not be certain of the authenticity of their 'Mola'." Davis, "Pier Francesco Mola's Autobiographical Caricatures: A Postscript," 50.

favour and proliferation of his reputation.[303] (His success on this occasion may have spurred him to continue the practice himself.) The need to maintain control (in both the senses of jurisdiction and restraint) over the quality and quantity of copies had been and remained a concern among other artists.[304] The uncontrolled production of copies posed various problems: in one sense, it threatened the "monetary prestige value" of an otherwise unique work of art. In another sense, if the copies were poor in quality (a particular concern of Rosa's) they could potentially "debase" both the artist and the buyer of the original.[305] The practical expense of making copies was also a potential concern. In 1653 Ricciardi requested a number of copies of paintings from Rosa, to which the artist responded by criticizing him for his "ridiculous" expectation that he had the money at his disposal: pleading his poverty once again, Rosa wrote: "it is vanity to hope for *trelliccio* [a type of canvas] for paintings of three or four *scudi* each".[306] All his money, he said, was tied up in the "cost of living".

The association of serial production with the poverty of the artist and a lower-end market clientage (especially those "lowly" clients who Rosa disdained in the *La Pittura* for purchasing the "low-life" works by the *Bamboccianti*, and who Passeri lamented as "beneath" the standards of Rosa's "princely" art) may also have elicited anxiety for Rosa in the practice of making of copies.[307] In his satire Rosa leveled a heavy indictment against artists (especially the *Bamboccianti*)

---

[303] Borelli, letter 86.

[304] Andrea Mantegna, for example, one of the first successful painters to discover the value of printmaking as a venue for disseminating both his art and his identity, was adamant about controlling the prints made after his paintings, even to the point of "assaulting unauthorized reproducers." Karpinski, "The Print in Thrall to its Original," 101. Claude Lorrain, too, expressed concern over the control of his paintings as intellectual property: "as early as 1635," notes Haskell, "Claude found himself compelled to keep a record of all his paintings, as copies of his works were being sold 'throughout Rome' as originals." Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 121; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, VI: 357.

[305] Matthews-Grieco, "The buyers' end of the market," 21.

[306] Borelli, letter 159: "Bisogna, Signor mercante mio gentilissimo, considerare che i poveri giovani cercano di spender quanto meno si può, e però è vanità il sperare trelliccio ne' quadri di 3 o quattro scudi l'uno; l'altra delle copie è impossibile, perché tutti costoro per camparne s'impiegano in sì fatto mestiere."

[307] Mancini regarded serial production as a sign of the artist's poverty. Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi", 317; Mancini, *Considerazioni*. On the association of copies with the "low-end" art market, see Vermeylen, *Painting for the Market. Commercialization of Art in Antwerp's Golden Age* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003), 7; Michael

who counterfeited antique paintings or made mere "pastiches" of canvases by old-masters like Titian – the latter a category of replication different in kind to that of the pure copy, but linked to it by Rosa in his broader critique of unoriginality. Borrowing from Vasari, Rosa used the metaphor of the baboon as unimaginative imitator, suggesting once again the premium he placed on invention over rote reproduction.[308] Rosa's contemporaries had expressed concern over the threat that duplication – especially endless duplication – posed to novelty and value. The issue became increasingly more acute during the *seicento*: the chancellor of Duke Vincenzo I of Mantua, for example, voiced his strict preference for the acquisition of originals over copies for the Duke's collection, while Giulio Mancini likened copying to rape.[309]

Seicento commentators on the subject of copying are contradictory in their evaluation of it, encapsulating the fluid conception of "originality" in the period. While some associated copying with violation or constraint, others offered a more positive assessment of the practice. Mancini took both sides of the argument: he warned the prospective collector to be wary of fraudulent fakes, but he also granted that skillfully painted copies (which might deceive the viewer into taking them for the original) were potentially preferable because they contained "the art of two artists". The caveat, however, was that the copy had to be masterful enough to even outdo the original.[310] Copying was

---

North, "The Long Way of Professionalization in the Early Modern German Art Trade," in *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Cavaciocchi, 459. On serial production in *seicento* Naples, see Gerard Labrot, "Un marche dynamique. La peinture de serie à Naples. 1606-1775," in *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Cavaciocchi, 261-279.

[308] Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 457-681; Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Bettarini and Barocchi, I: 399-401. As Roworth notes, "The story of the painter and the ape was actually taken from the already burlesqued version of Francesco Sacchetti, in his *Trecento novelle* of c. 1390, which is also referred to by Vasari." Rosa puts his own spin on the *topos*, turning even the baboon into an intelligent critic of the "atrocious" painters he copied. Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 116-118.

[309] On the Duke of Mantua, see Spear, "Di Sua Mano", 92; on Mancini, see Maccherini, "Caravaggio nel carteggio familiare di Giulio Mancini," 80. In a letter to his brother, Mancini wrote: "Non prestare in alcuno modo pitture per sverginarle col lasserle copiare."

[310] Spear, "Di Sua Mano," 95; Mancini, *Considerazioni*, ed. A. Marucchi (Rome, 1956), I: 134-5; as cited in Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche in the 17th-century Republic of Painting," in *Mapping Markets for Paintings*, 258. Loh also refers here to a similar contention by Marco Boschini, who argued that successful copies "are laudable deceptions and worthy of envy." Muller, "Measures of Authenticity," 145, 149 n. 41. Cardinal Federico Borromeo likewise deemed "exquisitely made" copies worthy of esteem. Spear, *ibid*, 92.

also deemed beneficial in the pursuit of fame and financial gain, both (especially the former) primary motives for Rosa.[311] Rosa had no problem owning copies of paintings by other artists: the 1673 inventory of his belongings lists copies of paintings by Titian, Veronese and Guido Reni, and a copy of a *St. Francis* by an unidentified artist, along with originals by Veronese, Polidoro da Caravaggio and Fra Bartolomeo.[312] And like many of his contemporaries, he had learned how to paint by making copies of works by masters like his early teacher Francesco Fracanzano.[313] The copy was also regarded positively for its ability to disseminate both an idea and an identity. Rosa's practice of signing some of his prints with the term "*pinx*" signals his participation in a more general set of copying practices in the period aimed at exploiting the reputation of the "originary" artist: by making a "copy" after a non-existent "original" (and a copy in print form, no less, intended to circulate widely) Rosa implied not only that an original existed but that his work was fundamentally *worthy* of being copied and duplicated.[314]

Rosa makes few comments about the practice, but copying – like printmaking – likely appealed to him primarily as a strategy for promoting his reputation. This motive, together with the rise of emulators (and especially the threat of poor quality imitations), seems to have informed

[311] These were the objectives of Guido Reni's extensive production of copies, which Spear describes as a strategy pursued in order to "maximize his profits". Spear, "Di sua mano," 79. Malvasia suggested that the retouched copies Reni produced were not always a benefit to his reputation. Spear, *ibid*, 84. As Spear emphasizes, it often served the artist's financial interests to "blur" the distinctions between originals, copies, and retouched paintings that connoisseurs and collectors were beginning to demarcate. Spear, "Di Sua Mano," 90-91.

[312] See Rosa's inventory in Volpi in "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 96-97. Rosa also seems to have occasionally held on to or arranged the acquisition of copies of paintings for friends. In 1660, he wrote to Ricciardi that he was keeping a copy of a painting by Pieter Van Laer for him, along with two other paintings. See Borelli, letter 234.

[313] Passeri noted that Rosa learned painting, in part, by copying some of Fracanzano's paintings: "Salvatore began with this education straight away to color, copying some things of Fracanzano, and revealed a ready ability." Passeri, *Vite*, 417.

[314] The status of the "copy" signaled both a pre-existing, laudable, sought-after original and an audience that demanded its duplication – it was a sign of the high status of its originary maker. The idea of the copy as a sign of the artist's reputation or status is also signaled by its function as a didactic tool, emulated or reproduced by younger and older artists alike in order to learn "secrets" or prove one's own talents. Spear, "What is an Original?", 30.

Rosa's apparent intensification of making copies in the 1660's.[315] In 1666, when Ricciardi asked Rosa for a copy of his large *Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus*, Rosa launched a hunt for an appropriate copyist: "this is an extraordinary difficulty", he wrote to his friend, "considering that not everyone is good at copying my things."[316] The following month he reiterated the sentiment: "I am trying to find a copyist, but I remind you that it's not easy because no one satisfies me – if you could see some of my copies in Rome, they would make you want to throw up".[317] Rosa also fretted over the copying of his most "extraordinary" canvases, which for their larger size and more complex iconography were expensive and challenging to produce.[318]

In attempting to find "appropriate" copyists, then, it is significant to note that most of the artists Rosa chose were trusted friends who – conceived ideally as "second selves" – were deemed the most capable of replicating his unique *genio*. In addition to Raffaello Landini and Francesco Martinotti, Rosa's copyists included Francesco Rovai, Giovanni Ghisolfi (1623-83) and Baldassare

---

[315] Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 41. Volpi notes that some of Rosa's early emulators included Sienese artists in the employ of Pope Alexander VII, such as Niccolò Tornioli (*Cain and Abel*, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome; or the *Astronomers*, Rome, Galleria Spada), Bernardino Mei (*Allegory of Fortune*, Rome, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica) or Giacinto Gimignani, the favourite of Cardinal Rospigliosi (*Allegoria della Fortuna che premia l'Ignorana e respinge la Virtu*, Rome, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica).

[316] Borelli, letter 331: "Intorno al pittore per la copia che mi accennate, farò la deligenza, essendo questa difficoltà non ordinaria in riguardo che tutti non sono buoni a copiar le mie cose."

[317] Borelli, letter 334: "Non manco di far la deligenza per lo copiatore, ma vi ritorno a dire che non mi riuscirà così facile, poiché nessuno mi contenta, e se voi vedreste alcune mie copie per Roma, vi faranno venir voglia di vomitare …" His concerns in this matter are reflected in Nicolas Poussin's comments to Chantelou on the same issue. Chantelou requested copies of Poussin's *Seven Sacraments*, and was "fully content to have Poussin arrange for copies to be made by another artist". In 1644, however, Poussin expressed his disdain for copyists: "I've thought a thousand times about the too little love, care and clarity that our professional copyists bring to what they imitate and of the price they ask for their daubs. And I have marveled altogether how so many people enjoy them. It is true that, seeing beautiful things and not being able to own them, one is obliged to content oneself with copies, even badly made, which, in truth, could diminish the name of many good painters, if it weren't that their originals are viewed by many who know well the extreme difference that exists between them and the copies. But those who don't see other things than the bad imitation easily believe that the original is not great … Reflecting myself on all these things, I thought I did well for my honour and your pleasure to let you know that …. I would wish myself to be the copyist … either of all seven or a portion; or rather make them a new arrangement [un autre disposition]. I assure you Monsieur, that they will be better than copies." Poussin then proceeded to make seven entirely new compositions for his friend. Jouanny, *Correspondance de Nicolas Poussin* (Paris: F. de Nobele, 1968), 242-45, no. 100 (January 12 1644), cited in Spear, "What is an Original?," 22, and Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*," 266.

[318] In response to Ricciardi's request in 1653 for copies of Rosa's paintings, and again in 1666, Rosa reprimanded his friend over the potentially high cost their manufacture would demand. See Borelli, letters 159 and 332.

Franceschini.[319] This consideration may also have played a role in his sanctioning of the making of copies themselves. The role of friendship in Rosa's other (although relatively few) artistic collaborations seems to have played a vital role in his reconciliation of joint production with a unique individuality. (There are numerous instances in which Rosa appears to have contributed either figures or landscapes to the work of other artists, or to have employed their services in his own work.[320]) Rosa's letter to Ricciardi of 1666, concerning the possibility of copying the *Atilius*

---

[319] Rosa's friendship with Landini is apparent from his letters. See Borelli, letters 5, 12, 16. He likely permitted Martinotti as both copyist and "student" on the basis of his friendship with Ricciardi. Baldinucci notes that Francesco Rovai was among a group of painters (including Francesco Boschi, Lorenzo Martelli and Taddeo Baldini) who copied the *Flight into Egypt* jointly painted by Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459. Baldinucci also records the activity of the Milanese landscape painter Giovanni Ghisolfi with Rosa, identifying him explicitly as Rosa's friend. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 483-4. Rosa solicited Ghisolfi's help with designing stage sets for Ricciardi in 1654 (Borelli, letter 178) and expressed concern over his financial troubles in 1659 (letter 322), and sent a painting by Ghisolfi as a gift to a Signor Fantacci in November of 1661 (letter 252). Rosa traveled with Ghisolfi to Ancona in April of 1662 (letter 264). In a letter to Ricciardi of 1651, where he complained to Ricciardi that Cordini was making unauthorized copies of his paintings, including the *Pan and Syrinx*, Rosa noted that "Baldassare" had been responsible for executing the retouchings on the paintings. (letter 86; in his letters Rosa refers to Baldassare Franceschini as "Signor Baldassare". See Borelli, letters 58, 60, 61, 62, 67, 70, 71, 73, 108, 162, 164, 168, 171, 363. Cordini's close relationship with Franceschini, which is also indicated by Rosa's letters, is further evidence for identifying him as the party involved.) The possibility of Franceschini's collaboration with Rosa is also suggested by a reference to a painting in the 1783 inventory of Marchese Donato Guadagni: a "Testa del giovane che legge" with the head by Rosa and the hand by Baldassare Franceschini. Getty Provenance Index: Inventory of June 1 1783, ASF MS Pupilli (Principato), 2707 (Inventari, 1789-93), n.66, 4 item 54. Baldinucci does not mention Franceschini "retouching" another artist's paintings, but does record that in 1683 he "restored" some paintings for Ferdinando de' Medici in his villa at Pratolino. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, ed. Barocchi, V: 189.

[320] According to Baldinucci, Rosa willingly collaborated with Lippi in his *Flight into Egypt*, and produced a (presumed) pendant (the *Arion on the Dolphin*) to accompany his *Orpheus*. [Figs. 40 and 134] The latter two paintings have an early provenance in the Ruccellai family, but were separated at an early date. See *Il Seicento Fiorentino*, 397-8, cat. 1.220 and 342, cat. 1. 180. Alterocca suggested that Rosa painted the landscape background in Lippi's *Jacob and Rachel at the Well*. Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 194-5. Rosa may also have collaborated with Viviano Codazzi (1604-70): among the twelve paintings exhibited at S. Giovanni Decollato in Rome in 1736, there is a painting identified as "Viviano [Codazzi], rappresentanti tutti Prospettive cioè: due d'imperatore per traverse, con figure di Salvator Rosa." Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 116, doc. CXCV, 196. Susan Russell has suggested that Rosa painted a figure in one of the paintings that Herman van Swanevelt sent to Madrid. Russell, "Salvator Rosa and Herman van Swanevelt" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference, 2009). Rosa also collaborated with Pietro da Cortona at the Palazzo Pitti, but was less amenable to the experience. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 29, 34. Rosa's *Mercury and Argus* (1650's) for Don Agostino Chigi appears to have been accompanied by a pendant commissioned from Claude Lorrain in 1658. Burton B. Fredericksen, "A Pair of pendant pictures by Claude Lorraine and Salvator Rosa from the Chigi Collection," *Burlington Magazine* cxxxiii (1991): 543-6. The post-1678 inventory of Don Antonio Ruffo's collection lists a landscape painting with the story of *Lot and his Daughters*, with a landscape by Rosa and figures painted by Andrea Vaccaro. Getty Provenance Index, Inventario di A.S. Antonio Ruffo Principe di Scaletta [omissis argenti, gioielli] (25r) Inventario di quadri, Archivio di Stato, Napoli. Archivio Ruffo di Bagnara, fascio 190, 31r. Baldinucci notes that Rosa painted "an infinite number of figures" in two, large "truly marvelous" paintings of "old curiosities" by Giovanni Ghisolfi, which were bought by the Marquis Pierantonio Gerini. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 457, 503. Rosa may also have collaborated with Pier Francesco Mola: Girolamo Mercuri described a work in his collection, which he left in 1683 together with other works of his to Cardinal Chigi, as "un ... quadretto piccolo lungo palmi due incirca e alto palmi uno del ... Sig. Salvator Rosa con figurine e con di più tre pecorelle dipinte

Regulus, encapsulates the artist's ambivalent attitude toward copying. Dismissing Ricciardi's desire for copies as an "*infermità*", a decision "not entirely worthy of your genius", Rosa scoffed at the Duke de Créquy for his rampant copying of works of art in Rome.[321] He admitted, however, that copies could result in financial profit, noting that money was the "compass of the desires of poor men".

While Rosa scoffed at the idea of just anyone copying his paintings, he had no qualms about re-touching the work of other artists or painting entire sections of their work, as Baldinucci claims he did for Lorenzo Lippi.[322] Rosa says little about the nature of his practice of copying or collaboration, but it seems plausible to suggest (particularly in view of his habit of retouching paintings for Ricciardi) that he frequently if not always retouched the copies of his paintings executed by other artists – an ironic exercise in view of his criticism of contemporary artists for the same undertaking in his satire *La Pittura*.[323] It is frustrating that none of these copies have been identified, as they would offer vital insights into Rosa's conception and manner of executing

---

dal Mola romano pittore anco di molta stima, cioè due di esse che stanno a pascere e un'altra ... che riposa che per la sua rarità e naturalezza stimo che possi stare tra le cose insigni che tiene S. E. nei suoi Musei ....". Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistic romano," 50; for Mercuri's inventory, see ASC MS not. Cap. M. Vitellius, sez. XI, t. 53 e t. 64 cc.n.n. Rosa may also have produced a pendant painting to accompany a work by Mola: Langdon notes that the *St. Paul the Hermit* that Rosa painted for Cardinal Luigi Omodei in c.1661 "must have accompanied a *St. John the Baptist in the Desert* by Pierfrancesco Mola"; both paintings are now in the Brera, Milan. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 49. In a letter of 1663, Rosa refused the requests of Antonio Ruffo's agents Giuseppe de Rosis and Cornelius de Stael for a painting with small figures, to act as a pendant for another work in Ruffo's collection, on the grounds that he only painted large figures. See Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," 168-72; Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 141-3, note 20. Scott notes that this was not to be a pendant for Rembrandt's *Aristotle*, as Vincenzo Ruffo had suggested. Fumagalli informed me that a technical analysis of Rosa's *Marina del Faro* [Fig. 7] confirmed that the boats and figures in the painting were not executed by Rosa but rather by another hand – a difference discernible via a comparison with the figures in the other large seascape that Rosa painted for the Medici, the *Marina del Porto* [Fig. 8a]. In 1650 Rosa indicated expressly to Giulio Maffei that the figures in the paintings he was sending him were painted by his own hand. Borelli, letter 60.

[321] Borelli, letter 332: "Si combina di più, che tutti i signori copiatori stanno occupati per l'Imbasciator di Francia, quale, per non spendere in comprare originali, fa copiar mezza Roma dai maggiori scarpinelli della professione."

[322] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459.

[323] Rosa critiques the *Bamboccianti* and other "lazy" Roman artists for lounging about the city's taverns and selling the paintings of others "after having only barely painted over them." Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 285; Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 664-65.

duplicates.[324] Here it is worth noting again the many copies of Rosa's paintings listed in Girolamo Mercuri's Roman inventory of 1682: that he also owned works by Giovanni Ghisolfi and Rosa's student "Bartolomeo" suggests that some of these copies were among the ones authorized by or retouched by Rosa, an idea further supported by the inventory's regular distinction between Rosa's paintings (or parts of them) as "*copia*" or "*orig.le*", and by an entry specifying that the figures in all the landscape paintings identified as Rosa's were by the artist himself.[325]

Did Rosa carry out retouchings himself? Did he rework the copies in such a way as to make them unique iterations of the "originals"?[326] By retouching his own paintings, as Rubens had informed his patron Sir Dudley Carleton in 1618, the master made the work authentically his own by lending to it his own inimitable brush.[327] The concurrent, persistent conception of authorship as "resid[ing] in invention and not in manual execution" meant that retouched copies – the products of labour rather than invention – were incapable of posing a threat to the "original" work of art, particularly if (as Rosa was anxious to emphasize) they were good copies, capable of skilfully and

---

[324] Rosa's inventory lists a number of copies, but does not specify whether they were executed by the artist himself. Among them are "nove tele con diverse copie di ritratti". ASR MS Archivio Capitolino, Auditor Camerae Notari AC 1671-1678. sez. 45 tomo 71, Tomaso Paulutius, 17 marzo 1673, 665v; Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti".

[325] Rosa's student Bartolomeo is also mentioned by Baldinucci. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 487. Among the entries in Mercuri's inventory that identify Rosa's paintings, or parts of them, alternatively as "copies after" or "originals", are: "Un quadro di Agar, et Ismaele con *paese orig.le* del Sig. Salvator Rosa tela di p.mi 7 con cornice tutta intagliata et indorata" (714r); "Una testa della Madonna *orig.le* del Sig. Salvator Rosa con cornice di ebano fino alta p.mi due e mezzo, e larga uno, e mezzo" (690r); and "Un quadro grande di S. Girolamo *copia* del Sig. Salvator Rosa tela di p.mi nove e sei con cornice noce, et oro" (694v). The entry specifying that Rosa painted the figures in all of the landscapes identified as his own reads: "Due altri paesi del med.o Sig. Rosa orig.li tele da testa con cornici intagliate, et indorate per lungo e in tutti i quadri del med. Sig. Rosa vi sono varie figurine del med.o" (714r). The paintings by Ghisolfi, a favourite of Mercuri's, consisted primarily of landscapes. The painting by Bartolomeo is identified as "Un quadretto d'una Marina tela di mezza testa con cornice tutta intagliata, et dorata orig.le di Bartol.o allievo del Sig. Rosa" (717r). Getty Provenance Index, ASC MS not. Cap. M. Vitellius, sez. XI, t. 53 e t. 64 cc.n.n.

[326] This practice was taken up by many artists in an effort to offer a unique and thus potentially more economically profitable product. Spear, "What is an Original?," 20. Lanfranco, for example, "essentially copied his huge canvas of *The Multiplication of the Loaves*, painted for S. Paolo fuori le Mura, Rome (now National Gallery, Dublin) – but he radically changed the size, changed colours, and deleted a figure seated in front of Jesus".

[327] Muller, "Measures of Authenticity," 143. This was even the case with the "self-portrait" that Rubens sent to his friend Peiresc in 1628, executed by an assistant. Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 367; see *Bulletin Rubens*, III, 238. Magurn notes, "Rubens knew that Peiresc cared little for artistic quality, but it is nevertheless strange that he sent him a [self-]portrait by a pupil's hand, while criticizing the 'lack of emphasis' in the portrait Peiresc sent to him.".

accurately reproducing that initial, ostensibly unique, performance of *invenzione*.[328] To purchase a good copy of a Rosa "original" was to procure a brand name, irrespective of the hands that made it.[329] Certain painters, like Guercino, made sharp distinctions between the work of master and student or assistant, while others, like Reni or Rubens, frequently retouched paintings and sold them as originals.[330] Retouching, in combination with the practice of making copies, was traditionally practiced as a method of correction. With the Renaissance development and *seicento* consolidation of the notion of the "divine," "inimitable" or "unique" artist's hand, however, retouching was a sign of the master's *ingenium*,[331] capable (in combination with the originary design he or she had provided for the initial work, if it was a copy) of overriding any contribution made by an assistant. As Richard Spear and other scholars have noted, "originality" in the minds of *seicento* artists and collectors could simply mean that the work was sanctioned by the master "as being up to par, regardless of his personal involvement in its execution."[332] Rosa's faith in the "added value" he gave to an existing work by the addition of his own hand is evident from his apparent claim that, in repairing and repainting the Maffei's "worthless" *clavicembalo*, he would raise its value to "no less than one hundred *scudi*".[333] Clearly he regarded his own "retouchings" as improvements,

---

[328] Sohm, "Maniera and the absent hand. Avoiding the etymology of style," 108. On the conception of invention and originality as a "unique" performance, see Richard Shiff, "Representation, Copying, and the Technique of Originality," *New Literary History* 15: 2 (1984): 335. On the copying and repetition as a series of "authentic" or "original" "performances", being "continuously renegotiated between the artist, the work and the receiver", see Panofsky, "Original and Facsimile Reproduction" (1930), published as "Original und Faksimilie Reproduktion," *Der Kreis. Zeitschrift für kunst Kultur*, 1930, reprinted in *Idea. Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunsthalle* 5 (1986): 111-23); as discussed in Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 43ff.
[329] As Beverly Louise Brown notes in connection with Veronese's late workshop reproduction practices, "Buying a Veronese meant buying a recognizable trademark: inspired and even quality-controlled by Paolo but not necessarily *di sua mano*." Brown, "Replication and the Art of Veronese," 121.
[330] On Reni, see Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 598; and Stephen Pepper, "Guido Reni's Practice of Repeating Compositions," *Artibus et Historiae* 20: 39 (1999): 27-54. On Rubens, see Spear, "Di sua mano," 80.
[331] Spear, "Di Sua Mano", 90. The notion was voiced by Vincenzo Carducho, Francesco Albani, Rubens, Carlo Ridolfi, and Guido Reni alike.
[332] Spear, "What is an Original?," 24.
[333] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462. There is additional evidence that Rosa retouched the paintings of other artists. Rosa and Mola were both employed to "restore" (retouch) two landscape paintings in the collection of Camillo Pamphili, via the auspices of Niccolò Simonelli. Giovanna Capitelli, "'Nota di guardaroba' del Principe Camillo Pamphilj," in *I capolavori della collezione Doria Pamphilj da Tiziano a Velazquez* (Milan, 1996), 77, notes 255, 256. Both paintings are still in the Galeria Doria Pamphili. Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 45, note 92.

enhancements, and even appropriations of the work in question. In 1662 Rosa reassured Ricciardi – who had apparently expressed concern over the matter – that the paintings he had sent him were retouched by his own hand in such a way as to make them utterly his own:

> "The pictures (since you asked) were sketched-out by one of my young men, and then from beginning to end were all retouched by my hand, and the two little figures entirely mine, to such a degree that they will be known all over the world."[334]

The equation Rosa made between his person and his art as sites of novelty reveal his contribution to the emergent modern conception of "originality", in which intentionality "is dislocated from the work itself and reinvested in the self-sufficient author".[335] His pursuit of rare iconography was aimed in large part at the creation of a unique identity, to be emulated and admired by successive generations like the great masters who were marveled at in his own day. With his unique subjects and style of painting and writing, Rosa aimed at making himself into an "original" in the dual *seicento* sense of the term, as both "primary" and "special". The practice of copying raised a potential conflict in this endeavour, encapsulated in the equivocal nature of the *seicento* discourse on copying and originality,[336] but the hazards it posed to individuality were allayed by the master's control and authorization (as both creation and permission) and ultimately superseded by the opportunity for self-propagation and fame. In this way, the singularity and originary nature of

[334] Borelli, letter 280: "I quadri (già che voi volete così) li feci sbozzare da un mio giovine, e poi da capo a piedi son tutti rittoccati di mia mano, e le due figurine affatto mie, a segno che le conosceriano sino agli orbi. Ma se voi non havete occhi da discernerlo, né lingua da confessarlo, io a chi colpo?" The passage is also interesting for its suggestion – contrary to Rosa's assertions elsewhere – that he *did* employ assistants or students, at least at this later stage in his career. In his next letter to Ricciardi (letter 281) Rosa again assured his friend that he would provide him, as always, with "my usual retouchings" (*rittochature*). In a letter of 1664 (letter 303), Rosa reprimanded his friend for daring to tell him how many figures to paint in works he was executing for him, one a picture of "soldiers" (as Ricciardi had requested) and another a "sacred subject". Rosa had set the limit at two or three figures (see letter 302), a restriction probably due to his failing eyesight, and, in the midst of lambasting Ricciardi for his lack of friendship, he exclaimed that even a single of the figures "by my hand" should suffice to satisfy him. The same unique "hand" appears in Rosa's complaint regarding Cordini's apparent manufacture of copies of his *Pan and Syrinx*: when his friend the Cavaliere Andrea Leoni told him that he had seen in Bologna "a Syrinx by my hand", Rosa realized that his original painting was "again in the possession of our Signor Cordini" and was being made into copies. Borelli, letter 86.
[335] Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 263.
[336] Spear notes that "there was no uniform opinion toward originals and copies in the seventeenth century." Spear, "What is an Original?," 24. Loh likewise notes the "diversity of aesthetic tastes" in the *seicento* in regard to the variety of attitudes toward the subject of novelty. Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 253.

the self was not undermined but assisted by duplication. As Rosa's comments frequently suggest, reputation was more important than the work of art itself.

Primary among Rosa's prerogatives was the liberty to choose his own subject matter. His obstinacy in this regard is clear from a number of his own comments and from a series of anecdotes recorded by his biographers. Baldinucci, for example, tells the amusing anecdote of a doctor who, upon daring to "prescribe" the subject of a painting he sought to commission from Rosa, was reminded by the artist that, just as it was not the artist's place to advise the doctor on his medical prescription, so too was painting not the province of the physician.[337] Rosa reputedly told another presumptuous client that he should "go to a brickmaker as they work to order."[338] He can be contrasted in this particular regard to Pietro da Cortona, who apparently "refused to choose his own subjects and claimed that he had never done so in his life", or with Rubens who conceded the choice of subject to a patron on the basis that he was the one paying for it.[339] It is often difficult to determine on the basis of Rosa's own identifications and those of his biographers (especially Baldinucci, who records the majority of Rosa's clients) whether the subject was of Rosa's own choosing or the suggestion of a patron or client, or some combination of the two. It is nonetheless apparent that many of Rosa's clients left the choice of iconography to Rosa, even if they had their own ideas in mind.[340] Rosa's claim to work for his "own satisfaction", moreover, left them little other choice.

---

[337] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 487-489.

[338] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 487-8; Pascoli, *Vite*, I: 84. Baldinucci reports that "Rosa used to say that 'only the *bottaio* (cooper or barrel-maker) and the *fornaciaio* (kiln-worker) make their work according to the requirements and measures prescribed to them, not the painters'." In painting the various inventive subjects for which he was most renowned, Rosa always decided on them "according to his beautiful poetic genius", following "the instinct of his natural very lively spirit", on occasion taking inspiration from the books he read. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 488.

[339] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 111. With regards to a commission for an altarpiece for London, Rubens writes to George Geldorp in 1637: "I leave the choice [of subject] to the one who will pay the expenses, as soon as we know how large the picture is to be." Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 406, letter 240, July 25 1637.

[340] Langdon notes, for example, that the subjects of Rosa's two paintings of *Pythagoras*, which he exhibited at San Giovanni Decollato in 1662, were likely proposed by Queen Christina of Sweden. When they could not agree on prices, however, Rosa gave the paintings to Don Antonio Ruffo. Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 50.

Rosa's assertion of his right to inventive freedom is based in a long-standing concept of artistic license or *licenza* – "an ability to question the rules and destabilize traditional orders" – given impetus by his *cinquecento* forebears.[341] To some extent, the early-modern art market permitted artists to pursue the prerogative of *licenza* and make their own choices. The early *seicento* Roman market, however, was a demand- rather than supply-driven system, in which popular taste was occasionally tolerant or supportive of the more unorthodox themes and genres of painting produced by artists like Rosa, but tended (to Rosa's dismay) to prefer the kind of genre paintings he detested.[342] The particular iconographic and stylistic choices Rosa made in his second Roman phase, from 1649 onward, did not always appeal to the market in which he operated. This suggests that Rosa desired to create his own, supply-driven or self-propelled "art market",[343] in

---

[341] Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 108-9; also see Alina Payne, *The Architectural Treatise in the Renaissance. Architectural Invention, Ornament, and Literary Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). It is surprising to discover, in view of his frequent proclamations for individuality and freedom, that Rosa only used the term *licenza* once in his extant letters in reference to his own artistic practice. His concern for adhering to historical accuracy in matters of iconography – in a manner similar to Poussin or Domenichino – presented a certain point of conflict when it came to exploring the alternative potential of innovative design. Rosa chastised certain painters for their unbridled license in rendering iconography. See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 490. In 1669 Rosa consulted with Ricciardi about his painting of *S. Torpè* for the Cathedral of Pisa, noting that he has consulted Guillaume du Choul's *Discorso sopra la castrametatione et disciplina militare de' Romani* (likely on the advice of Ricciardi himself) in order to determine the appropriate insignia for the flag the saint holds in his hand. Borelli, letter 370. When it came to the *Pan and Pindar* [Fig. 126], however, Rosa expressed a desire to take a certain "license" with the iconography. He could not find in Plutarch any distinction as to whether or not Pindar wore a beard: "e quando a ciò m'havesse obligato il rigore del testo, mi sarei presa licenza d'alterarlo per contestare l'offesa del buon costume e della modestia. Bastandomi per mia difesa le medesime parole dell'autore: Innamorato di lui e de' suoi versi." Borelli, letter 330. Elsewhere, Rosa uses the term *licenza* to refer more generally to the concepts of freedom and permission: see Borelli, letters 3, 48, 63, 129, 225, 252, 302, 342, and 366. H. W. Janson traced the origins of the artist's claims for inventive license to the *trecento* poetic theory of Petrarch and Boccaccio, their arguments subsequently "reflected in a series of anecdotes about artists that assert the artist's right to deal with his patron in cavalier fashion, on the grounds that the patron is ignorant and the artist obeys a higher law that gives him the freedom of a sovereign in his own domain." Janson, "The Birth of 'Artistic License': The Dissatisfied Patron in the Early Renaissance," in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. Lytle and Orgel, 344-346.

[342] Reinhardt, "The Roman Art Market in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", 91.

[343] This is a ploy that Spear identified in Reni's practice, although it was given a somewhat different execution by that artist. Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 598; and *idem*, "Scrambling for Scudi," 316: Reni "cleverly manipulated his market by controlling supply and demand. …patrons could decide how much they wanted to spend by choosing from among painters of quite inferior quality ('*pittori più bassi*'), who deserved no more than about 2 or 3 *scudi* per life-size figure; an ordinary artist ('*pittore ordinario*'), who commanded about 15 *scudi* a figure; and the special ('*straordinario*') painter, like himself, who was rewarded according to the excellence of the finished work. Reni knew how to profit by not setting prices on his paintings and relying instead on the magnificence of his wealthy patrons, who, after seeing the works completed, would pay him more than he would have asked for."

which he painted primarily for himself and his close friends yet expected at the same time to achieve the kind of success that the broader demand-driven market (in combination with the parallel, continuing system of patronage) offered so many of his less obstinate contemporaries.

The close analogy Rosa drew between his art and person is reflected in his concern over the difficulty of finding an appropriate artist to copy his paintings, and a perception of copying as a possible betrayal of that equation. The importance of solitary authorship (or, at least, the *appearance* of solitary authorship) to Rosa is clear from the academic fiasco of the mid-1650's during which certain Roman academics accused the artist of plagiarizing his satires.[344] Some of the *Umoristi* suggested that Rosa had stolen them from Ricciardi, and it is clear from one of Rosa's letters that both he and his Pisan friend were eager to make a distinction between their "hands": Ricciardi directly linked Rosa's "*ingegno*" to his hand, or his "manner of composing", distinguishing it as utterly unique to Rosa's "spirited" style.[345] That copying could be equated with theft as "plagiarism" was a pervasive concern among Rosa's contemporaries, conveyed perhaps

---

[344] For the scandal among the *Umoristi*, see chapter two, 91, note 97. Rosa complained to Ricciardi in 1652 that the *Umoristi* had accused him of plagiarizing his brother. Borelli, letter 153. No written works by Rosa's brother survive; his name is mentioned in a letter of San Giuseppe Calasanzio as the "brother of the Painter who is optimal in prose and verse". Festa, "Uno scolopio mancato ed uno vero: Salvator Rosa e il fratello," 73. In 1654 he wrote that they were accusing him of plagiarizing Reginaldo Sgambati for the composition of his *L'Invidia*, an impossibility since Sgambati had died in 1648. Borelli, letter 174; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 491. On plagiarism and imitation see Walter L. Bullock, "The Precept of Plagiarism in the Cinquecento," *Modern Philology* 25: 3 (1928): 293-312; and Stephen Orgel, "The Renaissance Artist as Plagiarist," *English Literary History* 48: 3 (1981): 476-495.

[345] Borelli, letter 181: "In quanto al negotio dell'Errera, è molto diverso dalla verità asseritami dalla vostra penna, attesoché lui ha detto d'havervi parlato, e discorrendo delle satire e delle mie discordie, haver trovato Vostra Signoria molto bene informato. Ma nel particolare delle satire, che voi havete detto di meravigliarvi di sì fatto sospetto, [affermate:] essendo cosa troppa chiara quanto il Signor Salvatore habbia più spirito et ingegno di me in sì fatto genere di comporre. Ma io questo dubito, che sia relatione dello Scorno mentre dice di vantaggio, che voi havete molte cose belle di mia mano. Quest'è quanto." That Rosa was appreciated in particular for his originality (if not always for his artistic skill) is suggested by Mattia Preti's comment to Don Antonio Ruffo in 1665 that "Rosa is the original one [*l'originale*] in his manner, in which he is a *valentuomo*". By "original", Preti meant "first", but also "special". Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel secolo XVII in Messina," 256, letter of February 27 1665: "Rosa è l'originale della sua maniera e in quella è valentuomo." Baldinucci also alluded to the same idea, noting that Rosa's strength lay in "originality of invention rather than beauty of style". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 478, cited in Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 344. The appreciation for Rosa as "original" – in both an originary and unique sense – extended into the posthumous, Romantic assessment of his work. It is a feature, for example, of Joshua Reynolds' description of Rosa as emblematic of the "characteristical" style. See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 338, 344; on Reynolds' category of the "Original or Characteristical Style" of painting, see Reynolds, *Discourses on Art*, 78 (Discourse V, 1772, line 249).

most succinctly in Giovanni Lanfranco's accusation and defamation of Domenichino for "plagiarizing" Agostino Carracci's *Last Communion of St. Jerome*.[346] Here, as in the case of Rosa's satires, the "originality" of the invention was inexorably linked to the artist's reputation, which was in just as much danger as his art. Rosa's anxiety to emphasize the "newness" of his work may have been motivated in part by the polemic surrounding the Domenichino incident itself, and the specific accusations of repetitive and theft-like copying levelled against the Bolognese artist.

Cropper has made the intriguing suggestion that Rosa's *"Genius"* etching [Fig. 99], a celebration of the artist's own *fantasia* and *capriccio*, commented on the subjects of originality, novelty and plagiarism via the Domenichino scandal: Rosa's print, as Giacomo Serra earlier noted, is very close in composition to Domenichino's *Last Communion of St. Jerome*, with a reversed arrangement.[347] Cropper proposes that Rosa's print, which "combines the attributes of sincerity, freedom and caprice with the countervailing balances of measure" can be interpreted alternatively as an "ironic" commentary on his own novelty (in basing his image of "capricious genius" on the "most notorious plagiarism of modern times") or as a "witty defense" of Domenichino, in which Rosa argues that his own inventive genius is based on the *concetto* of his slandered predecessor but – in its reversal – aims to overturn that criticism. Rosa could easily have added Domenichino to the list of wrongfully maligned forebears and contemporaries with whom he identified: "am I not to become the Socrates, the Tasso and the Guarino of my own time?" he wrote to Ricciardi in 1654, amid the hail of accusations from the *Umoristi*.[348] If it was intended to refer directly to Domenichino's *concetto*, then Rosa's print points to his desire to actively participate in the contemporary critical discourse on the subject of novelty and originality.

---

[346] On the scandal, see Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*.
[347] Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 161; see L. Serra, *Domenichino Zampiero, ditto il Domenichino* (Rome, 1909), 47. Cropper also notes the iconographic connection (earlier observed by Wallace, *Etchings*, 80) between Rosa's print and Raphael's *Transfiguration* (1518-20, Vatican Pinacoteca, Rome).
[348] Borelli, letter 176: "non son io divenuto il Socrate, il Tasso et il Guarino de' tempi miei, con tanti invidiosi latratori?" Rosa also compares himself to Socrates in letter 208.

The modern concept of "newness" as a unique and inimitable skill is apparent in Rosa's few comments on the subject. In 1662, he wrote to Ricciardi that he had finished his two paintings of subjects from the life of Pythagoras [Figs. 111 and 112], intended for the upcoming exhibition at San Giovanni Decollato, "the subjects of which are completely and utterly new and have never been treated by anyone."[349] In 1666, he boasted to Ricciardi that the large *Pan and Pindar* [Fig. 126] he had exhibited at San Giovanni was "considered entirely novel, and as yet no one else's paintbrush has touched it". Along with two other paintings, a *Chiron the Centaur Teaching the Young Achilles* and an *Etra and Theseus*, it "succeeded with an extraordinary innovation according to those knowledgeable in matters of painting," contrary to the charges of his "enemies" and "imitators".[350] (His anxiety over being duplicated, too, is signaled by the last part of his statement.) For the 1668 exhibition, Rosa "risked everything in order to achieve the credence of reputation" by presenting one of his most original subjects, the *Saul and the Witch of Endor*.[351] The premium Rosa placed on inventive, eccentric and new subjects is further suggested by his assessment of his etching *The Fall of the Giants* as a "simple idea" (*un semplice pensiero*).[352] The subject was not exactly pervasive in painting or printmaking, but it had already been made famous by at least one prior artist (Giulio Romano at the Palazzo del Te, between 1531 and 1536) and was thus closely bound to another artist's identity. This concern for the association of iconography with the artist's "mark" is also implicit in Rosa's desire to find subjects that no other artist's paintbrush (or hand) had "touched."

Rosa's discourse on the need to control his own iconography is tantamount to a theory of intellectual property. Like some of his forebears and contemporaries, Rosa made important

---

[349] Borelli, letter 272: "Ho concluso i due quadri che stavo lavorando, i sogetti de' quali sono del tutto e per tutto nuovi, né tocchi mai da nessuno."
[350] Borelli, letter 328: "[il] detto soggetto è stata stima novissima affatto, e non tocca ancora da pennello nessuno. … Tutti questi soggetti son riusciti di non ordinaria novità anche presso gli eruditi, e per quel che s'appartiene alla pittura, il meglior ch'io sin hora m'habbia operato, per quello che n'hanno favellato i miei emuli e nemici."
[351] Borelli, letter 359: "… ho questa volta arrischiato il tutto per conferirmi nel credito della fama."
[352] Borelli, letter 290: "Voi mi chiedete il disegno dell'ultimo rame intagliato de' Giganti, quand'io già l'havevo messo da parte per voi; è ben vero che ne caverete poco di bello, per essere un semplice pensiero. La stampa però è riuscita assai bene, e di non ordinaria sodisfazione presso quelli della professione." Also see letter 293.

contributions toward blurring the distinction between the previously disparate categories of the tangible *invenzione* (the invention, concept, design or composition) and the more elusive *novità* (novelty, innovation) and *ingegno* (talent, intelligence, ingenuity).[353] Iconographic control, and the pursuit of novelty in its formulation, was also a key feature of Rosa's exhibiting strategy as it was for his production more generally. He frequently aimed to "wow" the Roman art establishment with the *novità* – the unusual, spontaneous newness – of his subject matter.[354] The marketing of a unique, individual style (based in large part on novel iconography) was a key component in Rosa's attempt to create a distinctive "brand", directed not only at self-differentiation but at a target audience of like-minded clients among both his friends and potential clients. As Roworth has noted, Rosa promoted himself as inventive and "original" in the face of stiff competition via the cultivation of both "*bizzarria*" and novelty in the iconography of his work and in the unique traits of his persona.[355] Instead of aligning himself with older or contemporary masters, Rosa frequently positioned himself as their rival (especially with Michelangelo and Raphael, who Vasari had made the paragons of inimitability, but also Titian, Cortona, Caravaggio and Bernini),[356] asserting his

---

[353] De Marchi and Van Miegroet, "Pricing Invention," 30-31. On the increasing connection drawn between "genius" (*ingegno*) and invention in sixteenth-century Italian texts, see Miedema, *Kunst historisch* (Leiden: Primavera, 1995), 204ff; and Kemp (citing Vasari on Donatello), "The 'Super-artist' as Genius," in *Genius*: *The History of an Idea*, ed. Penelope Murray (Oxford and New York: B. Blackwell, 1989), 46.

[354] The *Vocabolario della Crucsa* defines "*novità*" as "a new, unusual thing that comes about unexpectedly" ("Cosa nuova, insolita, e che avviene improvvisamente"). *Vocabolario*, 1612 ed., 548-9, as cited in Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 249. Loh notes that "[t]he term *novità* originated in the fourteenth century as a term referring to 'news' (an equivalent to the modern word *notizie*). *Novità* then appeared as a critical term with [the] Domenichino controversy and the Marinisti debates in the 1620's and it eventually became associated with 'originality' in the eighteenth century." Loh, *ibid*, 250-251, n. 127; see Battaglia, *Grande Dizionario*, 11: 613-14.

[355] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 346, 353-4, 374. "Rosa turned the criticism to his advantage by incorporating it into his self-conception as a satirist, who must stand somewhat outside of society."

[356] Rosa's imitative relationship to Michelangelo is based in part on a desire to both emulate and supersede. Passeri recorded (with embarrassment) Rosa's declaration of having surpassed even Michelangelo with his altarpiece of SS. Cosmas and Damian. Passeri, *Vite*, 434. In *La Pittura* Rosa critiqued Michelangelo for his use of nudity in the *Last Judgement* (vv. 367-408), but in *L'Invidia* he praised him as an exemplary painter-poet. See Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 161. On Vasari's positioning of Michelangelo and Raphael as the ultimate and unsurpassable representatives of the "terza maniera" or "third age" of painting, see Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 107. The influence of Michelangelo is apparent in many of Rosa's images. The "Genius" figure in Rosa's "*Genius"* etching bears a close resemblance to Michelangelo's "often-copied" figure of Adam on the Sistine chapel ceiling. Roworth, *ibid*, 85. Rosa was also influenced by Michelangelo in his etching of *The Fall of the Giants*. For Rosa's epistolary references to Michelangelo, see letters 98 and 158. Rosa also pitted himself against Cortona (Borelli, letter 162), Caravaggio (he reputedly informed Bellori that Caravaggio was lacking in

own vision as the new guide to be followed: "think what you would say if you could see it through the eyes of Salvator!" he exclaimed one day when looking at a painting with a colleague.[357] Rosa's endeavour to position himself and his work as "original" in relation to past, present and future artists participates in what David Quint has identified as the "relative" and historically-grounded principle of originality.[358] Rather than aiming for emulation, however, Rosa's method was characteristically antagonistic in nature, playing out the Horatian dictum (paraphrased by Celio Calcagnani) that "no brilliant minds can make substantial progress unless they have an antagonist … with whom they may struggle and wrestle."[359] As Philip Sohm has noted, the link established by early-modern artists between identity and style made the latter into a means of "fighting for self-preservation or self-advancement" – in Rosa's case often quite literally. The pursuit of that virtuous reputation required the artist to be "original", to possess "a recognizable style that no one else could produce."[360] Rosa expressed this conviction when he told Ricciardi in 1666 that he would have to wait until he could find an appropriate copyist capable of giving a copy of the *Regulus* "an extraordinary exquisiteness" that would please Ricciardi as much as himself.[361]

Rosa was not the only *seicento* artist to pursue novel subject matter. Caravaggio, Pietro Testa, Lorenzo Lippi, Giovanni Battista Pace and Pier Francesco Mola also sought innovative and arcane subjects.[362] The pursuit of obscure, novel subject matter also prevailed in the academies of

---

his ability to paint history subjects; see Joseph Connors, review of *Le vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti..., Rome, 1642 by Giovanni Baglione*, by Jacob Hess, *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57: 4 (1998): 470) and Annibale Carracci, who he alternatively praised as unsurpassable (Borelli, letter 331) and judged negatively (Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 703-705).

[357] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 489. Passeri reiterated the idea of "unique" vision: "[i]f a single object is observed by one hundred eyes, *each sees it differently* and, in wanting to render it on canvas with the vivacity of colors, each is seen to centuplicate this variety in the expression [style]." Passeri, *Vite*, ed. Hess, 344, preface to the Life of Guercino. Emphasis mine. As cited in Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 181. For other instances of Rosa's use of the third person, see Borelli, letters 46, 116, 134, 141, 154, 170, 238, 290, 303 and 316.

[358] Quint, *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature*, 4-5, cited in Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 107.

[359] Pigman, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," 17-18, cited in Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 112.

[360] Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 24, 27.

[361] Borelli, letter 332: "straordinaria squisitezza"

[362] Caravaggio pursued genre scenes unusual for his time, and his faith in both his novelty and his personal dominion over it is made apparent in his threat to crack open Guido Reni's skull for copying his style of painting.

literature and poetry of the period, including Rosa's Florentine *Percossi*.[363] Mina Gregori has situated Rosa's "persistent individualism and non-conformism" within a broader trend in Florentine *seicento* art, a veritable alternative tradition in painting that can be traced from "the eccentric [*bizzarria*] creations and wit of Giovanni da San Giovanni", to the "irreverent provocations of Sebastiano Mazzoni", to the "disturbing vision" of Giovanni Battista Vanni's wild landscapes, and the black humor of Cecco Bravo.[364]

Rosa's contemporaries also noted his success in this respect. Defending Rosa against the accusations of plagiarism, Passeri described him as possessing a "novel style all his own, unattached to the heels of any other," capable of devising his "ideas" (*idea*) with a "very noble, copious, and abundant invention [*invenzione*]."[365] He uses the term *recondite* (abstruse or obscure) to describe Rosa's "outlandish" history subjects.[366] Baldinucci describes both Rosa's style of painting and his subject matter as "all things that truly were his own more than of any other",

---

Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 124; see Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice*, II: 13 Pietro Testa had a predilection for "rare" subjects, as his prints of the *Suicide of Cato* (c. 1648) and *The Symposium* (1648) make clear. Cropper ed., *Pietro Testa*, 245. Lorenzo Lippi sought obscure or untouched subjects in religious and literary histories. For example, *The Three Youths Condemned to the Furnace*, or *Tamar rendering the pledges to Judas*, which are both rare biblical stories (D'Afflitto, *Lorenzo Lippi*, 95-96, 198-201) or literary subjects like *Orlando and Isabella in the Bandits' Cove* (from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, XII, 90 and sgg., XIII, 1-39; D'Afflitto, *ibid*, 272). Giovanni Battista Pace (1650-1699), strongly influenced by Rosa's work and interested in "non-conventional iconography", painted rare subjects taken up by Rosa like *Saul and the Pythoness of Endor*. Epifani, "Giovan Battista Pace e il Disegno: Un Petit Maitre tra Pier Francesco Mola, Salvator Rosa e Pietro da Cortona," *Proporzioni* 5 (2004): 133; also see Vertova, "Ricordando Pietro Testa, il Lucchesino," in A. W. A Boschloo et al., '*Aux Quatre Vents': A Festschrift for Bert W. Meijer* (Florence, 2002), 121-130 (127-129). Pier Francesco Mola, too, who like Rosa desired to be known as a "*pittore di historia*", was interested in unusual subjects like the *Oriental Warrior* (1650, Louvre, Paris), although he seems to have been consistently drawn by market demand (and economic prospects) to the production of small landscapes and minor genres. Briganti, "Osservazioni sulla carriera professionale e sullo stile di Pier Francesco Mola," in *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*, ed. Khan-Rossi, 23; and Spezzaferro, "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano," 49.

[363] Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia*, 16, 20.

[364] Gregori, "I decenni centrali del secolo. 'Maxima et minima': Volterrano, Stefano della Bella e oltre," in *Storia delle arti in Toscana: Il Seicento*, ed. Gregori, 159. Eva Struhal has suggested that Rosa's taste for unusual, erudite subjects in his Florentine years closely parallels the "elevated poetic language" of his friend the poet Francesco Rovai, whose poetry is "replete with metaphors that draw on and require a profound understanding of antique mythology and history." Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements".

[365] Passeri, *Vite*, 429. His characterization of Rosa, from the outset, is defined by the artist's endowment with the "truly singular gifts" bestowed by God. Passeri, *ibid*, 416.

[366] Passeri, *Vite*, 433. "e nelle invenzioni delle istorie pellegrine, e recondite che toccava il segno maggiore …"

"eccentric" (*bizzarra*) in their uniqueness.[367] In an attempt to explain to Don Antonio Ruffo why Rosa refused to produce a painting for him with small figures, Cornelis de Stael explained that this was a feature of the artist's overly "eccentric humor" (*imore bisare*).[368] Rosa's own epistolary comments confirm that he sought to cultivate *bizzarria* and *stravaganza* as key features of his novel artistic persona. As both Roworth and Ebert-Schifferer have observed, Rosa opted for "*bizzarria*" subjects as a strategy for establishing an inimitable identity and competing in a competitive art market.[369] The quality remained closely attached to his work and style in the remarks of other contemporary and posthumous commentators.[370] Volpi has even suggested that it was a characteristic Rosa sought in his friends.[371]

The term *bizzaria*, used by Rosa and his biographers in reference to both his work and person, is closely linked to a set of related concepts – including *meraviglia* (marvel), *stravaganza* (eccentricity), *capriccio* and *ghiribizzo* (whim or caprice), *fantastico* and *licenzia* (invention or anti-rule) – that express the primacy granted to the imagination by early-modern artists and art theorists.[372] Rosa and his biographers indicate the influence of the direct experience on his art,

---

[367] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 477-8. He also describes Rosa's inventions as "bizzarre o satiriche invenzioni". Baldinucci, *ibid*, 442. As Roworth notes, he described Rosa as having a "perspicace ingegno e bizzarissimo spirito." Baldinucci, *ibid*, 490; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 344. Passeri called it an "ingegno vivace e sollevato". Passeri, *Vite*, 392.

[368] Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," 169. The letter is dated June 9 1663. De Stael spells "*umore*" as "*imore*", according to Ruffo's transcription.

[369] Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 66; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 354.

[370] Giovanni Targioni Tozzetti, for example, described Rosa's "bizzarri" paintings in his eighteenth-century life of Piero Dandini. Bellesi, "Una vita inedita di Pier Dandini," 157. The Abbè Nicaise used the term in reference to Rosa: "J'avois dans mon voisinage Salvator Rosa que je voyois quelquefois; c'étoit un Peintre assez celèbre suivant que ses ouvrages le témoignent, bizarre, singulier dans son genre et dans ses expressions, fort atrabilaire et melancolique". Giovanni Previtali, "Introduzione", in Bellori, *Vite de' pittori, scultori e architetti moderni*, ed. Evelina Borea (Turin: Einaudi, 1976), xlvi, note; Nicaise, *L'Ecole d'Athènes*, 21. Giovanni Cinelli Calvoli noted the liveliness of Rosa's paintbrushes and his "bizzaria ingegno". Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 71-2.

[371] Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 36.

[372] Rosa uses the term "*stravagante*" more frequently than "*bizzarria*". In a letter to Ricciardi of 1662 he noted that Pope Alexander VII had complimented his *Figurine* etchings as "bizzaria". Borelli, letter 271. Baldinucci uses the term to describe Rosa's inventions and style of painting (*Notizie*, 442, 478), his personality (490), the Getty *Fortune* purchased by De' Rossi (446), the improvised theatrical performances of the *Accademia dei Percossi* (452); the academic dinners or *symposie* hosted by Rosa for his academy and their inventive dishes (453), and so forth. Passeri opts instead for "stravagante". Passeri, *Vite*, 433 and 438. Helen Hills notes that "*bizzarria* did not have exclusively pejorative connotations from its earliest uses – it appears in Dante's *Inferno* [c.1300 and c.1313] – to even as late as the 1740s." Hills, "The baroque: beads in a rosary or folds of time,"

particularly during his early study in Naples when he made "oil sketches" from nature. Greater emphasis, however, is placed by the artist and his commentators on the imagination (*fantasia*), rather than nature, as the primary creative impulse.[373] Struhal has argued that Rosa's theory of art, inspired by his engagement in Florentine art-theoretical circles (and in particular by his relationship with Lorenzo Lippi) promoted an "*imitazione fantastica*" rather than an "*imitazione naturale*."[374] Unlike Lippi, who conceived of art as an "objective imitation of nature through disegno", Rosa emphasized artistic license and fantastic or poetic inventions.[375] Rosa's art consisted in novelty, emotional involvement of the viewer, and erudite subject matter, as well as a promotion of the *pittoresco* style. A passage in the *La Pittura* points to Rosa's adherence to a concept of ideal imitation promoted by Giovanni Battista Agucchi. Critiquing the *Bamboccianti*, Rosa asserts that the ideal painter:

> " … does not paint only visible things
> but should at times indicate
> as much as possible, all those things that are incorporeal.
> Painters must be erudite,
> well-versed in the sciences, and know well
> the Myths, the Histories, the Seasons, the Rites …"[376]

Fabrications (Dec. 2007), 1, note 3. The word was first given its full art theoretical meaning by Vasari in reference to Michelangelo's novel "aesthetic creativity" in architecture, in particular the "bizarre breaks" he introduced to the Laurentian library staircase. Giancarlo Maiorino notes that "*bizzarria* touched on an associative field ranging from *fantastico* to *stravagante*. Toward the end of the sixteenth century, *bizzarro* defined a formal category when interest in such eccentric forms as *strano*, *contraffatto*, *ingegnoso*, *caricaturale*, and *iperbolico* flourished." Maiorino, *The Portrait of Eccentricity. Arcimboldo and the Mannerist Grotesque* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 51. On "bizzarria" as an early-modern art-theoretical and formal concept, see Luisa Secchi Tarugi ed., *Disarmonia, Bruttezza, e Bizzarria nel Rinascimento*. Atti del VII Convegno internazionale. Chianciano-Pienza 17-20 luglio 1995 (Florence: Franco Cesati editore, 1998), esp. Lionello Sozzi, "Il *crotesque*: bruttezza e bizzarria," 9-17, and Tarugi, "Le bizzarrie pittoriche di Piero di Cosimo," 319-40.

[373] On Rosa "sketching from nature", see Passeri, *Vite*, 417 and Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438. Baldinucci observed that Rosa privileged his *fantasia* over "nature", a propensity that only increased toward the end of his career when "he did not draw anything from nature" but took recourse to his "most tenacious fantasy" in devising his paintings. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 487. Baldinucci elsewhere argued that Rosa's uniquely "eccentric" (*bizzarra*) style was in part the result of his "lack of or little view of nature", a deficiency that forced the artist "by great practice that he had acquired in handling the paintbrush" to create his own style. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 478.

[374] Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 144. *Imitazione fantastica* was also privileged by Baldinucci, and Struhal rightfully points to the need to see the biographer's praise of Rosa's style in connection with his own aesthetic biases. Sohm, too, has stressed that "Baldinucci's art-theoretical writings were informed by an interest in connoisseurship and thus by a set of aesthetic values that bias his accounts." Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 165-84.

[375] Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements".

[376] Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 298-301; Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 72-77: "non dipinge sol quel ch'è visibile/ Ma necessario è che tal volta additi/ Tutto quel ch'è incorporeo, e ch'è possibile./ Bisogna che i

The conception of artistic creation as rooted in the individual artist's mind or *fantasia* was also "a keystone in burgeoning arguments for the autonomy" of painting and the artist, traceable to the comments of much earlier theorists like Cennino Cennini, Leonardo and Albrecht Dürer.[377] Rosa's promotion of *fantasia* as the basis of his art, then, was also fundamentally about staking a claim for his professional freedom.

For Rosa, imaginative novelty was based above all in the qualities of rarity and obscurity, both new subjects as well as unusual ones. Rare iconography, however, could work for or against the artist, depending on the audience. While some clients expressed a preference for novel but still-recognizable subject-matter, taking satisfaction in their ability to interpret the iconography, others actively sought obscure subjects as a game of interpretation for the select, initiated few – a game equally vital for the artist in establishing his or her indispensability (in elucidating the image's meaning for the viewer) and entitlement to artistic license.[378] The relative rarity of iconography also had an economic dimension. Highly recognizable images often secured better financial

---

Pittori siano eruditi,/ Ne le scienze introdotti, e sappian bene/ Le Favole, l'Istorie, i Tempi, i Riti". Struhal here takes from Cropper and Thompson, who "have convincingly pointed out that this passage exemplifies Rosa's insistence on a mode of imitation that must transcend the material appearance of the world, which the *Bamboccianti* had made the sole object of their art." Cropper, *The Ideal of Painting*, 25; Thompson, "Pigmei Pizzicano Giganti," 352-54. Rosa was interested in a mode of imitation similar to that proclaimed by Agucchi in his *Trattato della Pittura* (1610-15, published in 1646), privileging an idealized form of imitation over a pure representation of visible nature. See Mahon, *Studies in Seicento Art and Theory*, 242.

[377] These artists, "among others, based claims for the elevated status of the visual arts on the faculty of artistic 'phantasia'." Swan, *Art, Science and Witchcraft*, 156.

[378] Gosman, "Princely Culture," 17-19, 27-29. In a letter to Cosimo I de' Medici, Giovan Battista Adriani commented on connection between painting and poetry, and on the viewer's need for familiarity with the subject: "it seems to me that a picture of a new subject is more pleasing when one already has some idea about it. … in my opinion he who paints something entirely unknown, or known by very few, will give less satisfaction". Hope, "Artists, Patrons, and Advisers in the Italian Renaissance," 334; see Alessandro del Vita, "Lo Zibaldone di G. Vasari," *Il Vasari* VII (1935): 106-110ff. According to a key tenet of psychology, the subject chosen must remain at least somewhat recognizable in order to elicit a pleasurable response from the viewer. Bianchi, "Consuming Novelty: Strategies for Producing Novelty in Consumption," 4. *Seicento* artists like Jacob Jordaens and Anton Franz Maulbertsch took it upon themselves to write explanatory texts for paintings with more abstruse subjects. They aimed to augment the "extraordinariness" of their work, but not at the cost of confusing the viewer: subjects were selected in order to encourage engagement with their work, to "solve the riddle", and to offer a more profound intellectual experience. See Pigler, "The Importance of Iconographical Exactitude," *Art Bulletin* 21: 3 (1939): 229.

recompense for the artist, an idea that Rosa appears to have mocked in his own satire *La Pittura*.[379] But obscure subjects, too, could be granted significant financial value: Queen Christina's inventory of c. 1703, for example, assigned a higher value to the paintings in her collection according to the relative "rarity" of their subject or style.[380] These "novel" subjects also had to adhere to the rules of artistic decorum: in choosing "bizarre" and rare subjects, Rosa nonetheless endeavoured to maintain the requisite balance between *licenza* and *regola* as defined by Vasari, and to seek a position of distinction within the bounds of erudite, classicist history painting.[381] (His subjects could not, for example, stray – as Rosa had criticized Bernini of doing in his *commedie* – from the "rules" appropriate to their genre.) The "audience" for Rosa's obscure iconography, however, was ultimately a select, privileged group of friends who – via their similitude of intellect and interests – were granted access to the meaning of his paintings. If they were not his friends already, his potential clients and patrons were required to "pass the test" of interpreting and appreciating his images *as if* they were friends, thereby enacting the egalitarian process so fundamental to Rosa's professional strategy.

Conceptions of and attitudes toward the idea of novelty in the *seicento* "cult of the new" (or what Mario Menghini terms "neomania"[382]) were complex and wide-ranging, but they generally followed two lines of thought. The first consisted in finding new ways of "reinterpreting" old

---

[379] Struhal considers that Rosa's derisive comparison of the *Bamboccianti* to the Greek painter Pyraeicos, "who excelled in the depiction of 'barbers' shops, and cobbler's stalls, asses, viands and the like" may have been inspired "by Pliny's mention of the aesthetic pleasure that such paintings evoke in their patrons resulting in their financial success." Struhal, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 298; Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 288-291; Pliny, *Natural History*, ed. C. P. Goold, trans. H. Rackham, vol. LCL 394, Book XXXV, 345.

[380] A "Ritratto di Cavallo" by Cicio Napolitano is given the value of 50 *luigi*, described as "in questo genere è rarissimo"), while a "Ritratto d'un Religioso suo Confessore" by Bernini, painted "di un gran maniera" and described as a "Cosa rara", is valued at 100 *luigi*, "per la rarità." *Cristina di Svezia. Le collezioni reali.* Exhibition at the Fondazione Memmo, Rome (Milan: Electa, 2003), 79, items 182 and 186.

[381] Maiorino, *The Portrait of Eccentricity. Arcimboldo and the Mannerist Grotesque*, 51-2. The emphasis on the nobility and decorum of invention was a much more pervasive concern in the period. At the French Academy in Paris, for example, "Invention was to be noble, and [Charles] Lebrun considered the presence of such vulgar beasts as the camels in Poussin's *Eliezer and Rebecca*, or ox and ass in [Annibale] Carracci's *Adoration of the Shepherds*, an offence against this rule." Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 94-95.

[382] See Menghini, *La vita e le opere di Giambattista Marino: studio biografico-critico* (Rome: Manzoni, 1888), cited in Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 135.

themes (recommended by Tesauro, Tasso, Poussin, Giambattista Marino, and Daniello Bartoli, for example[383]), in which the "newness" arose from the artist's own imaginative re-arrangement of existing or long-lost ideas. The second lay in carving an entirely new, completely un-trodden path. This is the metaphor that Rosa used in one of his letters to Ricciardi: asking his friend once again for help with finding a novel subject for a painting, Rosa complained: "I have seen the print you sent me, and I reply that it is not an innovation [*novità*] to make account of, being a very stupid thing, and so we are still pounding the well-trodden paths, not finding here anything worthy of admiration."[384] Certain theorists regarded this mode of devising entirely new, never-before-seen subjects as the superior of the two possible types of novelty.[385] In the fields of art and poetry, however, it remained a relatively nascent principle, only coming to full fruition with the modern conception of "originality" which places "all of its qualitative demands upon originary primacy."

---

[383] In his *Cannocchiale aristotelico* (1654), Emanuele Tesauro recommended that writers make a slight alteration in the "grammatical structure" of their imitation of clever expressions in order to produce something "no longer the same and yet … the same". Tesauro, in *Italy in the Baroque: Selected Readings*, ed. and trans. B. Dooley (New York: Garland, 1995), 468-9, cited in Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche," 255. Poussin adhered to Tasso's conviction that novelty was not tied to the choice of "a subject that has never been seen before" but rather based "upon a good and novel arrangement and expression" by which an old subject "becomes new and singular". Poussin, 'Osservationi di Nicolò Pussino sopra la Pittura'; see Bellori, *Vite*, 462; Tasso, *Discorsi del Signor Torquato Tasso* (Venice: G. Vasalini, 1587), 2-3; cited in Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 208, 249-50. Marino famously defended imitation-as-theft, rationalizing novelty as the product of the individual imitator's *fantasia* and *capriccio*. See Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 148-151. In Bartoli's popular *Dell'uomo di lettere difeso et emendato* (1646), which he dedicated to Rosa, he commented on the subjects of plagiarism (*ladroneccio*, or thievery), originality, and novelty, noting "We must not make ourselves Masters of Novelties, wandring without reason (especially in things that are meerly Natural) from those ways; which already beaten in so many ages, by the best wits of the World, have upon their confines for such as pass them, Temerity and Error." It was only acceptable to "steal" from others if the theft was conducted "honestly". Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 121, 168-9; Bartoli, *Learned Man Defended*, 157-8, English ed. of 1660. As Janson asserts, novelty in early-modern subject matter is not only about "inventing" something new, but also about interpreting old ideas in a new way. Janson, "The Birth of 'Artistic License'," 350-1.

[384] Borelli, letter 281: "Ho veduto la carta mandatami, e vi replico che non è una novità da farne conto, essendo cosa assai cogliona, e però ce ne staremo a battere le strade vecchie, non trovando in questa cosa nessuna d'ammirazione."

[385] Monsu Capellano (Jean Chapelain), for example, regarded it as the more perfect type of novelty in his *Discorso* of 1625. Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 250-251; Cappellano, *Discorso di Monsù Cappellano …Nel quale dà il suo parere sopra l'Adone Poema del Cavalier Marino* (Venice, Giacomo Sarzina, 1625), 139-40.

The first type of novelty, in which old is made into new, was the more pervasive conception of *novità* among *seicento* artists, a significant point for understanding the nature of Rosa's position.[386]

The potential of both prints and copies to act as instruments for self-propagation and the achievement of fame, and (less importantly) as a source of income, seem to have superseded in Rosa's mind any potential threat they posed to the "unique" or "innovative" nature of his work.[387] As various scholars have emphasized, the practices of repetition and imitation were not conceived in the early-modern period in the often negative terms that they are today: reproduction and imitation were prized over novelty and innovation, and were regarded as a "mark of prestige".[388] As Loh has argued, novelty in the *seicento* was not limited only to the "singular" moment but could be found in the repetitive act of reinterpretation. She emphasizes that the modern notion of originality as "singularity" – "a unique work in the unique hand of the master" – is a "post-Enlightenment construction."[389] Repetition, Loh contends, is a fundamental component of the early-modern artist's process of self-fashioning, an intrinsically socially-bound and performative experience.[390] Loh has scrutinized the semantics of the terms "copy" and "original" according to their use in the

---

[386] Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 251-2. Novelty as "reinvention" was cited by Poussin, for example, in his defense of Domenichino against the accusation by Lanfranco that he had plagiarized Agostino Carracci's *Last Communion of St. Jerome*. Bellori, *Vite*, 481; cited by Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 4.

[387] On the contentious history of printmaking in connection with the rising conception of authenticity and "originality" in art, see Spear, "Notes on Renaissance and Baroque Originals and Originality," in *Retaining the Original*, ed. Krauss et al, 98ff.

[388] Romano, "The Art Market in Italy (15th-17th Centuries). Concluding Remarks," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 447. The literature on imitation in early-modern art theory, and its ancient sources, is vast. See my bibliography for a selection of these texts.

[389] Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche," 239; see the definition of "*originalità*" in Battaglia, *Grande dizionario*, 12: 638-40. Loh notes that the term "originality" does not appear until the nineteenth-century in the fifth edition of the *Vocabolario degli Crusca* "where the only listed example of its usage is in Luigi Lanzi's *Storia pittorica dell'Italia*, which dates to 1792." Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 52.

[390] Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 18 and *passim*. Loh's location of the *seicento* conception of "originality" in theatrical terms is particularly revealing for my own assertion of the intrinsically performative, social nature of Rosa's practice and identity. Loh, *Strategies of Repetition*, 241-2. At the base of Loh's argument is the requirement to acknowledge the role played by external elements (including, implicitly, social contexts) in the production of art. Loh, *ibid*, 7-8. On the homo-social and performative nature of repetition, see Loh, *ibid*, 71-83. Arguing against Harold Bloom's theory of the "anxiety of influence", she writes, "Influence, [unlike cowardice or the fear of the power of artistic predecessors] ... was not conceived of as an anxious condition."... Passeri [wrote that] Salvatore Rosa, 'was not afraid of Titian, Guido Reni, Guercino, nor anyone else'." Loh, *ibid*, 62. While Rosa alludes to "copies" on various occasions in his letters, his use of the term "original" is far less common. In a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1651, Rosa refers to copying a passage of text from an "original" (meaning "first") document for his friend's benefit. Borelli, letter 93.

seicento, and argues that they are relatively fluid concepts that lack the sharp distinction made by modern users. On the one hand (and most commonly), the term "original" represented the "originary" or first object in a series or set, while "copy" referred to a "subsequent original" – the sequentiality of which (importantly) did not automatically imply any relative lack of quality or innovation.[391] On the other hand, in epistemological terms the "original" could represent a "unique invention" – "an immaterial concept, implying notions such as *invenzione*, *cosa mentale* and *idea*, rather than suggesting a physical and finite object."[392] Both ideas are at work in Rosa's conception of "copies" and "originals": his predilection for novel, unusual subjects can be explained equally in terms of a desire to be "originary" (that is, to be the "first" to paint a subject in the possible initiation of a series of subsequent versions) and "original" (in the sense of being unique, distinctive and inimitable). Loh concludes that this second interpretation, which locates originality in invention, may often have been a factor in both the making and buying of art, but it was not always essential. Of vital importance for the prospective consumer was the *knowledge* that the work was a copy, and this, too, seems to have informed Rosa's concern to control the reproduction of his paintings. As long as the buyer knew that it was by him (that is, based on his own "original" *invenzione*) the copy was permissible and even laudable. Cordini's devious duplication of Rosa's *Pan and Syrinx*, for example, was forgivable only because it turned out to the benefit of Rosa's own reputation.

The more open conception of originality and novelty to which Loh refers is true of both iconography and the work of art itself as a commercial object to be reproduced. As Marina Bianchi puts it, novelty can be "constantly recreated within consumption itself" – it is a "potentially

[391] Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche," 239-40. Loh points to both the 1612 edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, which defines "*originale*" as "that which we call a thing, painting, text, or something similar that is the first to have been made, from which follow the copies", and the same definition used by Baldinucci in his *Vocabolario* (1681). The same "chronological" conception, she notes, also permeated Dutch art theory, as demonstrated by the writings of Karel Van Mander, for example.
[392] Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche," 241.

unending series of creative and re-creative experiences."[393] Many of Rosa's forebears and contemporaries conceived of originality as a form of repetition that in no way diminished the artist's unique creativity. Evonne Levy has suggested that the idea was implicit in Bernini's practice of making copies. In a well-known statement concerning copying and "originality", the sculptor described to Paul Fréart de Chantelou his procedure of making portraits: he claimed that the idea in his mind was the "original", fearing that even a referral to his own drawings (as "copies") would consequently result in the production of a copy of a copy rather than an original – a likeness of the model rather than reality.[394] In Levy's interpretation, Bernini intended every new stroke as a new beginning; his copies are "repeat performances" in which each "iteration" is conceived as an original.[395] For artists who produced copies with the use of workshop assistants, such as Titian, copies were often considered by both collectors and critics alike to exist simultaneously as originals and copies, painted by the master, by one or more of his assistants, or some combination of the two.[396] This was the idea behind Guido Reni's defense of copies of his paintings (or parts of the originals) made by his own assistants: he described them as his own work on the grounds that they were based on his own ideas and designs and that he "finished and redid everything himself" so that the final work would "seem to be by his own hand."[397] Reni was responding to the contractual expectation of his patron, Pope Paul V, who had balked at the artist's

---

[393] Bianchi, "Consuming Novelty: Strategies for Producing Novelty in Consumption," *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 28: 1 (1998): 4; cited in Marta Ajmar, "Talking Pots: Strategies for Producing Novelty and the Consumption of Painted Pottery in Renaissance Italy," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 59.
[394] "In Chantelou['s Diary] Bernini states that the drawings served only 'to soak and impregnate his mind with the image of the King', for if he relied on the drawings when carving the marble, 'he would have made a copy instead of an original'." Steven F. Ostrow, "Bernini's Voice: From Chantelou's *Journal* to the *Vite*," in *Bernini's Biographies*, 124; also see Levy, "Chapter 2 of Domenico Bernini's *Vita* of his Father: Mimesis," 170.
[395] Levy, "Repeat Performances: Bernini, the portrait and the copy". *Bernini. Double Take*. Conference at the University of Toronto, March 7 2009; and *ibid*, "Chapter 2 of Domenico Bernini's *Vita*," 170-4.
[396] Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche," 239. Also on Titian's copying practices, see Ruth Wedgwood Kennedy, "Novelty and Tradition in Titian's Art," The Katharine Asher Engel Lectures. Smith College, Northampton Mass., 1963.
[397] Spear, "Di Sua Mano", 79. Rubens similarly argued in a letter of 1618 to Sir Dudley Carleton that his retouched paintings were "not simple copies but are so well retouched by my hand ... that it would be difficult to tell them from originals". Spear, *ibid*, 80. On Guido Reni's copying practices, see Spear, "Di Sua Mano"; and Stephen Pepper, "Guido Reni's Practice of Repeating Compositions," *Artibus et Historiae* 20: 39 (1999), 27-54.

use of an assistant (in this instance Giovanni Lanfranco) in executing the job granted to Reni himself under the contractual rule of "*di sua mano*". As Spear and other scholars have shown, this decree was in the *seicento* a relatively fluid one that fused the medieval notion of "practical skill" (*techne* or *ars*) with the Renaissance idea of the artist's talent (*ingenium*) into a conception of the artist's hand as the locus of "skill, talent, and personal style, *ars* and *ingenium* alike", emphasizing the artist's "inner vision," and – most importantly – his unique inimitability.[398]

This last interpretation is connected to another, vital conception of the artist's "hand" that regards it as brushwork and style, a tenet of modern connoisseurship: like handwriting, the artist's hand is a sign of his or her individuality that emphasizes *ingenium* over *ars* "by leaving traces of the mind's imaginative process."[399] That Rosa shared in the conception of brushwork as a locus of his unique artistic identity – an idea voiced by contemporaries like Mancini, Baldinucci, Rubens and Boschini, among others – is suggested by his comments regarding two still-life paintings in a letter to Ricciardi of 1652. In particular, he echoes Mancini's location of that individuality in the free, spontaneous and fluid nature of the brushstroke:[400]

> "With this mailing I have sent a small box for you, entrusted to Signor Cordini, in which there are two small canvases with flowers painted *alla pittoresca*, that is *di furia*, as you will see. I know that it will give your optimal nose a sudden kick, and you will damn them for this stupidity."[401]

---

[398] Spear, "Di Sua Mano", 81-84. On the development of the three conceptions of the hand as *techne*, *ingenium*, and a combination of the two, see Spear, *ibid*, 85-87. Also on the development of the equation between the artist's "hand" and style, see Sohm, "Maniera and the absent hand. Avoiding the etymology of style," *RES* 36 (1999): 101-124; and *idem*, *Style in Art Theory*, 117.

[399] Spear, "Di Sua Mano," 88, 96-7; also see Muller, "Measures of Authenticity," 141-2; Vico, *Discorsi* (1555).

[400] Mancini "focused attention on the passages in a picture that allow for a fluid and spontaneous handling of the brush. He looked for boldness and resolution. He thought these qualities to be inimitable because they assume the condition of license that is available to the original artist but denied to the copyist. The slavish repetition of a model, be it an object of nature or a work of art, inhibits the free play of the brush." Muller, "Measures of Authenticity," 143. Rubens expressed anxiety over the need to distinguish his brush from that of assistants or other masters, despite his practice of retouching: in a letter of 1603 to Annibale Chieppio he writes, "I am convinced that, by its freshness alone, the work must necessarily be discovered as done here (a thankless trick), whether by the hands of such men, or by mine, or by a mixture of theirs and mine (which I will never tolerate, for I have always guarded against being confused with anyone, however great a man). And I shall be disgraced unduly by an inferior production unworthy of my reputation, which is not unknown here." Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 33, letter 8.

[401] Borelli, letter 138: "Per quest'ordinario ho inviata una scatoletta per voi, racomandata al Signor Cordini, nella quale vi sono due teluccie con de' fiori dipinti alla pittoresca, cioè di furia, come vederete. So che il vostro ottimo naso vi darà subito d'urtoni, e li dannerà per coglionarie." Translation from Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 93-4. Sohm

As Sohm has pointed out, Rosa used the phrase "*di furia*" in order to qualify the still equivocal term "*pittoresco*", characterizing the style in connection with the imaginative, inspired and unique mark of the individual artist as author.[402] Rosa was participating in a more pervasive conception of the artist's hand and paintbrush as autograph – that "boldness" of execution that Mancini considered to signal the "imagination and fantasy of the master" and that could not be easily reproduced.[403]

Significantly, both Baldinucci and Passeri aligned Rosa's style or "hand" with *pittoresco* – a manner of painting defined by the individual mind and hand of the artist. The earliest account of Rosa's activity as a painter, in which Giovanni Lanfranco was apparently inspired to purchase as many of Rosa's paintings as he could find – unaware of the identity of their author – suggests that Rosa had already at that early stage of his career established a unique and inimitable hand. Passeri characterized Rosa's style (*le mani*) as "loose" (*disciolte*), linking it to the artist's "free", imaginative and inventive creativity as well as to his more general desire for personal and

---

interprets the paintings as Rosa's own, although, in view of the scarcity of still-life paintings among Rosa's *oeuvre* and his animosity toward painting anything but grand histories, it is equally plausible that they were among the works by other artists (some of them copies of Rosa's own paintings) that Rosa was acquiring for his friends in the 1650's and 1660's. See 382-3, above. Borelli, letters 128 and 234. Rosa's comments with regard to the style of the works in question, however, remain nonetheless equally valid for understanding his convictions about his own painting.

[402] Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 93-4. Sohm notes that the corresponding "*pittoresco*" of Rosa's letters is likely further evidence of his conception of his artistic style in those terms, and of his interpretation of the term "*pittoresco*" as "painterly": "his letter to Ricciardi is casually constructed with daring metonymy ('*ottimo naso'*) and linguistic liberties ('*pittoresco'*), almost a verbal sketch. In a preceding paragraph Rosa informs his reader that "When I write to my dear Ricciardi I think of everything except to sharpen my words, but instead I allow myself to be led entirely by the initial impressions of the imagination, largely ingenious, and by the most cordial impulses of love. This congruence of Rosa's literary and pictorial styles suggests that the visible results of *furia*, that *pittoresco* itself, are painterly." Rosa refers to brushwork again in a letter to Ricciardi of May 30 1664, regarding the "*macchie*" or painterly style of a Flemish painting that displeased Ricciardi but not Rosa, again suggesting Rosa's self-recognition with *pittoresco*: "Il quadretto, che voi dite d'haverlo per fiorentino, a me pare fiamengo, e, quel che voi ci dannate, è il men cattivo: cioè quel campo con quelle macchie. Onde io non saprei metterci le mani senza haverlo a gustar tutto, e questo non rende il conto, e per dirvela m'havete scandolezato a mandarlo! Ma ve la perdono, che nell'istessa maniera se ne ritornerà." Borelli, letter 302. Sohm considers the possibility that Rosa's use of the term – and his convictions regarding his own art as "*pittoresco*" – may have originated in a possible encounter Marco Boschini during his visit to Venice in 1649. Sohm, *ibid*, 95-6. Loh noted Luigi Scaramuccia's fictional anecdote of Boschini offering tours of Venice to visiting artists like Rosa and Cortona. Loh, "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche," 245; Scaramuccia, *Le finezze de' pennelli italiani* [1674] (Milan, 1965), 107-8.

[403] Spear, "What is an Original?", 25.

professional liberty.[404] Baldinucci, while he also considered Rosa's style to be entirely "his own", aligned his use of colour to Titian's naturalistic "*macchia*" (a 'blot', 'blur' or 'speck') and "beautiful impasto",[405] the latter a quality that Rosa apparently admired in his friend Lippi's paintings.[406] The "painterly" quality of Rosa's brush is clearly visible in many of his canvases, particularly in the dense passages of trees and foliage. His self-identification (and its reassertion by his biographers) with the colouristic element of the Venetian *pittoresco* in particular is suggested by Passeri's comment that Rosa "spoke about about Paolo Veronese more than others, and he usually took pleasure in the style of the Venetians" while he deemed Raphael (like his fellow Neapolitans) to be "hard, stone-like, and dry" – a criticism he had also directed at Pietro da Cortona.[407] Rosa's "painterly" hand is also apparent in two anecdotes recounted by Baldinucci: one in which Rosa deemed the Venetian *pittoresco* manner more financially profitable than Florentine *disegno*,[408] and another in which he offered to paint the landscape in Lippi's *Flight into Egypt*, an incident that presents him as an expert colourist rather than as a draftsman.[409] This is not to say, however, that *disegno* did not continue to have a profound importance for Rosa's artistic identity: the *Figurine*

[404] Passeri, *Vite*, 426: "Faceva più volontieri i quadri di proprio genio, parendogli di sodisfarsi più, che coll'obbedienza di un commando ristretto, non avendo disciolte le mani colla libertà della sua fantasia, però si sfogava sempre col proprio genio." Passeri elsewhere referred to Rosa's style as "painterly": he described Rosa's *Hagar*, which Lanfranco purchased in Naples and showed the biographer after his return to Rome in 1646, as "tocco con gran gusto pittoresco". Passeri, *ibid*, 418. Elsewhere he noted "dico bene, che in quelle, come in tutte le sue opera, palesasi il valore del suo bel genio, il furore del suo spirito sollevato, e la prontezza della sua mano ardita mostrando capriccio nell'invenzione, stravaganza negli abiti, e nei costume delle figure, e maniera dificolta, è risoluta nello sfrondeggiare degli alberi." Passeri, *Vite*, ed. Hess, 386; cited in Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 191-2. Passeri also linked Rosa's inclination toward painting, rather than drawing, to his Neapolitan heritage: Neapolitan painters, in general, were "not much given over to a long study of design, soon taking up the paintbrush, and as they say, to *pittare*." Passeri, *Vite*, 417.

[405] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 477.

[406] *Ibid*, 458. Baldinucci claimed that Rosa preferred Lippi to "every other Florentine painter for the superiority of his designs and the impasto of his painting [per l'impasto de' colori]".

[407] Passeri, *Vite*, 434; see Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 31. Rosa wrote in to Ricciardi in 1653 to that Baldassare Franceschini was "partial to a certain dryness [*seccagine*]" of style, and did not seem to like anything other than the work of Pietro da Cortona (Borelli, letter 162), an artist Rosa had expressed disdain toward in the *La Pittura* (vv. 649-54). Rosa's inventory, interestingly enough, lists two paintings by Veronese.

[408] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 489. Rosa told a supporter of Santi di Tito that the art of the Florentine artist "commanded much lower prices on the art market than that of the Venetian painter Tintoretto, despite the latter's faulty draftsmanship [and] concluded that painting based on an excellent manner of coloring should be more esteemed than one based on *disegno* with clear outlines." Struhal, "Friendly Disagreements"; also see *idem*, "La Semplice imitazione del naturale", 177-178.

[409] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 459. See my discussion of this anecdote in chapter two, 82.

are evidence of his endeavour to prove himself against contemporary criticism of his inabilities as a draftsman as much as they were to assert his skills as a figure painter. But, as Roworth has noted, Rosa recognized his own limitations and may have seen in the pursuit of *pittoresco* a quality of his work that was appreciated by his contemporaries as his greatest proficiency.[410] In his account of the contemporary critique of Rosa's painting, Passeri declared that "in the mastery of the paintbrush he did not have an equal; in the harmony of colour he was the master, but in the large figures he lost all of his beautiful qualities because he lacked the principle of study [meaning *disegno*]."[411] *Pittoresco* was considered by Boschini, Passeri and Rosa "a specific kind of artifice, one that carries the artist's individuality (his brushwork or inspiration) and delimits his addition to nature in the mimetic process."[412] The increasing "demand for authenticity" by collectors and artists alike (which also began to dictate prices, originals often being valued higher than copies) resulted in an increased emphasis on "styles that made the master's touch more evident and difficult to reproduce".[413] The intrinsically inimitable nature of *pittoresco*, characterized by free, quick and open brushwork, offered Rosa the best route toward an inimitable – but also sellable – style.[414]

The Advice of Friends: A Communal Source for Rosa's Distinctive Professional Identity

Rosa's position as novel or "original" is further problematized by the role of external influence in his creative process, particularly that of his friends. Rosa's colleagues – especially

---

[410] Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 351, 374.

[411] Passeri claimed that "in the mastery of the paintbrush he did not have an equal; that in the harmony of the color he was the master, but that in the large figures he lost all of his beautiful qualities, because he lacked the principle of study." Passeri, *Vite*, 433; also see 431. Evidence of a contemporary emphasis on Rosa as a colourist is suggested by Giacinto Brandi's comments in a letter to Ruffo. Brandi had thought he was painting a pendant to Rembrandt but it turned out to be a painting by Rosa. "He was upset to receive this news because he had painted it 'di maniera gagliarda', as had been Guercino's intention, but would have used lighter colouring if he had known it was to accompany a Rosa." Sohm, *Style in Art Theory*, 253, note 109; Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," pt. 5, 115, letter of January 24 1671.

[412] Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 193.

[413] Muller, "Measures of Authenticity," 143. On the relative pricing of copies and originals in the *seicento*, see De Marchi and Van Miegroet, "Pricing Invention," 27-70.

[414] On the inimitability and lucrative advantage of the painterly style, see Muller, "Measures of Authenticity," 143.

Ricciardi – frequently provided Rosa with the novel subject matter that he claimed as such an integral component of his unique, self-directed professional persona. In this sense, novelty must be reconsidered not solely as a product of individual *ingegno* but of social experience.[415] There are plenty of examples of the influence of Rosa's friends on his work, many of which I have already mentioned: the impact of the satiric and burlesque poetry of Antonio Abati, Francesco Melosi, Francesco Redi, Lorenzo Lippi, or Ricciardi, for example, or the philosophical and scientific interests of academic friends and associates like Carlo Dati, Evangelista Torricelli, and Athanasius Kircher.[416] In seeking the advice of his friends, especially learned poet-friends like Ricciardi, Rosa was participating in a long-standing tradition of exchange between artists and poet-advisors who assisted with the composition of iconographic programs.[417] Here, however, I am specifically interested in Rosa's solicitation of advice for "novel" subject matter from Ricciardi as an index of social invention.[418]

The ideal rhetoric of self-sufficient invention that Rosa endorsed masked the profound contribution of social collaboration to his work.[419] Rosa was fully cognizant of the shared nature of both invention and authorship, and occasionally acknowledged its significance for his practice, identity and reputation. The theories of modern anthropologists and sociologists offer a useful heuristic for understanding the social process of creativity on both a cultural and individual level.

---

[415] On the communal origins of novelty, see Crosby, *Novelty* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005), ix-x; and Le Fevre, *Invention as a Social Act*.

[416] On the influence of Rosa's early Roman and Florentine friends on his "satiric" style in poetry and painting, see Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 32-33, 53, 157, 245-6. Benedetto Croce considered that Rosa's satires were implicitly communal in nature, expressive of the amity he shared with his friends. See Bertini, "Sulle orme di Salvator Rosa nelle campagne volterrane," 14. On the influence of Athanasius Kircher and his interest in egyptomania, see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 36.

[417] Hope, "Artists, Patrons, and Advisers in the Italian Renaissance," 319. Alberti advised the painter to consult friends (especially poets and orators) to assure that their work was good and pleasing. Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. Cecil Grayson, Book III, 95. Conversely, Armenini urged the artist to be "intellectually self-reliant". See Levy, "Ideal and Reality of the Learned Artist: The Schooling of Italian and Netherlandish Artists," 21; citing Armenini, *On the true precepts of the art of painting*, ed. E. J. Olszewski, 122.

[418] For Rosa's solicitation of Ricciardi's advice, see Borelli, letters 95, 100, 101, 108, 152, 178, 203, 216, 272, 277, 302, 331, 369 and 370.

[419] On the Platonic conception of invention as "individual introspection", see Frank J. D'Angelo, in Le Fevre, *Invention as a Social Act*, 1.

The "collaborative" and "social collective" perspectives of invention as defined by George Herbert Mead and Emile Durkheim, for example, conceive of the process in terms that reflect the reputationally-based nature of *seicento* self-manufacture.[420] From the sociological standpoint, invention is "initiated by an agent" but this agent or inventor "always requires the presence of an 'other' – either the rhetor himself or herself as 'internalized other' or a perceived audience of 'actual others'."[421]

In devising his novel subjects Rosa attempted to exercise a significant degree of control over the procedure of "invention". As I noted above, he was highly selective in his choice of collaborators (always good friends) and ever-anxious about the potential conflict that could arise from consulting with them. His frequent disparagement of Ricciardi's knowledge in matters of art should be seen as a reflection of this anxiety, for, although Rosa willingly ceded to his friend's authority on the subjects of ancient philosophy, literature and language, his impulse to protect his image of self-agency required him to sustain a rhetoric of individual expertise in matters of his own profession. To some extent this was a matter of "public" reputation: perfectly willing to confess his intellectual and creative debts to friends in personal letters to them, he would not perhaps (like any other artist, for that matter) have been keen to admit to his broader audience that his paintings or satires were "collaborative" enterprises. Rosa's desire to assert the self-sufficient nature of his production, and to stake a claim for intellectual property, is apparent from his concern over accusations of plagiarism and his (and Ricciardi's) efforts to differentiate their writing styles. (Baldinucci's account of the rumours that spread about Rosa's satires suggests the extent to which

---

[420] Frank J. D'Angelo, in Le Fevre, *Invention as a Social Act*, xi. In Mead's view, "meaning is not privately constructed in an individual's consciousness, but is generated by symbolic gestures that call for a response in others". According to Durkheim, "a collective force or 'mind' permeates a society and acts, often through established institutions and conventions, to influence the attitudes, behaviours and inventions of members in social groups."

[421] *Ibid*, xi.

the intellectual community was aware of the influence of learned friends on the artist.[422]) Ricciardi dispelled the notion in a letter to Baldinucci himself, written after Rosa's death: quoting a line from the ancient poet Martial, "*Aurum, et opes, et rura frequens donarit amicis / Qui velit ingenio cedere rarus erit*" (A friend will often give gold, wealth and estates; he who will surrender genius is rare), he said to the biographer "You will find many, my Signore, by chance, who will give you clothing and money; but everyone wants glory for himself: and you will encounter very few people who will want to give it to you. Do you think that if I had made the satires I would want to give them to someone else? You deceive yourself if you believe that."[423] Like Ricciardi had done, Baldinucci attempted to dispel any such notion by asserting the individual and characteristic nature of Rosa's writing style as a veritable "self-portrait".[424] Just as Rosa permitted close friends as copyists and collaborators so, too, did he consider their advice in matters of art and poetry acceptable on the basis of the similitude conferred by true friendship. The like-mindedness of true friends, a parity that Rosa frequently noted in his letters, mitigated the threat posed to autonomy by the collaborative nature of invention. Of particular significance in this context is Rosa's conviction that Ricciardi was capable of replicating the unique "*stravaganza*" or eccentricity of spirit that he promoted as such a vital component of his inimitable artistic identity: in a letter to Ricciardi of May 1651, Rosa requested an idea for "something new" from his friend, perhaps a subject from Virgil treating the

---

[422] Rosa's biographers record the doubt cast by critics on Rosa's skill as a man of letters. Baldinucci tells the story of a later critic of Rosa's (who was skeptical of the artist's authorship of the Satires) challenging Rosa's ability to translate the *Te Deum* into Italian as proof of his linguistic and literary skills. Baldinucci also extended his criticism of Rosa's early training to Rosa's poetic production: its deficiencies stemmed from the same fundamental problem of not having studied the basics in his youth. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 490. Passeri, who likely wanted to embellish the story of Rosa's early education, noted that Rosa studied grammar and rhetoric with the Somaschi fathers in Naples; Scott points out that Rosa would likely not have received much of a scholarly education in such a crowded environment. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 5.
[423] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 492. Martial, *Epigrams*, Book VIII, chap. 18.
[424] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 490-3. Baldinucci constructs an elaborate defense of Rosa's authorship of the satires, citing the testimonies of the artist's friends, including Francesco Maffei, the *provveditore* of Volterra, who asserted that "Rosa composed most of the satires during the three years which he stayed at the Maffei villas of Barbaiano and Monterufoli" (see Festa, "Le lettere di Salvator Rosa ai Maffei di Volterra," 381, who publishes a letter by Maffei to Baldinucci), Francesco Redi, who noted that Rosa's frequent error in his use of the Tuscan language signaled his authorship of the satires, and Ricciardi himself.

allegory of Justice; but he asked him to think carefully on it, since "Rome has learned that I am most outlandish in my inventions [*stravagantissimo nell'inventioni*], so it must correspond as much as possible."[425]

Rosa's continued reliance on Ricciardi for his suggestions of novel iconography, well into the late 1660's, indicates the value he gave to his friend's input despite having established by that point an otherwise stable identity and reputation of his own.[426] Rosa often gave credit to Ricciardi privately for his role in the success of his novel subjects. When he told him of the acclaim his innovative *Conspiracy of Catiline* received at San Giovanni Decollato in 1663, Rosa conceded that some of the merit of its triumph was owed to his friend: the painting, he wrote "was extraordinarily

---

[425] Borelli, letter 100.

[426] Scott was "surprised" by Rosa's "continued reliance" on Ricciardi for iconographic advice at this late stage in his career. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 143, note 20. The many instances of Rosa's consultation with Ricciardi are too numerous to list here in full. In April 1651, for example, Rosa reminded Ricciardi to think of "some foreign story" dealing with a soldier and a female character for the purposes of a picture he wanted to show at San Giovanni Decollato. Borelli, letter 95. The following May he was asking him to hurry up with a "new" motif for another painting, with "many figures, and some figure in the air over a cloud or something else" that would be suitable for a "long" canvas, asking him if he thought that the subject of *Justice Departing the Shepherds* from Virgil's *Georgics* might be appropriate. Borelli, letter 100. Borelli identifies the painting is the *Allegory of Justice among the Shepherds* (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum), although this work was made during Rosa's Florentine sojourn. The more likely candidate is the *Allegory of Justice among the Peasants* (or *Astraea Abandoning the Earth*) that Rosa painted later, around 1662. Salerno, *L'opera completa*, no. 159; for the painting, see *Salvator Rosa. Tra Mito e Magia*, cat. 23. In September 1652, while writing the *Invidia*, he asked Ricciardi to send any idea (*motivo*) that came to him, "leaving it to me to sketch it out", in the hopes that it would be some "relief" from the taxing experience of writing such a "too harsh" (*troppo aspra*) satire. Borelli, letters 146 and 147. In 1654 Rosa consulted with Ricciardi for advice on the subject of Envy, inspired by his satire of the same subject. Borelli, letters 174, 175, 178. Ricciardi had asked him to send a copy of Melosi's *Capitolo*, the poem he had written in Rosa's defence as author of his satires, which may itself have played a role in Rosa's written and painted satires on the theme of envy. See letters 179, 181, 186. In October 1656 he requested the Latin inscription for the *Figurine*, with a dedication to Carlo de' Rossi. Borelli, letter 203. In 1651, 1661, 1662, and 1663 Rosa sent his friend the coppers and designs for his engravings in order to solicit his approval. See notes 292 and 293 above. Upon informing his friend of the success of his "utterly novel" paintings of *Pythagoras* in 1662, Rosa promptly reminded Ricciardi to send him any similar ideas for subjects if he came across them while reading, "considering that they succeed marvelously". Borelli, letter 272. Ricciardi had apparently suggested the life of Apollonius by Philostratus as a possible source for an appropriate subject for a painting, but Rosa was not convinced that it was sufficiently "singular and eccentric" (*singolare e stravagante*). Borelli, letter 277. The following winter he was still nagging Ricciardi to find something suited to his "inclinations", unhappy with the suggestions his friend had made. Borelli, letter 281. When he sent Ricciardi the designs for his etching of the *Fall of the Giants*, he expressed concern that his friend would not find its "simple idea" particularly satisfactory, clearly valuing his opinion on the matter. Borelli, letters 290, 293. When Rosa received an invitation from a "Prince" to paint one of his galleries in 1666 (presumed to be Duke Ranuccio II of Parma and the Palazzo Farnese), he consulted with the "oracle" of Ricciardi's opinion as to whether he thought he should accept the challenge of taking up fresco painting. Borelli, letter 329. And in the spring of 1669 Rosa was consulting with Ricciardi, who seems to have played an important role in arranging the commission, over the matter of the painting of *S. Torpè* for the Duomo in Pisa [Fig. 130]. Borelli, letters 365, 367, 369 and 370. On this occasion Rosa atypically conceded to the stipulations of his friend with regard to both measurements and iconography.

pleasing to the *intendenti* … I give you a share in it, because I must do this with a friend such as you are to me."[427] He made the same tribute again in 1666, telling Ricciardi about the successful exhibition of his *Pan and Pindar*: "I must also give part of my triumphs to you, since you are my friend without comparison you will rejoice in it."[428] In 1658 Rosa made clear that it was Ricciardi's contribution to his writings that made them great:

> "I am considering how it will be possible (in case we are unable to find each other together) to send to you this last satire of mine [*La Babilonia*], which with four of your expert brushstrokes will be secured from oblivion. The number of verses is over 600; and I know that many things need to be amended; on the other hand, many things will not displease you; and that is that."[429]

In a letter of 1660, Rosa referred to himself as Ricciardi's "school boy" (*scolare*), and assured him of his submission to his learning.[430] Rosa's own regard for the process of collaboration with friends is clear from his complaint that Ricciardi might attempt to compose poetry in his absence.[431] His practice of consulting with close friends reflects the broader sense of communal reciprocity that defined the interaction and exchange of ideas among *seicento* intellectual social groups.[432] For Rosa himself, the equivalency offered by the ideal terms of friendship allowed him to capitalize on the assistance of friends while minimizing the significance of that aid beyond (and occasionally within) the confines of those relationships.

---

[427] Borelli, letter 291: "in particolare agli intendenti è stata straordinariamente piaciuta. Ve ne do parte, perché così devo con amico qual voi mi sete."
[428] Borelli, letter 328: "Vi devo anche dar parte de' miei trionfi, a ciò come amico mio senza paragone ve ne rallegriate."
[429] Borelli, letter 217: "Sto meditando come potria (caso che ci fusse impedito il trovarci assieme) farvi capitare nelle mani questa mia ultima satira, la quale con quattro delle vostre pennellate maestre l'assicuraria dall'oblivione. Il numero de' versi passa 600; e so che molte cose hanno bisogno d'emenda; dall'altra parte molte cose non vi dispiaceranno; e quest'è quanto."
[430] Borelli, letter 234.
[431] Borelli, letter 216.
[432] Goldsmith, *"Exclusive Conversations"*, 9-13. On the social and group origins of the self, see Goffman, *Interaction Ritual* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), 91. Poussin, for example, who prided himself like Rosa on his individual authorship, also received a significant degree of assistance from friends and patrons in the devising of his subjects. Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 17; also see Mahon, "A plea for Poussin as a painter," in *Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag; eine Festgabe seiner europäischen Schüler, Freunde und Verehrer*, ed. Georg Kauffman and Willibald Sauerländer (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1965), 125.

Other Tools for Crafting the Image of the "Free" Artist

Rosa's "free" economic persona also consisted in the cultivation of a set of other techniques and ideals, including a self-conception as autodidact, an aversion to taking on students, the habits of working in secret and working quickly, the practice of collecting, and the cultivation of a philosophical disdain toward financial profit (in combination with the pursuit of alternative routes to the wealth equated with fame). Rosa's self-proclamation as an autodidact coincides with his declaration of distaste for taking on students: in 1669 he promised Ricciardi that he would be more than happy to assist his young friend Francesco Martinotti when he arrived in Rome; but he took the opportunity to emphasize that his young charge would have to work hard to impress him since he was not in the habit of taking on pupils, "never having known a master" himself.[433] Rosa's claim adheres to a time-honoured *topos* in which the artist is conceived as aspiring to the ranks of nobility (Michelangelo is perhaps the most well-known example), his or her professional practice thereby elevated from the level of manual or commercial craft.[434] His desire to work in secret, too, is a more generally pervasive characteristic of artists in the biographical tradition. Rosa's biographers noted his youthful predilection to sequester himself "alone with books"[435] and his need to "surprise" the Roman public (especially his academic critics) with the paintings he displayed at the annual exhibitions. In 1651 Rosa told Ricciardi that his large *Democritus in Meditation* had been seen by

[433] Borelli, letter 349: "Del pittore se mi capiterà inanzi con l'impronta delle vostre racomandazioni, sarà da me servito in tutto quello che voi vorrete. Fuor di voi, sarà frustatorio ch'egli possi mai far merito presso di me, quand'anche fusse foderato di Tiziano e di costumi di Paradiso, non essendomi mai difettato, né di far scolari (perché mai mi conobbi maestro) né di guadagnare sugl'altri."
[434] Michelangelo, who took great pains to assert his noble status, denied ever having been an apprentice in Domenico Ghirlandaio's workshop via Ascanio Condivi's biography of the artist. Condivi, *The Life of Michelangelo*, ed. Hellmut Wohl, trans. Alice Sedgwick Wohl (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 9-10, 125 note 14. Paolo Giovio wrote of Michelangelo: "Although implored even by princes, he has never let himself be induced to be the master of anyone or at least to let one into his shop as a spectator and observer." Barocchi, *Scritti d'arte*, 12; and T. C. Price Zimmermann, "Paolo Giovio and the Evolution of Renaissance Art Criticism," in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. Cecil H. Clough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), 416. On other artists asserting their "noble" birth, see Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 57, 162; and Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn*, 93ff.
[435] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438.

"no one except Simonelli", and he had kept it continually concealed in a special room.[436] Baldinucci reported that "no one, except for his disciple Bartolommeo, could ever boast of having seen him paint or of having dared to enter the place where he worked."[437] Other artists had behaved similarly.[438] Rosa (and his biographers, in their accounts of his practice) may well have been emulating their example – particularly Michelangelo, whose "alienating" *terribilità* was contrasted to the affable *grazia* of artists like Leonardo and Raphael and could be cultivated by his successors in the service of promoting an antagonistic persona.[439]

The desire to work in secret points to a conception of intellectual property not only in the material of art but in the procedures and methods of its manufacture. For Rosa, this included speed of execution, another *topos* of early-modern art biography touted in the service of promoting an image of proficiency, virtuosity, and infinitely prolific inventiveness.[440] In 1652, Rosa boasted to Giulio Maffei that not only would his *Battle Scene* for Louis XIV obtain the favour and praise of

---

[436] Borelli, letter 86: "non l'ha veduto altra persona che Simonelli havendolo sempre tenuto in una camera chiuso."
[437] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 487.
[438] Giovanni Bellini, for example, reputedly never showed anyone "anything of his that is not finished". Letter of Francesco Malatesta to Isabella d'Este, October 8 1503. ASM MS Busta 1440, 299, cited in Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 14. Orazio Gentileschi "would shut himself in his bedroom with a half-disrobed model and not let anyone in while he was painting." Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 55. Piero di Cosimo elicited a patron's wrath by refusing to show him the painting he had commissioned before it was finished, threatening to destroy it; and Michelangelo cautiously guarded both the *David* and the Sistine Chapel ceiling from the prying eyes of rival artists and patrons alike, burning his drawings in order to "conceal the labour that went into his art", but also to hide what he regarded as the keys to his mind and *invenzioni*. Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 14; Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 183. For the stories of Michelangelo and Piero di Cosimo's secrecy, see Burke, *The Italian Renaissance. Culture and Society in Italy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986), 109. For Vasari's account of Michelangelo burning his drawings, see Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Bettarini and Barocchi, VI: 108-9. Michelangelo was conflicted in his opinion regarding the "theft" of his ideas: he claimed that in witnessing him at work on the Sistine ceiling, Raphael had "stolen" from him everything he knew about art, but elsewhere dismissed the theft of his drawings by Bartolommeo Ammanati and Nanni di Baccio Bigio as a mere "trifle" undertaken in order to learn from them and not as important as stealing "important things" like money and possessions. Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair*, 105-6, citing Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Milanesi, VII: 227; for his comment on Raphael, see Barocchi and Ristori eds., *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*, 4: 155, cited in Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 171.
[439] Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 173. While *terribilità* is alienating, *grazia* emblematizes the hierarchical relationship implicit in the patron-artist (or prince-courtier) relationship. Eduardo Saccone, "Grazia, Sprezzatura, and Affettazione in Castiglione's Book of the Courtier," *Glyph* 5 (1979): 36, 37, cited in Goffen, *idem*. Other artists, like Benvenuto Cellini, also capitalized on divine furor or *terribilità* as a vital feature of their claims to uniqueness and freedom. See Gardner, "*Homines non nascuntur, sed figuntur*: Benvenuto Cellini's *Vita* and Self-Presentation of the Renaissance Artist", 463. Vasari used it to demonstrate "the specialized nature of the artist." Gardner, *ibid*, 463, note 72; Vasari, *Lives*, 893; also see Summers, *Michelangelo and the Language of Art*, 60-62, 234-41, and Barolsky, *Michelangelo's Nose. A Myth and its Maker*, 199-202.
[440] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 210.

"all of Rome" but that he had painted it in only two months' time.[441] Baldinucci implied that Rosa's habit of working quickly was directly connected to his desire for secrecy and his preference for being undisturbed or distracted. He considered, however, that Rosa's ability to paint quickly – to the point that he was able to start and finish a single painting of a reasonable size in a single day – could quite easily destroy some of his "beautiful hard work".[442] Speed of execution (or *prestezza*) was often dictated by the demands of patrons or clients who expressed concern over time-limit. Thus it was frequently to the artist's financial advantage to work quickly, reaping a more lucrative reward in the process. Alternatively, however, speed of working could work against the artist in his aim toward achieving high prices, particularly if the work was being valued – as it often continued to be in the *seicento* – on the basis of labour and time spent.[443] *Prestezza*, a skill cultivated by various other artists as a feature of their practice and professional *personae*,[444] was a "motivating principle of the work of art at court" that referred not only to speed and the superficial or surface qualities of painting but the concepts of "capability, competence, immediacy, and directness in the substance of the expression."[445] Speed of execution was also closely associated with the Venetian *pittoresco* manner of painting that Rosa sought to make a feature of his unique style.[446] A fast brush allowed the artist to capitalize on the art market, where time was quite

---

[441] Borelli, letter 148.
[442] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 486-7.
[443] Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 601.
[444] Luca Giordano, for example, was nicknamed "*Luca fa presto*" for his quickness of working, while Giovanni Odazzi was said to work even faster than Giordano. Baldinucci refers to Giordano's "maravigliosa speditezza". See Baldinucci, *Notizie*, V: 357-8, Life di Carlo Dolci. Fumagalli notes that this dictum was cultivated quickly in Florence, in contrast to the *diligenza* of many of the local painters. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 84. Carlo Dolci commented humorously on the rapidity of Giordano's execution upon meeting the artist in his studio in Florence in 1682. Giacinto Brandi and Gaspard Dughet aimed for a reputation of swiftness in painting. Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 12; see Pascoli, *Vite*, I: 59, 61, and 132; II: 390 and 395. And Philip Peter Roos (Monsù Rosa) was nicknamed "*Mercurio*" and "Lightening" for his quick brush. Lorizzo, "People and Practices," 355; Nicola Pio, *Le vite di pittori, scultori et architetti* (Cod. ms. Capponi 257), ed. Catherine and Robert Enggass (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1977), 147.
[445] Strinati, "La Roma papale del tardo Seicento: regola e trasgressione," in *Velazquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano. Le corti del Barocco*, ed. Fernando Checa Cremades (Milan: Skira, 2004), 64.
[446] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 12. "[T]he Venetians…were especially famous for their speed and the fact earned them a certain amount of contempt elsewhere."

literally money.[447] A combination of diligence (*diligenza*) and speed of working (*prestezza di fare*) was recommended by Alberti in history painting, in order to avoid "the bother and tedium of working and that eagerness to finish things that makes us botch the work."[448] As Spear has noted, rapidity in painting also served the interests of inimitability as a category of esteem, particularly for artists working in a highly gestural style.[449]

A final economic strategy in Rosa's arsenal consisted in the formation of a relatively small collection of art. Rosa's inventory lists various paintings. Some of them are his own, but there is also a selection of works by other artists, consisting of both copies and originals.[450] Many contemporary artists formed collections of art, ranging from relatively modest caches like Rosa's to extensive hordes like Rubens'.[451] In accumulating collections of their own, artists made important contributions toward the growth of a secondary market for works of art as "collectibles", in which paintings and other objects were conceived as entertainment, as instruments for self-presentation and self-promotion, and as a "store of value and speculative investment."[452] The artist's private collection made him an active participant in the economic and evaluative system that determined his

---

[447] Luca Giordano and Guido Reni both recognized this and adjusted their practice accordingly. Sohm raises the important question of whether "visible rapidity" in painting might occasionally arise from "financial expedience." Giordano was "the most honest about this practice, having 'three brushes (gold, silver and copper) to match his fees' and using the aphorism 'As the pay, so the painting' (*qualis pagatio, talis pingatio*)." But there were other artists who used painterly brushwork "as a shorthand to make cheap paintings quickly", such as Andrea Schiavone. Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 17-18. Goldthwaite also notes the important interconnection between the economic dimension of "speed" in working and the aesthetic development of the aesthetic of "*pittoresco*". See Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market," 430. Critics like Marco Boschini, however, emphasized the diligence and labour involved in a seemingly "quick" brushstroke, the practice of which necessitated a mastery of *sprezzatura*. For a comprehensive discussion of *pittoresco* in early-modern art theory and practice, see Sohm, *Pittoresco*, esp. 10-11. Rosa used the term *pittoresco* on at least three occasions in his letters (Borelli, letters 138, 265 and 382) one of which is cited by Sohm as the first use of the word in reference to a stylistic quality. Borelli, letter 138, dated 1652. Sohm, *ibid*, 93. On Giordano and the art market, see Marshall, "*Appagare il pubblico*," 245-52.

[448] This combination, "una diligenza congiunta con prestezza", became a central theme in Renaissance criticism. Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 31; see Alberti, *On Painting*. On the art-theoretical concepts of *diligenza* and *prestezza*, also see Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 31-2.

[449] Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 601.

[450] For Rosa's inventory, see Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 96-7.

[451] On Rubens' collection, see Jeffrey Muller, *Rubens: The Artist as Collector* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

[452] Wernick, "The Work of Art as Gift and Commodity," 183.

own professional conditions. The inventory of Rosa's belongings at his death may not represent a comprehensive picture of his long-term collecting habits, but it is tempting to suggest that the few paintings in his possession reveal not only an interest in but a desire to support and promote in particular the *pittoresco* style of Titian and Veronese that was so vital to his own unique artistic persona.

V.6. What Price Freedom? Rosa's Valuation Strategies

Rosa's attitude toward the pricing of his paintings is a particularly significant component of his professional practice and it warrants closer consideration.[453] Regarded by Haskell as "revolutionary" among his contemporaries, Rosa's pricing strategies are not so much ground-breaking in an individual sense (many of them were adopted by other artists) as they are in combination: they comprised a systematic plan aimed at freeing the work of art from its fiscal limitations, and, consequently, removing the artist from his purely economic definition.[454] As I argued earlier in the chapter, Rosa's quest to "free" the work of art from its purely monetary (and therefore "controlled") designation, was built on a philosophical and fundamentally ideal outlook that masked the reality of both his financial need and desire. That all of Rosa's moral ranting about the merits of the painter and his craft was essentially a performance – and that he was willing to concede the futility of his profession in the face of dire practical need and the realities of mortality – is clear from many of his comments in letters to friends, particularly in times of great stress. Haskell has pointed to the profound effects of plague and war on the *seicento* Roman economy more generally.[455] Just after the death of his son Rosalvo and brother Giuseppe during the plague in

[453] On early-modern pricing strategies, see Cecchini, "'Fatte varie, et diverse esperienze per essitar esse Pitture'. Prezzo e valori di stima. Breve analisi di un campione seicentesco a Venezia," in Dal Pozzolo and Tedoldi eds., *Tra Committenza e Collezionismo*, 123-136; Pierre Gérin-Jean, "Recherches sur la signification economique des prix des oeuvres d'art: la facon dont se formaient ceux des peintures et les hierarchies qui en resultent," in *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Cavaciocchi, 729-749.
[454] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 22 and *passim.*
[455] *Ibid*, 152.

Naples of 1656, Rosa wrote with a combination of apathy and frustration to Ricciardi that it had been "five months since I have touched my paintbrushes, speaking these days of every other thing than of painting, and what before these turbulences was worth ten now goes for one, nor can anyone be found who wants it."[456] During the Roman plague of 1657, Rosa lamented the "uselessness" of the profession of painting.[457] In 1664, during the war in France, Rosa complained to his friend about his lack of income, concluding acrimoniously that "it is necessary that our riches consist only in the mind, and that one content oneself with sipping while others gulp down prosperity."[458] His resignation to "plant the paint-brushes in the garden" plays, perhaps, on a metaphor Rosa used in a much earlier letter of 1651 to Giulio Maffei, in which he equated the products of the artist with the agricultural harvest[459] – an economic valuation of art that he perhaps intended on this occasion as a tongue-in-cheek remark on the notion of painting as subsistence, but which he would later perceive as an all-too-real analogy.

It was not only in times of discomfort and need, however, that Rosa betrayed his concern over the monetary value of his paintings. His frequent anxious epistolary statements concerning finances reflect not only a desire to promote a persona of high esteem and virtuous reputation, but also a more fundamental and contradictory desire for money itself.[460] In reality, Rosa did quite well

---

[456] Borelli, letter 201: "Sono 5 mesi che non ho tocchi pennelli, parlandosi in questi tempi d'ogni altra cosa che di pittura, e quello che prima di queste turbolenze valeva dieci adesso va uno, né si trova chi lo voglia."
[457] Borelli, letter 209.
[458] Borelli, letter 300: "Amico, le nostre ricchezze bisogna che consistono nell'animo e di contentarsi di libare, quand'altri ingoiano le prosperità."
[459] Borelli, letter 107: "Delle mie raccolte non discorrerò attesoché sono andate aride et il quadro [the *Democritus in Meditation*] si ritrova ancora in mio potere in tempo che l'havevo di già venduto per i ducento scudi conforme v'accennai. Ma perché gl'huomini si mutano da un giorno all'altro bisogna haver pacienza."
[460] Rosa's comments concerning the price of the *Democritus in Meditation* are particularly revealing: Rosa wrote to Giulio Maffei on April 18 1651 that he had managed to find a buyer for two-hundred and fifty *scudi*, (Borelli, letter 90) but (strangely) told Ricciardi in a letter of the same date that he had only secured two-hundred for it (letter 92); in the same letter to Ricciardi, Rosa boasted that the "university of painters" in Rome were praising the painting as worth a thousand *scudi*, while Rosa said he would expect three or at least two hundred for it; in January of 1652 the painting was still in Rosa's possession, and he noted with vexation that its price "still cannot pass fifty *doble*", unwilling to part with it for anything less than it was worth since it was "a painting to make some account of, and every day it pleases me greatly (letter 119);" in April 1652 Rosa wrote to Ricciardi – apparently now aiming to sell both the *Democritus* and the *Diogenes* together – that they were not fetching anything more than two-hundred and fifty *scudi* combined (letter 129); Rosa finally sold the pictures to Nicolò

for himself. He often received high prices for his paintings (the three-hundred *scudi* he collected for the *Crucifixion of Polycrates* [Fig. 120], for example, was a high price for a gallery picture) and at his death he left approximately twelve-thousand *scudi* – a not insignificant sum for an artist of his day, particularly in view of his profligate generosity in splashing out on friends, his refusal of commissions on principle, and his rejection of an otherwise guaranteed lucrative career as a landscapist.[461] In some ways Rosa adhered to an older system of pricing: the large size of many of his canvases, some of which are populated with numerous figures (particularly the early battle scenes, for example) are perhaps evidence of his desire to capitalize on a more traditional valuation of painting in which the physical and iconographic features of the work are given precedence.[462] Contemporaries like Guercino, after all, were still basing their pricing on this older system.[463] But in his mission to suppress an undesirable reputation as landscapist or genre painter who worked on commission, Rosa attempted to divest the work of art of its "lowly" status with a set of interrelated, novel strategies, some of which were also being taken up by his contemporaries: he was emphatic about either setting (or in some way determining) the prices himself; he raised his prices so high

---

Sagredo, for 300 ducats, in July of 1652 (letter 137); in the following August, the papal nuncio to Spain, Giovan Francesco Caetani (?-1671) offered Rosa five hundred *scudi* for the pair, in order to present them to the King of Spain. (letter 144) There are other comments in Rosa's letters that also signal his pursuit of a significant financial recompense. In a letter to Ricciardi of May 1651, for example, concerning the possibility of painting an altarpiece on the subject of "St. Matthew" (now presumed to refer to the *Parable of St. Matthew* (Naples, Capodimonte) [Fig. 54]) Rosa noted that five hundred *scudi* was not a sufficient sum for the commission of an altarpiece, and therefore refused to pursue the project for that fee. See letters 85 and 101. Upon the sale of his *Democritus* and *Diogenes* to Nicolò Sagredo in July of 1652, the following August he received the offer for the paintings from the papal nuncio to Spain, Giovan Francesco Caetani (?-1671), for five hundred *scudi* for the pair, in order to present them to the King of Spain – an offer that Rosa considered evidence of his having "advanced in glory" and "grown in the reputation and opinion of Art". (letter 144) For similar statements, see letters 143, 144, 305, 335 and 381.

[461] "Bernini and Cortona ... left behind assets which were equivalent to those of an average cardinal and belonged without question to the top two percent of the Roman social pyramid." Reinhardt, "The Roman Art Market in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," 88. For a comparison of early-modern artists' earnings, see Pierre Gérin-Jean, "Prices of Works of Art and Hierarchy of Artistic Value on the Italian Market (1400-1700)," in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 184.

[462] On this older system of pricing, see Marten Jan Bok, "Pricing the Unpriced: How Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painters determined the Selling Price of their Work," in *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, ed. North and Ormrod, 104-8. Bok's study of workshop notebooks shows that "the size of the painting played a crucial role in the calculation of the artist's labour involved in the production process and thus in the price."

[463] Matthew, "Painters Marketing Paintings in 15th- and 16th-century Florence and Venice," in *Mapping Markets for Paintings*, 312. On Guercino's practice of using fixed prices, see Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 592-602. In a letter to Don Antonio Ruffo, "Guercino cautioned his patron, who did not want to pay the full price for an entire figure, that for his 80 *scudi*, 'you'll get a bit more than a half figure'." Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi," 316.

that they were unattainable; he refused to set a price for a painting before it was finished (asserting that the price was dictated by the intrinsic merits of the finished work); and he cultivated the practice and discourse of the work of art as a "gift".

The attitude toward monetary value that motivated all of Rosa's pricing strategies was one that privileged self-determined opinion. Rather than his client or patron, Rosa felt he should have the final say in the matter. This notion was founded on the popular early-modern concept of *nemine iudicatur*, a long-standing tenet of the liberal arts in which the artist claimed that the "individual product of the mind cannot be judged by others".[464] The conception of *stime* as the artist's prerogative, expounded by Lorenzo Lotto, Albrecht Dürer, Benvenuto Cellini, Vasari, Guido Reni, Lodovico Carracci, and Francesco Albani, among others, is frequently echoed in Rosa's letters to Ricciardi.[465] Vasari had also granted the authority of valuation to certain noble and intelligent persons related to the profession, their high status giving added value to their judgments. But Rosa was less flexible in his desire to keep the procedure a self-directed one: even in his participation in the gift-economy of art, where the concept of the "just price" ostensibly conferred the right of judgment on the patron or client, Rosa's ultimate goal was to control the assessment on his own terms and to his greatest personal advantage. This tactic did not always succeed, however, and on more than one occasion he was forced to accept the price on offer.[466] Like some of his

---

[464] Nagel, "Art as Gift", 329.

[465] On Lotto, see Matthew, "Painters Marketing Paintings," 312. On Dürer, see *Albrecht Dürer: Schriftlicher Nachlass*, ed. Hans Rupprich, vol. 1, 291; cited in Nagel, "Art as Gift", 329. On Cellini, see Suzanne B. Butters, "Making Art Pay: The Meaning and Value of Art in Late Sixteenth-Century Rome and Florence", in *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al, 30; and Barbèra Bianchi ed., *La Vita di Benvenuto Cellini* (Florence: Successori Le Monnier, 1963), 518, 522-523. For Vasari, see Krohn, "Taking Stock," 206-9. On Reni, Carracci and Albani, see Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 594, 600. For Rosa's own comments, see Borelli, letters 104, 144, 137, 138, 245, 255, 260, 280, 281, 303, 330, 345 and 375. Rosa critiqued Ricciardi's lack of expertise in matters of style, rather than iconography (with which his friend frequently supplied him). Rosa defended Francesco Albani against Ricciardi's unfounded criticism (Borelli, letters 104, 144), he mocked Ricciardi as "my sage Signor Metrodoro", after the Greek painter Metrodoro of Athens (letter 137) and derided him as "Signor critico alla moda, who knows both how to eat beans and critique paintings" (letter 138).

[466] As in the case of the *Democritus in Meditation*, for example, which Rosa was considered to be worth at least a thousand *scudi*, but was ultimately forced to sell (along with its pendant, the *Diogenes Casting Away the Bowl*) for the "adequate" sum of three-hundred *scudi* to the Venetian ambassador Nicolò Sagredo. Borelli, letters 92 and

contemporaries, Rosa did not always have the requisite financial security to support such claims, a fact that highlights the daring nature of his unrelenting confidence in his professional superiority.

In 1658 the Modenese painter Francesco Manzuoli compiled a report on decorative painting in Rome for Francesco I d'Este, in an attempt to solicit his patronage, noting both the high prices charged and significant amount of time taken by Roman artists like Mola, Borgognone, Cerquozzi, and Mario dei Fiori – citing Rosa as a particularly excessive case in point.[467] Baldinucci noted Rosa's habit of raising his prices, occasionally refusing outright even to sell his paintings.[468] In this, Rosa may well have been guided by his youthful experience of the equation between high professional esteem and high monetary value: according to Passeri's account, after Giovanni Lanfranco "discovered" Rosa's paintings among the shops of the *bottegari* in Naples, those merchants suddenly began to ask him for more of his work and Rosa "shrewdly" raised his prices.[469] As Roworth has also observed, Rosa seems to have deliberately elevated his prices in order to garner a higher degree of reputation.[470]

With a mixture of reproach and admiration, Baldinucci says that Rosa used to take such offense at the haggling over the prices of his works that he would respond with a level of disdain that paid no regard to the rank or stature of the person involved. This attitude, however, seems to have been contradicted by Rosa's own actions on occasion. In 1652, for example, he wrote to Ricciardi that he had sold his paintings of the *Democritus in Meditation* and *Diogenes Casting Away the Bowl* to the Venetian ambassador Nicolò Sagredo for the "adequate" sum of three-hundred *scudi*, a price that was not in Rosa's opinion commensurate with the "labor of my pictures"

---

137. As De Marchi and Van Miegroet note, "patrons frequently enjoyed superior social or political status, which put them outside the law, and in the event of a dispute they had to means to wait out an artist, who thus bore the risk of deprivation". De Marchi and Van Miegroet eds., *Mapping Markets for Paintings*, 326.

[467] Cited in Southorn, *Power and Display in the Seventeenth Century*, 50.

[468] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 439, 478, and 483. Pascoli reiterates the claim in his *Vite*, 72-3.

[469] Passeri, *Vite*, 418.

[470] Roworth, "*Pittura*, *Invidia*, and the artist's fortunes".

but that he had agreed to on the grounds of his client's reputation and esteem.[471] Rosa's distaste for bartering over prices is revealed in an amusing story recounted by Baldinucci, concerning a certain insolent *cavaliere* who, upon informing the artist that he had fourteen-thousand *scudi* at his disposal, dared to haggle with the artist over the cost of a "most beautiful landscape" – to each of his offers, Rosa simply raised the amount by a hundred *scudi*. Refusing to budge, Rosa declared that four-hundred *scudi* was the final price and told his client that "even with all your fourteen-thousand *scudi* you aren't able to buy even one of my pictures." He then proceeded to destroy the painting in question, throwing himself at it with his head, knees and hands, and smashing it completely.[472] Whether or not the anecdote has truth to it (it echoes both an ancient Plinian *topos* and a story told by Francisco de Hollanda in his *Dialogues on Painting* of 1550[473]) it demonstrates in unequivocal terms Rosa's valuation of art as devoid of its previously monetary bounds. There are two measures at work here in the service of a single ideal: in the first instance, Rosa raises his price to the point of absurdity in order to emphasize its detachment from any real system of economic valuation; in the second, his destruction of the object itself expresses its "invalid" nature (in the sense of being beyond mundane valuation). Here, the wealth of a prospective client is diminished in relation to the incalculable value of Rosa's art.

Passeri also noted Rosa's persistent "obstinacy" in the height of his prices, noting that "in the end he agreed with whoever made him satisfied of his pretensions; and this came about because

---

[471] Borelli, letter 137: "I give you news of having already sold my two large pictures to the Ambassador who is here from Venice. A cavalier of extraordinary completeness, who, coming to visit me, strained (himself) to give me that esteem not yet expressed with words from mouths of similar persons, to the point that he obliged me to offer him the two of my pictures at the first of his offers, which from one of his gentleman and [a man of] my acquaintance makes me do. The payment was 300 ducats; a price which, although not proportionate to the labor of my pictures, is however favorable for my ends."
[472] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 485-486.
[473] See De Hollanda, *Three Dialogues on Painting*, in *Michel Angelo Buonarroti, with Translations of the Life of the Master by his Scholar, Ascanio Condivi, and Three Dialogues from the Portuguese by Francisco Hollanda*, trans. Charles Holroyd (London: Duckworth, 1911), 269; cited in Nagel, "Art as Gift," 320. For Pliny's comments on the "outrageous prices" paid for works of art, and the adoption of the topos of "pricelessness" by early-modern artists like Dürer, see Nagel, *ibid*, 329, 337.

little by little he had lost that need [poverty] which takes hold of the throat of men of purpose."[474] But Passeri was even more critical than Baldinucci, for he considered that Rosa's stubborn and extravagant attitude toward his work – particularly his refusal to paint small landscapes – was poor judgment on his part, since he was depriving himself of an easy profit that would have enabled him to live even better-off than he already was.[475] Rosa was unwilling to take advantage of the market in the way that other artists had done. The Neapolitan painter Bernardo Cavallino (c. 1616-1656), for example, is a particularly informative foil for Rosa: recognizing his limitations as a struggling young history painter, Cavallino turned to the growing Neapolitan art market of the 1630's and 1640's in order to achieve both financial success and fame as a painter of "cheaper, private cabinet paintings", and as an alternative to the restrictions of traditional patronage.[476]

In 1663 Rosa refused to produce a painting with small figures for Don Antonio Ruffo, which the Sicilian collector was soliciting as a pendant for another painting in his collection, on the grounds that he only painted large figures.[477] Part of Rosa's problem was that the patrons and clients he wanted to attract preferred the landscapes and genre scenes of the *Bamboccianti* over large-scale, philosophically-erudite figure paintings.[478] Rosa seems to have advised other artists skilled in these genres to adopt the strategy of raising prices: reminding his friend and collaborator Giovanni Ghisolfi that he was "the best both within and outside of Rome" in the landscape genre,

---

[474] Passeri, *Vite*, 432.
[475] *Ibid*, 433. Rosa's frustration over the continual desire of his wealthy prospective buyers for his small landscapes, even after he had established himself (or so he felt) as a master of large-scale figure paintings, forced him on one occasion to demand a million *scudi* from a prelate who had dared to inquire about the price of one of his landscapes. Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 485
[476] On Cavallino's stylistic conversion and his use of the Neapolitan art market, see Marshall, "Markets, Money and Artistic Manoeuvres," 45.
[477] This requirement may also have been dictated in part by the artist's already failing eyesight. Ruffo's agents Giuseppe de Rosis and Cornelius de Stael solicited Rosa on his behalf, who responded to their patron that Rosa would only paint large figures, and suggested his two large paintings on stories of *Pythagoras* along with a list of other paintings that he attached in a note to de Rosis's letter. See Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," 168-9, letter of June 2 1663, and *idem*, 169-70, letter of June 9 1663. Scott notes that Abraham Brueghel, another of Ruffo's advisors, offered an apparently misinformed report on the matter of Rosa's iconographic preferences in a letter of July 1665: "Sig. Salvator Rosa paints large and small pictures, but mostly small landscapes because everyone wants small pictures." Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 14, 3 note 20.
[478] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 143.

he urged him to raise his rather meagre prices; Ghisolfi responded by doubling them.[479] Here, then, the value of finding a market niche or brand again comes to the fore – we know that Rosa regarded his own pursuit of a unique and novel subject matter as one of the keys to both ideal professional success and practicable economic gain. Rosa's strategy of raising prices was conducted partly in connection with a philosophical ideal of the divine intangibility of intellectual production, and he considered it an estimation of his own personal merit and value. But it was also about a fundamental and basic desire for financial gain as a reflection of his ability to succeed (and attain the status given to court artists of old) outside the confines of that older system.

Central to Rosa's pricing strategy was the conviction that the work of art was first and foremost an expression of the free will and imagination of the artist. The inimitability and "originality" of the artist's *ingegno*, made manifest in the work of art itself, had already begun to complicate the valuation of art (as well as the notion of reproduction) in the *cinquecento*. In Rosa's conception, the work's own merit, as a product of his *own* value intrinsic worth and freedom, dictated the monetary value of his paintings. This merit, moreover, could only be assessed once the painting was finished – a "blow for the vagaries of talent [that] struck at the roots of the generally held conception … that an artist's capabilities could be assessed in advance."[480] Adamant about maintaining the intrinsic excellence of his work at all costs (quite literally, it seems), Rosa's attitude caused the agent Giuseppe de Rosis to write to Antonio Ruffo in 1663: "From the little I have had to do with him, I can see that he would rather starve to death than let the quality of his produce fall in reputation."[481] The esteem and respect shown to Rosa's own person also appears to have been a

---

[479] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 484. On the close, and sometimes problematic, connections between Ghisolfi's and Rosa's paintings, see Volpi, "Filosofo nel dipingere," 45, note 88.
[480] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 22-23.
[481] Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," 171-2, letter of September 22 1663; Haskell's translation, in *Patrons and Painters*, 23. In 1664, Ruffo gave in and purchased the paintings according to Rosa's demands, buying the two paintings of *Pythagoras* as well as the *Satyrs and Nymphs*, and an *Archytas of Tarentum with his Dove*. Ruffo, *ibid*, 176-7, 180. Ruffo also owned three of Rosa's landscape paintings, inherited from his brother. Scott, *Salvator Ros*a, 143 note 20. Baldinucci, too, noted that "Of few, or indeed of no, painters who lived before

significant factor in Rosa's pricing system: "It was ordinary practice for Salvatore not to demand a determined price for his small pictures," writes Baldinucci, "but, *if he felt himself treated well*, the friend [that is, the prospective buyer] could on another occasion return to his studio".[482] Many of Rosa's epistolary comments explicitly equate the merits of art and the artist in order to elevate the value of both beyond the strictures of an older paradigm of valuation. On one occasion, Rosa implied that the value of his paintings might increase over time, particularly after his death when his reputation and esteem would reach new heights.[483]

Unlike many of Rosa's predecessors and contemporaries, who laid out the terms of production and payment in advance, often with a detailed and restrictive contract, Rosa refused to take a deposit for his paintings because, as Baldinucci said, he desired a "certain freedom in planning his pictures" and did not want to have to subject his "beautiful thoughts" to the will of a patron's demands.[484] Other artists employed different strategies in order to achieve similar ends: the system of the "fixed price", for example, which permitted artists to gradually increase their prices in accordance with their growing reputation, was adopted by Tintoretto in order to "undersell the competition" and by Guercino, who rigorously applied it to every component of his paintings.[485] Baldinucci says that Rosa could never be persuaded "to agree on a determined price prior to it [the

---

or after him or who were his contemporaries do I find that it can be claimed that they maintained the esteem due to art as he did." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 579; Haskell's translation, in *Patrons and Painters*, 23.

[482] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 485. Emphasis mine.

[483] In 1666 he noted that although De' Rossi had paid fifteen doble for the *Scene of Witchcraft* [Fig. 41] twenty years ago, the banker had once offered him five hundred *scudi* for it, and Rosa had predicted at the time that, after his death, it would be valued at a thousand *scudi* "attesoché trapassa i segni della curiosità". Borelli, letter 335. Rosa elsewhere alluded to the fickle and elusive nature of glory as a thing to be achieved only after death: "gloria, che se mai viene, non è mai in tempo d'esser sentita da noi." Borelli, letter 331.

[484] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 483. Artists' contracts frequently determined even such details as the number of figures to be represented. Conti, "L'evoluzione dell'artista," 117-263. The down payment, too, was "universally given to painters as a guarantee of the commission … This ranged widely from a minimum of about one-seventh to a maximum of nearly a half … the artist was very often given a further payment when it was half finished and the remainder on completion, together with a final bonus. Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 13, 22.

[485] Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 13. Haskell notes "the uncompromising rigidity with which Guercino enforced his own practice of charging a certain sum for every figure painted". Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 14; see Ruffo, "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina," 97; Oliver Bonfait, "Le public du Guerchin: recherches sur le marché de l'art à Bologne au XVIIe siècle," *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine* XXXVIII (1991): 401-27; and Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'". On Tintoretto, see Goldthwaite, "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market," 436; and Nichols, *Tintoretto: Tradition and Identity* (London: Reaktion Books, 1999), 101-10.

work] being done" for the reason that "he was not able to command his paint-brush". His paintings could only be priced after they were finished, "according to the esteem that they deserved" which he would leave to the will of his customer.[486] By aligning financial value with personal worth, however, Rosa intended to make himself – and not his client – into the ultimate barometer of his own economic success.[487]

Rosa's wealthy friends and clients (particularly Carlo de' Rossi) played a crucial role in the valuation of his art, receiving paintings from him as "gifts" and buying his paintings when no one else would for the high price he commanded. De' Rossi's complicity in playing this "certain game" (as Baldinucci called it) with Rosa allowed the artist to "sustain high prices for his paintings, since anyone who wanted his pictures was then forced to pay him what he wanted."[488] In raising his prices to occasionally preposterous amounts Rosa was adhering to a long-standing professional *topos* that began, perhaps, with Pliny's account of Zeuxis who was said to have given his works away for free since he considered no price adequate to their value.[489] This strategy of "gift-giving"

---

[486] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 483.

[487] Rosa frequently shared the news of these victories with Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei, although there are some intriguing disparities in the nature of his reports to either friend that suggest Rosa "valued" his paintings accordingly in the name of preserving and maintaining various friendships. In two letters of 1652 Rosa quoted the payment he had received for his Louvre *Battle Scene* [Fig. 60] in two different forms of coinage: he told Giulio he had received six-hundred *scudi* for it, but informed Ricciardi that he had been given two-hundred *doble*. See Borelli, letters 144, 148. Also see letter 149. The monetary value is approximately the same (one *doble* is about three *scudi*), but Rosa's choice to quote the price using the ostensibly larger sum of "six-hundred" to the wealthy Giulio suggests a desire to inflate his financial situation and the level of esteem it rendered him. Rosa's quote to Ricciardi of "two-hundred" *doble*, on the other hand, may have been intended to downplay that accomplishment to an ever-jealous and suspicious friend. Ricciardi had inquired on more than one occasion about the payments Rosa received from Carlo de' Rossi for his purchases, and Rosa was cautious about revealing too much about the banker's extravagant favour in view of Ricciardi's particular envy toward his relationship with the artist. Rosa expressed a disingenuous modesty to Ricciardi about the high prices of his paintings: in 1664, he wrote to his friend about the successful delivery of his *Calling of Protagoras to Philosophy* and his *Battle Scene* by Cardinal Flavio Chigi to the King of France (the reason for Neri Corsini's absence in this exchange is unclear), noting that, while the King "mostrò di compiacersi assai, e per modestia non vi dico il prezzo datoli da' Signor Francesi." Borelli, letter 305. Ricciardi often asked Rosa for the prices received for his paintings. In 1667, Rosa refused to indulge his friend's inquiry about the payments for the *Regulus* and *Scene of Witchcraft* for De' Rossi. Borelli, letter 336.

[488] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 483-4.

[489] Alberti cited Pliny's anecdote in evidence of the divine (and therefore emancipated) ideal of the artist: Zeuxis "began to give his works away, because, as he said, they could not be bought for money. He did not believe any price could be found to recompense the man who, in modeling or painting living things, behaved like a god among mortals." Alberti thus concluded that "the virtues of painting, therefore, are that its masters see their

was taken up by many of Rosa's contemporaries in the service of attaining both professional esteem and autonomy: Malvasia records that Reni used a similar tactic, and Giulio Mancini recommended it in his *Considerazioni* (c. 1621).[490] Rembrandt, too, reputedly gave away his paintings as gifts and then bought them back in order to "jack up" their prices.[491]

The system of personal esteem that underlies the "gift-giving" economy situated value directly in relation to reputation. This meant that the admiration granted to Rosa and his paintings occasionally inspired potential buyers to give him a high price at the outset.[492] Such was the case with Prince Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna, the Grand Constable of the Kingdom of Naples, who gave Rosa the equivalent of a blank cheque for two of his landscape paintings. This story offers a particularly noteworthy instance of the collusion Rosa identified between monetary value, the painting's merit, and the esteem of the artist himself. Rosa politely declined Colonna's generous offer, sending him the two landscapes and returning the blank cheque. He told Colonna that it was not his (Rosa's) place to decide the price, but that, if Colonna liked the paintings, he could send him an appropriate "honorarium" (*onorario*). In response, Colonna sent Rosa a "gift" (*regalo*) of two-

---

works admired and feel themselves to be almost like the Creator." Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. Cecil Grayson, Book II, 61; Pliny, *Natural History*, XXXV, 62. In his satire *La Pittura* Rosa referred to Zeuxis's practice of giving away his paintings as a sign of the "arrogant liberality" of certain artists, both past and present, who cultivate unjustifiable airs about themselves – a particularly ironic observation in view of his own predilection toward the same practices. As with so many of Rosa's ostensibly self-contradictory statements, this refutation was less an indication of his actual practice than a performance of an ideal philosophical agenda. Rosa, *La Pittura*, vv. 415-23. Rosa notes that Zeuxis believed that the rivers Ganges and Pactolus, which Pliny claimed to be running with gold dust (Pliny, *Natural History*, Book XXI, 4), did not have enough gold to pay for one of his pictures, so he arrogantly took up the custom of giving away [donare] his paintings: thus he claimed liberality with arrogance, and to all the festivities he attended, he wore his name embroidered in gold on his cloak. (Pliny, *ibid*, Book XXXV, 8) Rosa called Parrhasius arrogant for claiming to be the son of Apollo (*La Pittura*, vv. 412-13), an ironic charge in view of his own self-identification with past models, both artistic and philosophical.

[490] Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 595; Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice*, II, 47; Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, ed. A. Marucchi and L. Salerno (Rome, 1956-57), I: 140. For Malvasia's comments on pricing, see Bonfait "La valeur de l'oeuvre peinte: l'economie du mecenat de Pompeo Aldrovandini," in *Le commerce de l'art de la Renaissance à nos jours*, ed. Laurence Bertrand Dorleac (Besancon: Editions La Manufacture, 1992), 95-99.

[491] Chapman, *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits*, 102-3.

[492] Baldinucci notes that Rosa did not always have to place such high prices on his works, since he "fell sometimes into association with very generous persons of high rank, who anticipated his esteem and spontaneously gave him more than the amount which had asked or intended." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 484.

hundred doble.[493] A similar ritual informs the circumstances of the payment Rosa received for his altarpiece of the *Martyrdom of Saints Cosmas and Damian* in S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini in Rome: Rosa's patron, the marquis Filippo Nerli, sent the artist an *onorario* of a thousand ducats in a "crimson velvet purse on a silver tray", two-hundred *doble* of which Rosa returned to him and which Nerli subsequently sent back again, telling Rosa that "in this courteous exchange he wanted to remain the victor". Rosa eventually kept the money, but later sent to the marquis two more of his paintings.[494] In his exchanges with Colonna and Nerli, Rosa was participating in the "competitive subtext" of gift-giving, in which the patron-client relationship was defined by the patron's "power to give the client more than the client could return".[495] In order to sustain his own position of autonomy, Rosa was required to rebuff the offers of his patrons.

Rosa referred to the payments he received, particularly those from De' Rossi, as "*regali*". In 1666 he told Ricciardi that he had received from De' Rossi as payment for the *Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus* "a gift [*regalo*] of one hundred *piastre* under a piece of Parmesan cheese sent to me in a wicker basket". In the same letter he noted De' Rossi had given him a "*regalo*" of fifteen doble for the *Scene of Witchcraft*.[496] In a letter of 1667 Rosa implied that the terms "*regalo*" and "*prezzo*"

---

[493] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 484.
[494] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 484-5; Passeri, *Vite*, 431.
[495] Biagioli, "Galileo's System of Patronage," 18-20. On competition in gift-giving also see Mauss, *The Gift*, 38-40; and Verboven, "The Economy of Friends," 38-9. In arguing for his product as commercially "inestimable", the artist also placed it at the outer bounds of monetary valuation. Baldinucci's stories of Rosa's exchanges with Colonna and Nerli, where the artist's endeavour to "remove" his art from its fiscal bounds resulted in driving up the price to an exorbitant amount, are later biographical derivations of Vasari's tale concerning Michelangelo's *tondo* of the *Holy Family* (c. 1504-6) for Angelo Doni. Upon sending his patron the painting with a bill for seventy ducats, Doni responded with a payment of only forty ducats, claiming that the price was too great for a painting of that size; in response, Michelangelo asked for either a hundred ducats or the painting itself; Doni then said he would pay the original seventy since he liked the painting; Michelangelo then doubled his fee to a hundred-and-forty ducats, to which Doni agreed in order to keep the painting. Nagel, "Art as Gift," 319; Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Bettarini and Barocchi, VI: 14-15 (1550 ed.), 22-23 (1568 ed.). Baldinucci (or Rosa himself) probably had the story in mind when he had Rosa exclaim "*un milione*" to the unwitting client who dared to bicker over the price of one of Rosa's measly landscapes. The idea of "doubling the price" was "a declaration of inestimable value", and a practice that Rosa also sought to incorporate into his scheme of an ideally free art. Nagel, "Art as Gift," 319-20.
[496] Borelli, letter 335.

were interchangeable.[497] Rosa's practice of "giving" his paintings is somewhat more complex than his biographers' (especially Baldinucci's) accounts suggest. Baldinucci's indiscriminate use of the verb "*donare*" would have his reader believe that Rosa "gave" his paintings to just about everyone, when in reality he often received money or expected some form of profitable return in exchange. The concept of "*donare*" reflects the affective, altruistic and democratizing nature of Rosa's ideal economy of art – a practice that I will explore more fully in the next section.

V.7. The Economics of the Friendly Gift

The concept of the "gift" informs Rosa's professional practice in two related dimensions. The first consists in the giving of the work of art to a friend as a token of friendship or sign of affection, an explicitly non-commercial exchange that is nonetheless bound by certain rules of obligation and expectation of reciprocation. The second lies in the application of this ritual (and its discourse) to the artist's more general economic strategy, in commerce with patrons, clients or customers, as a way to infuse its practice with the same ideal of an altruistic, democratic and affective exchange.[498] Marshall Sahlins's distinction between two (often overlapping) models of exchange is perhaps useful here: on the one hand there are gifts of "reciprocity," traded between friends as like for like; on the other hand are gifts of "redistribution", given to patrons or clients in exchange for either the tangible payment of money or intangible rewards of honour and reputation. The latter of the two models consisted in a "network of redistributive exchange moving up and

[497] Borelli, letter 336: "havendomi richiesto che vi raguagliassi del regalo o prezzo dell'Attilio e Stregherie …"
[498] Among the many artists who gave their works of art as "strategic" gifts, is the "somewhat eccentric Paolo Guidotti" who "used to say that he gave away his paintings as 'free gifts', but he had no hesitation in accepting the most expensive presents in return. Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 14; also see Italo Faldi, "Paolo Guidotti e gli affreschi della 'Sala del Cavaliere' nel Palazzo di Bassano di Sutri," *Bollettino d'Arte* (1957): 278-95. Claude Lorrain shared in the notion, as Jacopo Salviati noted in a letter of 1662 to Leopoldo de' Medici: "Or ce qui est pire c'est qui'il faudra le payer largement car il ne fixe un prix qu'aux gens de mediocre conditon." Haskell, *ibid*, 14; Ferdinand Boyer, "Documents d'Archives Romaines et Florentines sur le Valentin, le Poussin e le Lorrain," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Francais* (1931): 238. Also on gifs in early-modern economic exchange, see Guido Rebecchini, "Il mercato del dono. Forme dello scambio artistico a Mantova tra Cinque e Seicento," in *Tra Committenza e Collezionismo*, ed. Dal Pozzolo and Tedoldi, 113-122.

down a social hierarchy."[499] As Sharon Kettering notes, however, the line between "token gifts and gift-giving as patronage was blurred and not always easy to distinguish."[500] A key component of the practice of friendship, gift-giving was an essential performance in the pursuit and exercise of professional autonomy: by giving a work of art for "free", the artist made his patron or client into an equal and, consequently, a friend, permitting a removal from the traditional procedure of commission and contract defined by inequality and indenture.[501] At the core of the distinction between these two types of gifts – those intended to encapsulate the terms of "true" friendship, and those made in expectation of payment from (or as payment to) a patron or client (friends of "utility") – is the tricky concept of altruistic intent, always in some sense illusory by virtue of the fundamentally self-seeking nature of the gesture itself. In this section, I distinguish between the gifts Rosa gave to his friends as a sign of "selfless" affection and those given in expectation of payment with the understanding that a clear-cut division between the two is never really possible.

In contradistinction to the older, more common practice of arranging a price in advance with a patron, some *seicento* artists turned instead to the practice of refusing to name a price and relying on the "munificence" of the client or patron in question.[502] Artists could claim that their work transcended the purely commercial sphere, declaring it, as Pirro Ligorio did, a "sovereign art,

---

[499] Warwick, "Gift Exchange and Art Collecting," 640, note 68; see Sahlins, "On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange," in *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, ed. M. P. Banton (London: Tavistock, 1965), 111.
[500] Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," 139.
[501] *Ibid*, 132. "The euphemism of gift-giving made a patron's bestowal of benefits seem voluntary and disinterested, but in reality it was obligatory and self-interested: Gift-giving disguised the obligatory reciprocity of the patron-client exchange, and made the personal bond appear more emotional and affective than it really was."
[502] Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 122. Guido Reni, for example, famously engaged in this ritual as a strategy intended to liberate his art from its status as a commodity and in expectation of greater financial gain. Tintoretto had much earlier taken up the economic strategy of the "gift" in 1564, producing a painting – without being asked – for the Scuola Grande di San Rocco in Venice and installing it himself; not asking for money outright, he nonetheless expected a significant financial recompense in return for his "free" donation. Marshall, "Dispelling Negative Perceptions," 379. On Tintoretto's "tactical gift-giving", see Paul Hills, "Tintoretto's Marketing," in *Venedig und Oberdeutschland in der Renaissance: Beziehungen zwischen Kunst und Wirtschaft*, ed. Bernd Roeck et al. (Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1993), 113, 116; and Tom Nichols, *Tintoretto. Tradition and Identity* (London: Reaktion Books, 1999), 102.

because it must be practiced for fame, not for reward,"[503] or arguing, as Rubens did, that it was produced not out of a desire for large sums of money but for the sole purpose of esteem.[504] Rosa's offer to paint the panels for De' Rossi's church "for free" is echoed in the propositions of artists like Jacques Courtois, who in 1671 offered to fresco the sacristy of S. Andrea al Quirinale for a minimal fee "since he was mainly keen to make known his abilities, so as to gain a reputation."[505] As Patrizia Cavazzini notes, "[a]n intellectual activity deserved a gift, not a salary, which was appropriate compensation for a craftsman."[506]

An intrinsic feature of the conception of art as "liberal" rather than "mechanical", the gift emblematized the artist's definition of his profession as one pursued not for gain but for "disinterested pleasure," an idea that would become central to the Romantic and modern vision of artistic identity. This is the notion that underpins Rosa's proclamation to Don Antonio Ruffo that he painted not for money but only for his "own satisfaction"[507] – a claim asserted by several of Rosa's predecessors and contemporaries.[508] In this scheme, which aligned the artist with the "social norms of aristocratic conduct," it was not the artist's work that was being evaluated and rewarded

[503] Coffin, "Pirro Ligorio on the Nobility of the Arts," *JWCI* 27 (1964): 209.
[504] Magurn, *The Letters of Rubens*, 399-401, letter 237, Rubens to Peiresc, from Antwerp, dated Aug 16 1635.
[505] Haskell, "Art Exhibitions in XVII Century Rome," 120.
[506] Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 123; also see Modesti, "Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna," 375; and Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 212.
[507] Appendix I. 5. For Rosa's claims to not need to paint for money, also see Borelli, letters 128, 245, 306 and 375.
[508] Other artists had staked similar claims: it is traceable, for example, to the terms of employment granted to Filippo Brunelleschi by his prospective patron Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta, and to Alberti's claim that he painted occasionally "*per mio piacere*." In 1449 Malatesta wrote to Giovanni de'Medici asking for a painter to decorate a chapel for him, stipulating that "his agreed allowance will be paid punctually, even if he works solely for his own pleasure ('per suo piacere')" – an "unheard-of offer" in the guild-regulated Florentine system of the period. Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 44-5. The idea of painting for one's own pleasure, or of taking pleasure in working, became a veritable *topos* in the biographies of *cinquecento* and *seicento* artists. Warnke, *ibid*, 166-7. Friendship played an important role in this process of democratization: in 1593 the ambassador of the Duke of Urbino informed his patron that the painter Federico Zuccaro (c. 1542-1609), "will not hear of a price [since] he says he is painting it to your commission and therefore for a friend, which is tantamount to painting it for himself". Warnke, *ibid*, 150; see Giorgio Gronau, *Documenti artistici urbinati* (Florence, 1936), 226f. Like working for oneself, the production of paintings (or prints, for that matter) for "friends" is closely bound to the emancipating ideal of artists and their production: the inscription devised by the humanist Andrea Alciati for Vasari's frescoes in the refectory of the Camaldolese church in Bologna, for example, recorded that "This work was painted by Giorgio Aretino in eight months, not for gain but as a gift of friendship and by a vow of honour, in the year 1539." Nagel, "Art as Gift," 341; see Vasari, *Lives*, trans. A. B. Hinds (London, 1927), 266.

but rather "a pre-existent virtue and inward disposition".[509] Because the divine nature of this inner talent was unquantifiable – that is, incapable of a monetary equivalent because it could not be "sold" – it could only be "honoured" with "voluntary donations or reciprocal gifts."[510] (The recognition of the artist as "special" in this way is also tied to the increasing regard given to novelty, originality and idiosyncrasy in subject matter – as well as the right to choose that subject freely, without a commission.[511]) Thus emerged a "system of exchange and barter", in which "the work retained its identity as an inalienable product of the individual mind"; the artist offered his work to his patron and then made an appeal "to the princely virtue of *liberalitas*, which implied a gift in return."[512] In this scheme, the valuation of the work was based on "subjective judgement" rather than "objective calculation," and a "compromise between the artist's sense of his own worth – which depended on his reputation – and the personal taste of the purchaser".[513] Warnke's observation that the artist could, in refusing to name a price "set a costly process in train," rings true to Rosa's own practice of capitalizing on an altruistic ideal for the purposes of significant financial gain. The artist's requirement to play up his or her personal virtues and values found a natural body

[509] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 34, 165.
[510] *Ibid*, 37. The concept of the work of art as a gift is also tied to the conception of the creative impulse, itself, as a "gift" bestowed on the artist; his or her products, then, are consequently reflections of that initial divine endowment. Hyde, *The Gift. Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property* (New York: Random House, 1983), xi-xii. On this important dimension of the art as "gift", see Nagel, "Gifts for Michelangelo and Vittoria Colonna," *Art Bulletin* LXXIX: 4 (1997): 647-668; and *idem*, "Art as Gift," 319-360. Nagel also traces the history of the idea of art-as-gift to the Petrarchan discourse on female beauty and possession – one that parallels, moreover, the discourse of male friendship. Nagel, *ibid*, 348-9; see Gombrich, "Botticelli's mythologies: A study in the Neo-Platonic symbolism of his circle," in *Symbolic Images: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 41; and Cropper, "The place of beauty in the High Renaissance and its displacement in the history of art," in *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance*, ed. Alvin Vos (Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 132, 1995), 159-205.
[511] Other artists had produced paintings without commissions or customers. See Jane Costello, "The Twelve Pictures Ordered by Velazquez and the Trial of Valguarnera," *JWCI* 13 (1950): 237-284; Linda Freeman Bauer, "Oil Sketches, Unfinished Paintings and the Inventories of Artists' Estates," 93-107; and Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi," 316; also see essays in the volume *The Art Market in Italy*, ed. Fantoni et al. Warnke notes that Dürer's practice of gift-giving and dedication to patrons "has been seen as the first indication that the artist could allow himself a 'free choice of subject'." Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 90-100. As Nagel has noted, the conception of art as a "free gift" also entailed a "semantic freedom" – room for novel iconography – since objects of this sort "were not to be explicated by recourse to traditional iconographic conventions, and this meant that they required special interpretative efforts on the part of the viewer" who was, ideally, conceived as a recipient of a gift. Nagel, "Art as Gift," 358.
[512] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 148.
[513] *Ibid*, 150.

of language in the discourse of friendship, applying it to artist-patron (or artist-client) relations. Here, however, it is important to note that artists who were actually *able* to paint for their own satisfaction – above and beyond merely claiming to do so – were assisted by a certain financial stability.[514] The ideal of "painting for oneself" was built on a fiction, a fragile and often untenable illusion that required the artist to diminish his or her economic reliance and need.[515] It is the pressure to reconcile the tension between this ideal and reality that lies at the heart of the early-modern artist's identity, and it is the root cause of Rosa's own struggle to turn a long-standing principle into a practicable truth.

The gift paradigm that informs the commercial strategy of Rosa and his contemporaries rests on a concept known as the "just price", in which value is dictated not by some "inherent property" of the object itself but by the process of exchange and the relationship between or relative status of the artist and buyer.[516] This is related to the concept of the "*valore di stima*", an ideal of valuation as determined by the patron or client, in opposition to the "*valore di fatica*" or the valuation of labour.[517] Rosa's conception of *valore di stima*, however, was based less in the "esteem" of his illustrious patron or client (as Mancini had defined it) than it was in his own person.

---

[514] As Montanari has noted with regard to Bernini's practice of painting "for himself," the artist's significant funds went a long way toward permitting him the opportunity for greater experiment, a wider variety of materials, and to make the claim that he painted solely for his own private purposes. Montanari, *Bernini Pittore*, 75-6; also see *idem*, "'Dar todo a uno es obra del diablo'."
[515] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 165-66.
[516] Komter, *Social Solidarity and the Gift*, 16. On the "just price" also see Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 14; Raymond de Roover, "The Concept of the Just Price: Theory and Economic Policy," *Journal of Economic History* xviii (1958): 418-34; and Zarines Negron, "Francisco Pacheco: Economist for the Art World," in *Economic Engagements with Art*, ed. De Marchi and Goodwin, 33, 35.
[517] Adherents of the "*valore di stima*" included Guido Reni, Elisabetta Sirani and Francesco Albani and collectors like Giulio Mancini, while advocates of the "*valore di fatica*" included Annibale Carracci and Guercino. See Spear, "Guercino's 'prix-fixe'," 595, 597, 600-1; and *idem*, "Scrambling for Scudi," 316. Rubens, interestingly enough, seems to have fallen somewhere in between. In a letter of May 12 1618 to his patron Sir Dudley Carleton, Rubens adheres to aspects of both the *valore di fatica* and the *valore di stima*, both employed in the service of soliciting a high price. See Ruelens and Rooses, *Correspondance de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Antwerp, 1898), 149; and Houdt, "The Economics of Art in Early Modern Times," 308, 316. For the ecclesiastic author Antoninus Diana (1585-1663), only the sum paid above the just price was to be considered a "free gift". Houdt, "The Economics of Art in Early Modern times," 317-18; Diana, *Resolutiones morales* (Mons: Franciscus Waudraeus, 1635), 56.119.

In this, Rosa was aiming for parity with his noble customers, co-opting their own liberality and magnanimity as signs of his own professional autonomy.

Liberality and Magnanimity as Keys to Rosa's Economic Performance

The freedom to "give away" art, money or any other possession is the privilege of the wealthy and powerful.[518] In his *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (c. 1621), Mancini had advocated gift-giving as the "preferred mode of exchange for princely collectors and others who aspired to noble status." "Magnanimus gift-giving," he considered, "is for those who do not wish to be surpassed in courtesy."[519] The ideals of magnanimity and liberality informed the practice of *seicento* artists as much as that of their patrons and clients, and their cultivation was vital in Rosa's attempt to nurture an aristocratic philosophical persona: they permitted the otherwise self-denying and ostentation-rebuking Stoic to pursue a comfortable and even luxurious lifestyle.[520] *Seicento* Neo-Stoics throughout Europe adopted a concept of magnanimity ("*magnanimitas*" or "*magnitudo animi*") in emulation of an ideal devised by Aristotle and the ancient Stoics: related to the concept of *magnificenza* (magnificence), which referred to actions directed at "achieving greatness in external things",[521] magnanimity indicated actions aimed at "greatness in moral action".[522] The *moral* ideal

[518] Wernick, "The Work of Art as Gift and Commodity," 180.
[519] Warwick, "Gift Exchange and Art Collecting," 632; citing Mancini, *Considerazioni*, ed. A. Marucci (Rome, 1956), I: 128-40.
[520] Rosa admitted to Ricciardi that his love of fame (and perhaps also his desire for money) was antithetical to his Stoic precepts, but the ideals of poverty and denial of wealth cultivated by the seventeenth-century Neo-Stoics masked a profound need on their part to associate themselves with an aristocratic way of life. See Houdt, "The Economics of Art in Early Modern times," 322; Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics*," 191-2. Guido Reni, for example, was described by Malvasia as "abhorring the mention of prices, preferring to offer his work as gifts to great princes who would send magnanimous gifts in response." Warwick, "Gift Exchange and Art Collecting," 632; also see Modesti, "Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna," 375. Malvasia also made "magnanimity" a virtue of Annibale Carracci. See Summerscale, *Malvasia's Life of the Carracci* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 271. On the centrality of magnanimity and liberality to the gift-based economy of Western European culture, see Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor," 345.
[521] Guerzoni outlines the Greek etymological origins of the term: "*magnificentia* (μεγάλοπρέπεια) comes from the fusion of "*magnus*" (*grande*/ great), in this case closely tied to the idea of '*mangnitudo*/ *grandezza*/ magnitude', and the Greek verb meaning 'to stand out, to be noted, to be distinguished, to signal, to emerge', as well as 'to be convenient, proper, decorus' (*decorum*)." Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor," 341.
[522] Houdt, "The Economics of Art in Early Modern times," 322-3; René-Antoine Gauthier, *Magnanimité: L'idéal de la grandeur dans la philosophie païenne et dans la théologie chrétienne* (Paris: Vrin, 1951), 55-118, 119-76.

of magnanimity masked the potentially unsavoury nature of "magnificence", an ostentatious display of material possessions, but adopted its requisite condition of grandness and its justification of material wealth.[523] By co-opting and cultivating an ideal long applied to princely or courtly conduct as a feature of their own practice, Neo-Stoics like Justus Lipsius appropriated their nobility and consequent autonomy.[524]

Liberalità, a term closely allied to magnanimity, can be loosely translated as "generosity" but it places particular stress on the moral content of that action: opposed with *ostentatio* (ostentation) and situated between the two extremes of *prodigalità* (prodigality or largesse) *avidità* (avarice), liberality refers to a spirit of free giving among the nobility whose practice is intrinsic to upholding the honour of that noble status.[525] As a ritual to be practiced by the nobility, liberality was intended to "redistribute" that wealth among the worthy, and correct the errors of Fortune.[526] *Liberalità* was also one of the primary values of friendship, aligned by Cicero and Seneca with *benignitas* and *beneficentia* (kindness and beneficence).[527] The "free" and democratic components of *liberalità*, expressed in its cognate *libertà* (freedom),[528] too, are essential aspects of its value for Rosa – only the wealthy nobility are truly "free" to dispense with their wealth as they please. By cultivating both himself and his professional practice as magnanimous and liberal, Rosa was able to

---

[523] Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor," 345.
[524] Houdt, "The Economics of Art in Early Modern times," 326. For Lipsius, see Lipsius, *Politcorum sive civilis doctrinae libri* VI (Leiden, 1589); *idem*, "Epistolarum selectarum centuriae III ad Belgas," in *Justi Lipsi opera*, vol. I (Lyons: Hubertus Cardon, 1602, 1613); *idem*, *Monita et exempla politica libri duo, qui virtutes et vitia Principum spectant* (Antwerp: Joannes Moretus, 1605, 1606); and Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics*.
[525] Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor," 333, 341-2. Like magnificence and magnanimity, the concept of liberality also has fundamentally Aristotelian roots: "Aristotle defines 'liberalitas' as the golden mean with regard to material goods (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 4.1). The liberal man is praised for his equilibrium in giving and receiving material goods, with more praise being awarded for giving." On largesse (*largito*) see Philippe Desan, "Préfaces, prologues et avis au lecteur: stratégies préfacielles à la Renaissance," 99; Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," 138.
[526] Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor," 333, 365, 368.
[527] The four primary values of friendship were *liberalitas* (or *benignitas*), *gratia* (grace), *fides* (faith or loyalty), and *benevolentia* or *amor* (benevolence or love). See Verboven, "The Economy of Friends," 35-6.
[528] As Guerzoni explains, "'*liberalitas'* (ἐλευθεριότης), which can be translated as the condition-sentiment-action of a free man/not slave, derives from the noun form of the adjective for 'liberal', linked to the adjective for '*liber-libero*-free' and to the noun for '*libertas-libertà*-liberty', which signified liberty, independence, and the condition of not being a servant or slave." Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor," 341.

reconcile financial gain with an ideal of poverty, to assume the noble and free status of the highest social class of his time, and to expect demonstrations of the same munificence in return from friends, patrons and clients alike.[529]

The Discourse of Gift-Giving: *Donare* as "Give and Take" and Other Oxymorons

According to a central tenet of gift-exchange, the giver places himself in a "morally superior position" that causes the recipient to "feel indebted".[530] This produces the phenomenon of "keeping-while-giving" – the notion that in giving something away, we simultaneously retain the gesture via the expectation of its return.[531] The discourse of the gift economy of art, part of the culture of courtesy or "economy of human relations"[532] that defines *seicento* sociality, underscores the artist's (and his patron's or client's) desire to construct a level playing field and a professional relationship defined by the reciprocal terms of amity. The terms used by Rosa and his contemporaries, such as "*onorario*," "*regalo*" and "*donare*," encapsulate the dual nature of giving as selfless and self-serving, exercised in expectation of significant return.[533] "*Donare*" is a particularly flexible and multivalent verb, frequently employed to suggest the free giving of the work of art as a gift, but implying at the same time an expectation of some return. This ambiguity is apparent in Rosa's usage: in 1651, for example, he told Ricciardi he had made a "small canvas in a

---

[529] Baldinucci applied the term "magnanimous" to Rosa's Florentine princely patrons, who welcomed the artist to the city and offered him "recompense adapted to his own merit." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 448. He also used it to describe the marquis Filippo Nerli, who sent Rosa an "honorarium" of a thousand ducats for his altarpiece of SS. Cosmas and Damian. Baldinucci, *ibid*, 484. In his letters Rosa uses the term *magnanimo* only once, in reference to his own generosity to friends, but the term *liberalità* appears much more frequently, in reference to both his own actions and those of others. See Borelli, letters 48, 101, 111, 149, 178, 199, 200, 202, 206, 251, 252 and 350.

[530] Komter, *Social Solidarity and the Gift*, 47.

[531] *Ibid*, 79.

[532] Calitti ed., *L'Arte della Conversazione*, 206; citing Falvo, *The Economy of Human Relations*.

[533] See Warwick, "Gift Exchange and Art Collecting," 632; and Mauss, *The Gift*. Seneca had much earlier encapsulated this duality, writing "The logic of gifts is simple: so much is given out. If something is returned it is called gain; if not, there is no loss. I made the gift for the sake of giving". Seneca, *Moral Essais*, III, trans. John W. Basore (London, 1935), Book 1, chap. 2, sec. 3, 10-11, cited in Nagel, "Gifts for Michelangelo and Vittoria Colonna," 651. Elsewhere, Seneca acknowledged that "There is no man who, when he has benefitted his neighbour, has not benefitted himself." Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, LXXXI, On Benefits, 231.

beautiful gilded frame to give [*donarla*]" to Cavalier Pietro Pandolfini, not clarifying whether or not he expected payment for the work in question.[534] Later that same year, he reassured Giulio Maffei that the paintings he made for him were to be regarded ultimately as "gifts", in expression (and expectation of) friendship rather than an explicitly monetary compensation:

> "All the pictures and drawings that I have put in your house, dearest Signor Giulio, I never had the intention to give them to just anyone [*donarli al comune*] but only to you to whom I profess the sum of friendship and obligation. Except, however, for those two *Teste* that I gave [*donai*] to Signor Marc'Antonio, and those engravings to Signora Caterina. The rest is all yours, confessing myself in the rest excessively obliged to all the Gentlemen, your brothers."[535]

In a letter to Ricciardi of 1652, Rosa made an ideal distinction between "selling" and "giving" that masked the actual collusion between the two concepts: attempting to sell the paired *Democritus* and *Diogenes* for more than the two-hundred-and-fifty *scudi* that was then on offer, he conceded that "because I want to sell [*vendere*] them, and not donate [*donare*] them, I think they will be with me a little while longer."[536]

Baldinucci noted on more than one occasion Rosa's frequent habit of giving his paintings away as gifts: Rosa "was loved ... for his goodness, and sometimes he made gifts of his paintings, which were worth not a little."[537] Amusingly, he claims that Rosa was often willing to "give away" his paintings in return for his favourite fruit – figs – to which he was so addicted that he even refused the invitations of foreign rulers on the basis that the delicacy was not to be found in their countries.[538] Figs do in fact feature in Rosa's epistolary comments as a unique and personal

---

[534] Borelli, letter 92: "Ieri fu da me il Signor Cavalier Pietro Pandolfini e mi pregò a ch'io li facessi favore di farli una teluccia in una cornice assai bella indorata per donarla avanti che se ne torna costà al mastro di camera del Cardinale Panziroli, onde di presente lo sto servendo. …"

[535] Borelli, letter 110: "Tutti i quadri e disegni ch'io ho messo in casa vostra Signor Giulio carissimo non ho hauto mai intentione di donarli al comune ma solamente a voi al quale io professo somma amicitia et oblighatione. Toltone però quelle due Teste che donai al Signor Marc'Antonio e quel rame alla Signora Caterina. Il resto è tutto vostro, confessandomi del resto oltre modo oblighato a tutti i Signori vostri fratelli."

[536] Borelli, letter 129: "poiché io li voglio vendere, e non donare, credo che staranno presso di me un pezzo."

[537] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 481.

[538] *Ibid*, 502.

measure of value in his economy of gift-giving.[539] His letters also show that he did occasionally give paintings as "free" gifts to close friends like Ricciardi, Giulio Maffei or Girolamo Signoretti.[540] But when it came to collectors like Carlo de' Rossi, Filippo Nerli, Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna or dealers like Francesco Cordini (all of whom Baldinucci claims as recipients of Rosa's "gifts"[541]), the purely altruistic nature of exchange masked an expectation of financial, rather than non-monetary, gain. The "payments" Rosa received from these clients, such as the silver basin he kept in his bathroom in Rome, were also described in ideal terms as "gifts".[542]

Rosa's "gifts" for Cordini demonstrate the particularly contentious nature of "*donare*". Baldinucci noted that Rosa painted "as a gift" (*dipinse in dono*) for his "dear friend" Cordini the large canvas of *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31], described by the biographer as among the first paintings Rosa made in Florence.[543] Scott suggested that this was an erroneous oversight on the part of the biographer, who mistook an altruistic, affective motive for a self-serving financial one: Rosa's comments in his letters to Ricciardi, and his anger over their sale to the Archduke, suggest that he regarded his donation to Cordini as one that would yield a payment, rather than as a selfless gift of friendship.[544] But Baldinucci's use of the term, like Rosa's own, was intended to encapsulate the dual nature of Cordini's relationship with the artist as both personal and professional. Cordini's "betrayal" in selling the paintings Rosa had given him for a low price was as much affective as financial. Baldinucci's observation that Cordini "enjoyed" the paintings "for many years" before selling them suggests that Rosa may well have intended them – especially the *Moral Philosophy* –

---

[539] For example, the dried meat he received from Giulio in 1651 was "not worth a dry fig"; the comedies being performed in Rome during the Carnival season of 1653 "do not please me a dry fig"; and Rosa's Roman friends "do not equal a dry fig" in comparison to his beloved Ricciardi. See Borelli, letters 107, 161 and 337.
[540] For the "gifts" of the self-portraits to Signoretti and Giulio Maffei, see Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 456, 462.
[541] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 483, 484-5.
[542] *Ibid*, 501.
[543] *Ibid*, 455. Baldinucci says that the *Moral Philosophy* was among the '*più antiche*' of Rosa's Florentine phase. Mahoney has convincingly dated the painting on a stylistic basis (together with its preparatory drawings) to c. 1643-5. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 233. Salerno dated it to just before 1649, noting the affinity between its large figural composition and the Roman paintings of the early 1650's, like the Copenhagen *Diogenes* and *Democritus*. Salerno, *L'opera completa*, no. 97.
[544] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 95.

as a gift for Cordini's personal use.[545] Like Niccolò Simonelli, Cordini not only traded in paintings but also "acquired pictures for his own collection," and the *Moral Philosophy* may have been among these collectibles.[546] Of all the paintings by Rosa that Cordini owned, the *Moral Philosophy* is arguably the most highly personal for Rosa, signalled by Baldinucci's description of the subject as "the science ... [of] the perfect understanding of one's self," the crucial ability of the moral philosopher.[547] At a later point in his biography, Baldinucci notes that Rosa made the painting for Cordini, a fellow member of the *Percossi*, partly "because of their close friendship" as well in response to the dealer's own request for a large painting by Rosa's hand.[548] In this context, the *Moral Philosophy* may be compared with the *Umana Fragilitas* as a painting invested with not only a highly personal meaning but a homage to friendship.[549] Despite Rosa's assertions to the contrary, Cordini's decision to sell the paintings may reflect less a disregard for the images as personal gifts than a pressing financial need. Rosa's exchanges with Cordini are a salient illustration of the

---

[545] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 456.
[546] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 216.
[547] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 455. On the painting's philosophical and "melancholic" iconography, see Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 27; Salerno, *L'opera completa*, no. 97; and *idem*, "Il dissenso nella pittura," 48. The figure of the woman rests her left hand on a skull, which bears the Latin inscription "sustine et abstine", identified as a translation of Epictetus meaning "Endure and abstain." Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 72; Wallace, "Genius", 478; Roworth, *Pictor Succensor*, 191. Roworth notes that the phrase appeared in Alciati's *Emblemata* as the title for Emblem XXXIV, which shows a man beating a bullock, and considered that it appealed to Rosa's interest Epictetus and the Stoic pursuit of virtue – particularly evident in his pictorial work during his Florentine period (as in the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher*), when Rosa first began to absorb the influence of Ricciardi. Roworth, *ibid*, 248-9. In the *Moral Philosophy*, Rosa included a scale just below the mirror which Salerno connected to the idea of philosophy as self-knowledge. The reptile gnawing on the cartouche with Rosa's signature introduces a *vanitas* element to the picture, while the serpent may refer to Philosophy, taking from Ripa who wrote that "Logic is a venomous matter and, like the serpent, it bites and kills those who oppose it with temerity." As Salerno writes, "Perhaps Rosa wanted to express with the painting not only the lapsing of fame, but also the proper skeptical attitude in regard to logic. The image would therefore constitute a vanitas in this sense, asserting in this way the uselessness of philosophy in avoiding evil (logic is in fact also the art of the devil), in finding the good and the truth." Salerno, *ibid*, no. 97. Scott identified the female figure in the painting as an allegory, herself, of Moral Philosophy, seated "in gloomy meditation, paying little attention either to the man who stands beside her, pointing to the mirror of self-knowledge, or to the *putti*, who show a surprising interest in the philosophical tomes at her feet." Scott, *ibid*, 72. On the Socratic theory of self-knowledge and moral virtue, see Quondam, in Calitti ed, *L'Arte della Conversazione*, XVIII-XIX.
[548] He cites the *Moral Philosophy* as an example of Rosa's high opinion of his own talents, and his frequent desire to show off his "concept of himself" in making "large and laborious works". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 478. The painting, as I note in chapter three, was also the subject of a laudatory ode by Rosa's friend Jacopo Salviati, which reiterated its significance as part of Rosa's claim to be a "famous painter of moral things." Baldinucci, *ibid*, 455-456. See Appendix VII. 4. See my discussion of the poem in chapter three.
[549] See my discussion of the *Umana Fragilitas* in chapter four.

complex nature of Rosa's economic practice. He gave some of his canvases to Cordini as gifts to be enjoyed for personal use, and others in the expectation that he would sell them; but *all* of these paintings were ideally circumscribed as "gifts". In "giving away" these paintings (both those intended for his own collection and those intended for eventual sale) for next to nothing, Cordini not only invalidated Rosa's initial gesture, but failed to reiterate the ideal commercial ritual of "*donare*" that Rosa demanded of his own transactions, in which the "free" nature of the paintings in question were conceived as so far beyond monetary value that they became, consequently, as expensive as possible.

The Gift of the Self: Self-Portraits and Drawings as Gifts

Artists frequently gave away their paintings as gifts to friends, as presents in recognition of affection or aid, or as payment for a service rendered. Some artists were reluctant to give away their best paintings, however, choosing instead to exchange copies.[550] Rosa seems to have given only originals to close friends as a sign of affection, but also – importantly – in order to sustain and promote the ideal of liberality that he sought for both his art and his person. In chapter four I discussed in detail the most important and unique example of the first type of gift: Rosa's *Portrait of a Poet-Philosopher* [Fig. 64] for Ricciardi, a self-referential painting expressly intended as an offering of companionship and a tribute to the mutuality of friendship. Implicit in this image and its dedication to a friend as a "gift" was a desire on the part of its sender to both reciprocate and outshine the recipient's position in the exchange. It is tempting to imagine that a similar motivation lay behind the other allegorical self-images that Rosa reputedly gave as "gifts" to other friends: the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* [Fig. 15], which Baldinucci records was "made for" Rosa's Florentine colleague Girolamo Signoretti, and the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* [Fig. 16], which Rosa "made for"

[550] Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 128.

the Maffei family.[551] If the gift is conceived as an embodiment or fragment of the giver's identity, then the self-portrait gains a particularly subjective potency as a literal representation of that same self.[552] The self-portraits that Rosa made for his friends are particularly significant in the context of the gift for they imply on one level that the self – like the work of art in which it is contained – is an entity of "free" commerce. In giving himself "freely" to his friends, Rosa seizes another opportunity to tout his autonomous professional status via the intrinsically "free" nature of the exchange that takes place among friends. As always, however, there is more at stake in the process. The "self-portrait as a gift" is at once a selfless and self-indulgent object. Like the practice of gift-giving itself, which operates on both an ideal altruistic plane and a more real (if often unacknowledged) level of self-interest, the self-portrait is both a gesture of offering or reciprocation *and* an opportunity to tout one's own virtues and proclaim one's immortality (and to act perhaps in *expectation* of reciprocation in the form of another gift or favour).[553] In giving himself freely, Rosa expected a certain return on his investment, if only in the form of a significant acknowledgement of the autonomous authority of the identity represented therein.

Baldinucci has nothing to say about Rosa's motives in giving either the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello* or the *Self-Portrait as an Artist*. One is left to speculate, then, on the artist's intentions and the possible connections between the images and recipients in question. Signoretti was a well-known Florentine printer and bookseller who, to judge from Rosa's frequent mention of his name and expressions of affection for him long after he left Rome, was counted among Rosa's dearer

[551] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 456: "A Girolamo Signoretti, nostro cittadino, fece un bellissimo paese bislungo: e ancora donògli un ritratto di se stesso, vestito in abito di Pascariello, con guanti stracciati, quadro, che passò poi alle mani del serenissimo cardinale Leopoldo di Toscana." His claim that the painting passed to Leopoldo has not been confirmed by the documents. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 67. Baldinucci also recorded that Rosa gave Signoretti "a most beautiful oblong landscape". With regard to the S*elf-Portrait as an Artist*, Baldinucci writes: "Per li Maffei fece di sua mano un ritratto di se stesso, che poi da' medesimi fu donato alla casa serenissima [the Medici]." Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462.
[552] On "embodiment" in gift-giving, see Mauss, *The Gift*, 1, 3, 10-11, 25; Kettering, "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France," 131; Firth, "Symbolism in Giving and Getting," in *Symbols Public and Private* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973), 372-4; Komter, *Social Solidarity and the Gift*, 7; and Strathern, "Partners and Consumers. Making Relations Visible," in *The Logic of the Gift*, ed. Schrift, 292-307.
[553] Mauss defined the psychological procedure of the gift and its obligatory nature. Mauss, *The Gift*.

friends.[554] It is impossible to know for certain why Rosa would choose to give Signoretti a self-image in his preferred theatrical role as Pascariello, but perhaps the bookseller took a particular interest in this facet of Rosa's career. Signoretti is not officially listed as a member of the *Percossi*, but he could have participated in or sponsored their activities. Closely involved in Rosa's circle of more intimate friends, including Ricciardi, Giulio Maffei, Cordini and other members of the academic coterie, the possibility that Signoretti solicited the painting from Rosa is suggested by Cordini's short, witty sonnet, in which Rosa is urged to paint a portrait of Signoretti.[555] The ironic nature of the *Self-Portrait as Pascariello*, which I discuss in chapter one – simultaneously exalting and mocking the artificiality of both theatrical performance and Renaissance portraiture traditions – may also have appealed to Rosa and Signoretti alike.

The *Self-Portrait as an Artist* [Fig. 16] that Baldinucci identified as a gift for the Maffei family is now considered a possible copy of a lost original, the description of which appears in the 1682 *Quaderno della Guardaroba* of the Medici collection: here, the artist is depicted with a "pen and paint-brush in his right hand", and "paintbrushes and a palette" in the other.[556] The proliferation of paintbrushes and the palette are missing in the Uffizi copy. Also different in the

[554] In the 1640's Rosa was entrusting to Signoretti the exchange of his letters and other items (including a horse and cheese) with Giulio Maffei during Rosa's time at the villas in Volterra. Borelli, letters 16, 17, 22. He did the same with letters and paintings intended for Ricciardi, sent from Rome during his later years. Borelli, letters 279, 316. In a letter to Giulio Maffei of 1646, Rosa expressed concern over some outstanding money owed to Signoretti. Borelli, letter 15. In 1652 Rosa told Ricciardi, with affection, he would "beat Signoretti in his bed" for apparently having tampered with the "avviso" from Rome, omitting the news of Rosa's triumphant success with his *Battle Scene* for the King of France. Borelli, letter 158. For Rosa's other declarations of affection for Signoretti, see letters 61, 70, 223, 227, 235, 238, 239, 245, 324, 325, 332, 335, 338, 360, 364 and 383. Signoretti was also among the party of friends who went to join Rosa at the Maffei villas in Volterra in the late 1640's. Festa, "Per una biografia di Salvatore Rosa. La Galleria di Palazzo Maffei," *Rassegna Volterrana* 61-2 (1987): 382.

[555] See Appendix VI.1. Fumagalli gives the poem to Cordini, but it has also been alternatively attributed to Antonio Malatesti, Lorenzo Lippi and Rosa. See Alterocca, *La Vita e l'Opera*, 221; BNCF MS Magl. VII 391, 216r-v and 458r-v; BNCF MS Magl. VII. 220, 223r-v and 236r-v. Each of the manuscript transcriptions gives the poem slight variations and assigns it to a different author. Fumagalli notes further that Signoretti was the subject of another long composition by Cordini, addressed to Averano Seminetti. See Appendix VI.2. It is also noteworthy that Averano Seminetti, a personage in Lorenzo Lippi's 'Malmantile', was cousin of the Cavaliere Matteo Zeffi who in 1684 left four paintings by Cecco Bravo to Cordini. See Matteoli, "Documenti su Cecco Bravo," *Rivista d'Arte* XLII (1990): 100; cited by Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 67.

[556] See chapter two, 111, note 186.

Uffizi copy is the presence of an arrow – a likely allusion to Rosa's satirical proclivities – not mentioned in the *Guardaroba* description of the original painting, but which may have been intended in connection with the "pen" held in the right hand. If we assume that the basic composition of the copy reproduces that of the original, then a few conclusions can be drawn. Rosa appears in a pose that was popular in both earlier and contemporary self-portraits, among them examples by colleagues like Lorenzo Lippi and Alessandro Rosi.[557] Caught in the moment of painting, the artist's brush poised at the canvas, he turns his head toward the viewer as if interrupted from his work (a similar sense of the "momentary" characterizes the Met portrait for Ricciardi). His brush seems to touch the edge of the canvas in the familiar conceit that expressed the painter's powers of verisimilitude, as if painting the "real world" beyond the frame itself.[558] Rosa's allusion to his poetic and, especially, artistic talents in the same image suggests a desire to present the Maffei with a comprehensive professional self-representation, one that advertises in particular the same ideal of naturalism touted by his academic friends in the poetic *encomia* they composed in his honour.[559] It is perhaps also meaningful that Baldinucci did not identify a specific recipient (Giulio or Ugo Maffei, for example) but rather the Maffei family as a collective, suggesting that Rosa intended the painting for display at the Maffei *palazzo* in Volterra or one of the family's villas in the countryside, and that he anticipated a relatively broad viewership beyond the circle of his intimate

[557] Daprà has noted the resonance of Rosa's pose with Lippi's *Self-Portrait* (Washington County Museum of Art, Hagerstown), Alessandro Rosi's *Self-Portrait* (Uffizi, Florence), Carlo Dolci's *Self-Portrait* (Uffizi, Florence) and Poussin's *Self-Portrait* (Louvre, Paris). Daprà, "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa," 65 note 10.
[558] Other examples that depict the artist as if "caught" in the midst of painting include Alessandro Allori's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1555, Uffizi, Florence), Palma Giovane's *Self-Portrait Painting the Resurrection of Christ* (1590's, Brera, Milan), Joachim Wtewael's *Self-Portrait* (1601, Central Museum, Utrecht), and Judith Leister's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1630, National Gallery, Washington). Images that also employ the conceit of the paintbrush touching the edge of the canvas include Katharina van Hemessen's *Self-portrait at the Easel* (1548, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Basle), Orazio Borgianni's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1615, Prado, Madrid), Niccolò Musso's *Self-Portrait* (c. 1618, Museo Civico, Casale Monferrato) and Artemisia Gentileschi's *Self-Portrait as the Allegory of Painting* (c 1635-7, Royal Collection).
[559] In this context it is interesting to compare the strategy of comprehensive self-portrayal employed in the *Self-portrait as an Artist* with that used in the *Portrait* for Ricciardi.

friends.[560] His decision to depict himself as both artist and poet, then, may have been informed not only by his friends' interest in and support of his professional diversity, but by his own faith in the self-portrait-as-gift as a powerful performative instrument that could serve his own ends. By positioning himself as the author and artist of the "real" world beyond the frame, Rosa makes the viewer (the recipient) into the subject of the image itself, a claim that is at once supplicating and self-righteous in nature.

Rosa seems to have given other self-portraits to friends as gifts. In the 1775 "Elogio di Salvator Rosa", a note records that Ricciardi owned a self-portrait by Rosa – perhaps the Met portrait, although it is not identified as such outright and could be a different image.[561] Another self-portrait is mentioned in the 1690 inventory of the Roman collector Antonio Amici Moretto, this time a framed pastel drawing of the artist.[562] Carlo de' Rossi also appears to have owned one or two portraits of Rosa.[563] An interest among Rosa's friends in possessing a portrait of the artist – self-portrait or otherwise – is also clear from Lodovico Serenai's purchase of Lorenzo Lippi's now-lost portrait of Rosa, described by Baldinucci in his biography as "a life-like half-length

---

[560] Ebert-Schifferer stresses Rosa's lack of engagement in the genre of portraiture, and notes that his self-portraits were probably all intended for private use. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 68. The opportunity for self-promotion, however – even in a relatively private context – would likely have appealed to Rosa in the devising of his self-images and in giving them as "selfless" gifts to close friends.
[561] Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 92. The reference is to a "Cav. Ricciardi" in Florence. "Elogio di Salvator Rosa", in *Serie degli uomini piu illustri in pittura, scultura, e architettura con i loro elogi e ritratti incise in rame*. (Florence: Stamperia di S.A.R. per Gaetano Cambiagi, 1769-76), vol. 11 (1775), 69, note 3.
[562] Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 99, doc. CLXXX, inventory ASR MS Notai del Tribunale dell'A.C. vol. 919 (a. 1690), 1003v.
[563] As I mention above on 374, De' Rossi also owned a drawn portrait of Ricciardi: "Un disegno di palmi uno, e un quarto con cornice di ebano dove vi è il ritratto di Salvatore Rosa con il Cristallo sopra". Inventory of Carlo de' Rossi, 1683, 170r; See Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de' Rossi," 369. He may also have owned a copy of the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10]: an inscription on the reverse of the London canvas identifies the painting as having been made "for the Casa Niccolini in Florence" ("Salvator Rosa. II suo primo ritratto fatto da lui per la Casa Niccolini a Firenze") but a painting matching its description also appears in De' Rossi's 1683 inventory: "Un ritratto di Salvatore Rosa in piedi con scrittione in mano, cornice dorata d'altezza meno che da Imperatore [that is, a canvas measuring approximately 98 x 130 cm] di mano di …". Inventory of Carlo de' Rossi, 165r; Volpi, *ibid*, 367. The listing ends here abruptly, but the similarity (including the measurement) to Rosa's London portrait is striking and it could be a copy. On the painting and its purported provenance, see Roworth, "Salvator Rosa's Self-Portraits," 138; and *idem*, "The Consolations of Friendship," 106-9. Fumagalli notes that numerous paintings by Rosa are recorded by the 1677 guide to Florence by Bocchi and Cinelli as being in the collection of the Niccolini family, among them two "Philosophers," four "Landscapes" and four "tondi di sortilege" (four witchcraft *tondi*). Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 69.

representation of the painter, dressed in a beautiful fabric with sliced sleeves, a small collar in the custom of those times, and looking out at he who admires him" – a copy of which was also bought by Baldinucci himself.[564] Lady Sydney Morgan suggested that Rosa offered his friend Don Mario Chigi (mistaking him for Agostino Chigi, the work's actual recipient) a self-portrait in the form of the poet Pindar in his large canvas of *Pan and Pindar* [Fig. 126] – a Romantic suggestion, but one that may have some truth to it, particularly in view of Rosa's own self-identification with the ancient poet.[565] In 1654, Rosa lamented to Ricciardi the death of a dear, unidentified friend – "the greatest advocate that I had in Rome, an old man of the greatest learning and in the laws of friendship on par with every other person" – who apparently kept a portrait of Rosa "at the head of his bed", perhaps another self-portrait the artist had given as a gift.[566]

---

[564] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 460.

[565] Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, I: 356-357. Morgan saw in Pindar's head a self-portrait of Rosa himself. On Rosa and Pindar, see Langdon, "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni," 55; Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 137. On the Chigi collection at Ariccia, see Almamaria Tantillo Mignosi, "I Chigi ad Ariccia nel '600," in *L'arte per i papi e per i principi nella campagna romana grande pittura del '600 e del '700.* Museo Nazionale del Palazzo di Venezia, Rome, 8 marzo-13 maggio 1990 (Rome: Casa Editrice Quasar, 1990), 2: 69-114.

[566] Borelli, letter 183 (August 2 1654): "Il Traglia m'have amazzato il maggior diffensore ch'io m'havessi a Roma, huomo vecchio, di grandissima letteratura, e di leggi d'amicitia, al pari d'ogn'altra persona, svisceratissimo. Bastami il dire che si teneva il mio ritratto a capo del letto, e che la sua virtù seppe rifiutare nel corso della sua vita quattro vescovati. Oh Dio, e quanto questa disgratia l'ho sentita nell'anima. Ma non si puol far altro." An enigmatic drawing [Fig. 124], dated to the second half of the 1660's on stylistic grounds (Mahoney, *Drawings*, no. 82.11) may also represent an idea for a planned portrait or self-portrait, similar in kind to the Sarasota *Portrait of a Poet* which is dated alternatively to the 1640's, 1650's or 1660's [Fig. 35]. The drawing may also reveal something of Rosa's conception of the function of portraiture (or self-portraiture) in general. In the sketch, a seated male figure turns toward the viewer with a book in hand; in front of him there is an easel with a portrait resting on it. In combination, the props may allude to Rosa's own dual profession as painter and poet. It shares a certain compositional affinity with the *Portrait of a Poet*, whose provenance is completely unknown. The painting could have been intended as a gift for a friend – Meroni even proposed it was a portrait of Ricciardi himself, an idea that Brigitte Daprà thinks is "not to be discarded" considering the likelihood that Rosa used his friends as much as himself as models for his allegorical portraits. Meroni, "Salvator Rosa: autoritratti e ritratti di amici," 66; Daprà, in *Salvator Rosa. Tra Mito e Magia*, 108. If the *Portrait of a Poet* was intended as a gift, and the drawing under discussion represents either a preparatory study for the painting or a variation on its theme, can we presume it, too, was conceived as a *Freundschaftsbild*? (Rosa's drawing seems reminiscent of a number of the self-images by other artists that include portraits of friends or companions, many of which I discuss in chapter four, which play on the inclusion of an illusory image of the friend (or the self) in the form of a mirror-reflection or painting within the image itself: for example, Sofonisba Anguissola's *Self-Portrait as a Portrait by Bernardino Campi* (Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale), Luca Cambiaso's *Self-Portrait Painting the Artist's Father* (whereabouts unknown), or Bernardino Licinio's *Self-portrait with an Architect Friend* (Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum, previously attributed to Giovanni Battista Paggi).) In this context, the portrait resting on the easel in the drawing becomes highly suggestive: representing himself in the "character" of the poet-philosopher, seated directly opposite the easel and portrait that signify his other profession as painter, the composition suggests a *paragone* between the two activities. The hatched lines that appear to "cross out" the easel and portrait suggest

Other Gifts for Friends

Rosa frequently sent drawings to friends, especially Ricciardi, as a gesture of friendship and gratitude for sharing in the invention (which Ricciardi often did) as well as to solicit his friend's opinion – one that Rosa seems to have derided almost as much as he welcomed, likely in order to reinforce an ideal of autonomous production.[567] Ricciardi appears to have intended to compile his large collection of Rosa's drawings into a "book".[568] The conception of the drawing as a gift is traceable to the *cinquecento* emergence of the "presentation drawing". As Alexander Nagel has argued in his study of Michelangelo's gifts of drawings to his friend and collector Vittoria Colonna, these drawings constituted a new and vital category of "free" art.[569] Intended to be "presented" to friends, they were fundamentally conceived as finished works of art. As drawings, however, they "retain[ed] an experimental quality, a freedom from the conventions that controlled finished panel painting in the period – a freedom that, in turn, reinforced the exemption from the conventional practice of making works of art on commission."[570] Drawings themselves were considered to lay bare the artist's mind – the closest tie to the originary idea or *invenzione* itself.[571] According to Pliny, unfinished paintings, which left "traces of the design and the original conception of the

---

that Rosa opted to remove this feature of the image, concentrating on the seated poet who appears in the finished Sarasota painting. Rosa's initial decision to include a *portrait* as a symbol of his identity as painter, however, deserves further consideration, particularly if the finished work was intended as a gift. Like the Met portrait for Ricciardi, the (presumed) portrait in the drawing is existentially "relational" – a process that occurs in two stages: in the first, the portrait of the "friend" on the easel is offered as Rosa's product; and in the second, the final painted image (which consists of Rosa himself as the poet in the chair and his "friend" in the portrait) makes his own identity contingent upon its reception – and ratification – in the experience of the viewer, the friend. The significance of the exchange of gazes is suggested by Rosa's apparent experimentation with the direction of the head in the portrait on the easel.

[567] In 1652 Ricciardi asked Rosa for the preparatory studies for his Louvre *Battle Scene* of 1652, which Rosa refused on account of the possibility that he might need the sketches at a later date. In 1661 Rosa asked Ricciardi to return some of the drawings he owned so that the artist could consult them in devising ideas for etchings. For references to Rosa sending Ricciardi drawings, also see Borelli, letters 182, 252, 261, 293 and 296. In 1654 Rosa also supplied Ricciardi with drawings for a stage set, with the assistance of Giovanni Ghisolfi. Borelli, letter 178; also see letters 179, 180, 181, and 182.

[568] See Borelli, letter 151 (October 26 1652), where Rosa refers to a "Libro de' disegni".

[569] Nagel, "Gifts for Michelangelo and Vittoria Colonna," *Art Bulletin* LXXIX: 4 (1997): 647-668

[570] Nagel, "Art as Gift," 354.

[571] On the drawing as the site of the artist's invention, see Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 50-54.

artists," were "more valuable than any of their finished paintings" for that very reason.[572] For Michelangelo, the presentation drawings he gave to friends were "a means of personal expression, an extension of himself toward an other."[573] The performative, kinesthetic and self-reflexive nature of drawings is implicit in the comments of early-modern commentators and practitioners, from Leonardo, Alberti and Cennino Cennini to Vasari and Roger de Piles.[574] Since the artist's hand was perceived as the instrument of the mind, the drawing naturally and consequently presented the closest approximation of the originary "idea" itself.[575] Increasingly conceived as autonomous "works of art", and repositories of both *invenzione* and *fantasia*, drawings made a significant contribution to the growing detachment of art from its status as a commodity.[576] Rosa's friends clearly valued drawings in this manner: in addition to Ricciardi's extensive collection, both Girolamo Mercuri and Carlo de' Rossi's inventories record numerous drawings displayed in frames and under glass,[577] and Baldinucci's declaration of pride in owning drawings and a notebook by Rosa is representative of a much more pervasive contemporary interest.[578]

As I noted in chapter four, Rosa also made a number of caricature drawings for friends, including the drawing of Reginaldo Sgambati [Fig. 42] and a "Young Boy Defecating" for Niccolò

---

[572] Linda Freeman Bauer, "Oil Sketches, Unfinished Paintings and the Inventories of Artists' Estates," in Hellmut Hager and Susan Scott Munshower eds., *Light on the Eternal City. Observations and Discoveries in the Art and Architecture of Rome* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987), 93; see *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, trans. K. Jex-Blake (Chicago: Argonaut, 1968), ch. 35, 145.
[573] Rosand, *Drawing Acts*, 207.
[574] See Rosand, *ibid*, esp. xxiii, 13, 289, for an outline of this complex and varied discourse.
[575] Anticipating Alberti, Cennini observed that the art of painting "calls for imagination and skill of hand, in order to discover things not seen (hiding themselves under the shadow of natural objects), and to fix them with the hand". His comments are the basis of Alberti's and subsequent critics' theory of "invenzione", and the origins of the notion of drawing as the realization of a painter's "fantasia". Rosand, *ibid*, 32-33.
[576] Raphael's gift of a drawing of nude studies to his friend Albrecht Dürer in 1515 is considered to be among the earliest instances of a valuation of the drawing as an autonomous work of art; Dürer reciprocated with a painted self-portrait. Nesselrath, "Raphael's Gift to Dürer," *Master Drawings* 31:4 (1993): 384. Dürer's own *Badefrau*, which he "announced as a self-contained work of art by inscribing it with the date of 1493" is another example. Nesselrath, *ibid*, 386.
[577] For De' Rossi's inventory of 1683, see Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 77-82, doc. CLXXII; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi," 364-373. For Mercuri's inventory, see the Getty Provenance Index. ASC MS not. Cap. M. Vitellius, sez. XI, t. 53 e t. 64 cc.n.n.; see 386, note 160 above.
[578] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 463; cited in Sohm, *Pittoresco*, 181. Baldinucci also owned numerous paintings by Rosa. For Baldinucci's collection, see Goldberg, *After Vasari*, 54.

Simonelli (c. 1635-1640, private collection) [Fig. 3a-b], the latter of which seems to have been made in reference to some joke shared between the two friends.[579] Rosa's interest in caricature, and in the sharing of jocular images with friends, is signaled at an early stage in his career in two drawings attributed to Rosa's brother-in-law Francesco Fracanzano which include Rosa among a group of friends: the first shows them running along the seashore [Fig. 133], and the second depicts the group lying about on cots as if taking a nap after a heavy drinking session, with a padlock on the wine cellar door [Fig. 132].[580] This interest also seems to be signaled by Baldinucci's account of Rosa's precocious habit in his youth of drawing on the walls of a cloister – a practice echoed in his much later production of drawings on the walls of the Maffei villa at Barbaiano as a token of friendship.[581] Sybille Ebert-Schifferer has suggested that Rosa intended one of his *Vanitas* drawings [Fig. 46] as a gift for a friend, situating it in connection with the artist's broader interest in this theme as part of a dialogue on the subject with his Florentine friends.[582]

---

[579] Rosa's drawing, attributed to Rosa by Luigi Grassi, is best understood in relation to the variety of caricature drawings made for Simonelli by other artists, particularly Pierfrancesco Mola's humorous drawing of himself and Simonelli relieving themselves in the ground of the Villa Pamphilj in Rome, in which an inscription declares that each friend drew the other's portrait (1649, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) [Fig. 154]. See Grassi, "Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Fréart de Chantelou, Salvator Rosa e Nicolò Simonelli: Due Accademie e una Caricatura," *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Federico Zeri*. vol. 2. (Milan: Electa, 1986), 634; for Mola's caricature, see *Pier Francesco Mola*, *1612-1666*, 127 and cat. III. 92. Grassi suggested the caricature might be seen as partly "ideal" and partly "allegorical," or that the figure could represent another person among Simonelli's and Rosa's circle of friends – perhaps Girolamo Mercuri. Grassi, *ibid*, 637. For the other drawings that Simonelli received from his artist friends, including Mola, Pietro Testa, Ribera, Giovan Battista Castiglione, and Luigi Scaramuccia, see Grassi, *ibid*; *Pier Francesco Mola*, *1612-1666*; Capitelli, "'Connoisseurship' al Lavoro: la carriera di Nicolò Simonelli (1611-1671),"*Quaderni storici* 116 XXXIX: 2 (2004): 384-5, 391; Bayer, "A Note on Ribera's Drawing of Niccolò Simonelli," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Journal* 30 (1995): 73-80; Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 124; and Blunt and Cooke, *The Roman drawings of the XVII & XVIII centuries in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle* (London: Phaidon Press, 1960), 115.

[580] The drawings are also valuable as an indication of Rosa's early friendships in Naples. The characters in both drawings are identified with names: Tomasso Musso "antiquary", Francesco Francanzano, Francesco Oglielmo, and Andrea Coppola "artists" and Rosa himself. Mahoney rejects both drawings as by Rosa on the grounds of their uncharacteristic technique. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 21. Scott also notes that the handwriting is "not wholly reconcilable with Rosa's." Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 7 and note 16. Stolzenburg has also doubted Rosa's authorship of the second of the two drawings. Stolzenburg, "Anmerkungen zu einem neuen Oeuvre-Katalog der Zeichnungen Salvator Rosas" (lecture, *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*, international conference, 2009).

[581] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 438, 462.

[582] Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 74; see chapter four, 289, note 188 above. If the drawing can be associated with Rosa's *Umana Fragilitas* (c.1657-8), then, she argues, it may even point to a less autobiographical reading of the painting itself. It is possible, I would add, that - as a gift for a friend – it might be connected with a friend's loss, rather than Rosa's own: in 1662, for example, Rosa's friend Cosimo Fabretti and

Rosa also gave other works of art to friends as a sign of amity. These exchanges should be seen as part of a broader trade in goods, from paintings, drawings and books, to food and wine, and even advice, favours and assistance.[583] His awareness of this procedure as a ritual of one-upmanship, infused with both altruistic and self-serving intent, is suggested by his comments to Ricciardi regarding his dispatch of a "very beautiful small painting" by his friend Giovanni Ghisolfi to a certain Signor "Fantacci," in thanks for sending him white wine and Lombard salami: here, Rosa alludes specifically to his desire to "outdo" his friend's initial gesture.[584] The concept of "debt" and "obligation" – and the necessity for reciprocation in the practice and sustenance of friendship – pervades Rosa's epistolary writing. His letters to Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei – both of whom were among his "truest" and most sincere friends – are filled with expressions (and expectations of their return) of affection, obligation and servitude that indicate Rosa's simultaneous desire to convey a sincerity of emotion and his acute awareness of the benefits of utility.[585] The analogy that Rosa frequently draws between affection and indebtedness is encapsulated in his use of the metaphor of the "book of the heart", which he insinuates as a kind of "account book" of debts to friends.[586] In a letter to Ricciardi of 1666, Rosa played on the notion of friendship as a business contract: striving once again to find a new way to reassure his jealous friend of his affections, Rosa

---

his wife (who was Ricciardi's sister) lost his son Salvatore, presumably named in honour of Rosa himself. See Borelli, letters 270, 272, 273, 277, where Rosa refers to the baby as "Salvatorino" and notes that he has given him the good fortune of "perpetuating my name in your House".) The notion of this drawing as a gift is also supported by Mahon's proposal that one of Rosa's preparatory drawings for the *Umana Fragilitas* was made as a gift for Ricciardi, in response to the *canzone* he had written for the artist. Mahon, in *Italian Art and Britain*, 165, cat. 404; for the drawing see Mahoney, *Drawings*, no. 48.2. Mahoney has also suggested that Rosa's drawing of an *Allegory of Fate* [Fig. 49] might treat the death of his friend Pietro Testa. Mahoney, *Drawings*, 305-6.

[583] See Borelli, letters 1, 7, 13, 24, 27, for example. In 1646, Rosa sent a picture to Giulio Maffei in exchange for a horse. Borelli, letter 17. See my bibliography for sources on the standards of gift-exchange in patronage.

[584] Borelli, letter 252: "Vi dico bene ch'el Fantacci cortesissimo con l'occasione d'una lettigha vota ch'è venuta di Fiorenza m'ha mandato a regalare di nuovo d'una cassetta di verdea et un'altra di salami di Lombardia. Ma io che non sono avvezzo ad essere soprafatto se non da voi, l'ho mandato un quadretto del Signor Ghisolfi assai bello, e ringratiatolo al maggior segno."

[585] Examples are too numerous to cite here in full. See Borelli, letters 8, 11, 22, 88, 206, 241 and 341, for example.

[586] Borelli, letter 102, to Giulio Maffei. Regarding the favours Giulio has done for Lucrezia's sister; Rosa refers to his debt-book as a "book of the heart": "Di quanto poi adoperarete per beneficio della sorella della Signora Lucretia, tutto sarà scritto da me nel libro dell'anima per conservarvene l'oblighationi in perpetuo."

implored "do not believe that I have contracted with others the obligations that I owe you."[587] His awareness of the potential artificiality of gift-giving – almost game-like in nature – is suggested by his rude comment to Ricciardi in 1650 that, although he was an "idiot" for sending him sausages unsuited to his "refined palate," the "boundary of decency and of gratitude requires that I give you thanks, and not insults".[588] With close friends like Ricciardi, Rosa felt free to make light of the etiquette of gratitude that governed the practice of gift-giving, although his words reveal that he is still very much aware of the importance and necessity of that protocol. Reprimanding Ricciardi once again for his possessiveness, Rosa reminded his friend that he was happy, in spite of his "poverty," to freely give drawings and paintings to friends, but that the gesture should merit some loyalty in exchange. In this, and in a subsequent letter, Rosa composed a rambling apology that offers valuable insights into his conception of art as a gift for friends, and its complex function as symbolic of the fine balance in which friendship consists:

> "… You say in one of your letters the following words: 'For the Love of God, dear friend, we should strive to find all those means that can immortalize love between us, and sever all the roads to suspicions and to the shadows that can be generated in our minds.' I tell you that such pretexts are totally useless to me, and that you would do well not to point them out to me. But because you do not know my nature well, and with reason, since if you had a little more knowledge you would have given up such a solemn heresy to think that the ties of our affection are those of a picture, of a drawing, the suspicion is truly that of a Florentine who does not know to love with respect and diplomacy. … You have little consistency in loving the friends who truly deserve this name, and you go on clinging to misunderstandings, haggling over the purity of other people's words in a mean, indeed shameful manner. … I have many times confessed to you my small ability, and again I remind you that I am a poor man. But not such a mendicant that I cannot give to a friend a drawing, a painting; things which, being able to give them, and wanting to give them, I do not mean to suggest that I could be prohibited by anyone, and in particular by you, who should out of greater respect adapt yourself to my will, mainly in the things that are not immoral, but praiseworthy. … you are worthy of reprehension, indeed of being severely beaten, every time that you, for having spoken only twice to someone, expect them to immediately dedicate the compositions that do not have to be consecrated to anyone to a more famous person … you are such a prick! … My Ricciardi, you must get the idea into your head that, except for our friendship, all others will come to an end, and that if one

[587] Borelli, letter 330: "non credete ch'io habbia con altri contratte l'obblighazioni che devo a voi …"

[588] Borelli, letter 46: "già che siamo a discorso di cotali vi do nuova come la vostra salciccia non è ancora comparsa. Quando comparirà vi scriverò per rendimento di gratie che voi sete un solendissimo coglionone a mandarmi sì fatti regali come voi non fossivo informato ch'io non ho finezza di palato, e che mancio e bevo con l'orecchio. …Ma scusatemi …il termine della creanza e della gratitudine vuol che vi renda gratie, e non ingiurie."

> gives a lemon [*cedrato*], a sausage, he wants in exchange something that weighs twice as much. … But because you want with these means, perhaps, to make light of the love that you owe me … I will call upon Heaven as the judge [to defend me against your accusation] … that has turned me into the greatest heretic of friendship in the world today. … you suspect me of regretting my gift [to you], … Remember Ricciardi, how many times you yourself accused me of being an excessive spendthrift in giving [my work] to people who didn't deserve it. On how many occasions you praised me for generosity! So, if these things are true, how can you think now that it would be displeasing for me to give you a big old canvas [*telaccia*], a sheet of worthless paper, having already dedicated to you the will that is by far superior to these things? You have greatly offended me, you have insulted me enough. … you tell me that, since you don't want me to avail myself of your courtesy in matters of Poetry, you protest to no longer want any paintings or drawings from me. You are the master, to this I do not know what to say to you; do what God inspires you to do, since in my opinion the mind is incapable of working any other way.[589]

In his next letter, he writes:

> "... Oh God, and what differences [of mind we have]! I study and speculate all day and all night, on what I can do in order to meet the taste of Ricciardi, what thing I can paint, what thing I can draw in order to please, to blame the fortune that has made me so poor as to not be able to give the greater part of what I paint to those who are truly my friends, amongst whom you were the only one, the Beloved [*Beneamino*]. And you, with a correspondence more barbarous, mean to say that I do not speak from truth, and that the business of a small painting or drawing can poison and sever the holy bonds of friendship!"[590]

---

[589] Borelli, letter 49: "Voi dite in una vostra le seguenti parole: Per Amor di Dio, amico caro, cerchiamo tutti quei mezzi che possano fra di noi eternar l'amore, e recidiamo tutte le strade ai sospetti et all'ombre che possano generarsi nelle nostre menti.Vi dico che sì fatti pretesti eon me sono affatto inutili, e che potessivo assolutamente far di meno d'accennarmeli. Ma perché non conoscete belie la mia natura, e con raggione, poiché se vi havessivo un poco più di notitia non haverestivo dato in un'eresia cosi solenne, di pensare che i legami della nostra affetione siano quelli d'un quadro, d'un disegno il sospetto è veramente da fiorentino che non sa amare che con riguardi e politiche…Voi havete pocha sodezza nell'amare gli amici che veramente meritano questo nome, già che v'andate attacando agli equivoci, a stirachiare la purità dell'altrui parole a sensi così cattivi, anzi vituperosi.…Io v'ho più volte confessato il mio poco potere, e di nuovo vi dico che sono un pover'huomo. Ma non così mendicho che non possi donare ad un amico un disegno, una pittura; le quali cose, potendole dare, e volendole dare, non intendo che mi possa esser proibito da nessuno et in particolare da voi, che dovete per più rispetti adeguarvi alla mia volontà, massime nelle cose che non hanno del vitioso, anzi del lodevole.…sete degno di riprensione, anzi d'esser bastonato atrocemente ogni volta che, per haver parlato due volte ad un huomo, volerli subito dedichare i componimenti che non si devono consacrare a nessuno, o veto a persone più che notissime.…Oh quanto dai in coglionarie!…Ricciardi mio, bisogna che voi vi mettiate in testa che fuor che le nostre amicitie, tutte l'altre sono con qualche fine, e che se uno dà un cedrato, un salciciotto, vuole in contracambio, cosa ehe vagli it doppio.…Ma perché voi volete forse con questi mezzi indebolirmi l'amore che mi dovete…Chiamerò it Cielo giudice di questa causa…fattomi mutare nel magior eretico dell'amicitia, che oggi viva nel mondo.…sospettate di me che mi rincresca il donare…Ricordati, Ricciardi, quante volte tu medesimo m'hai ripreso per soverchio prodigho nel donare a persone che non meritavano. In quante occasioni m'hai celebrate, per generoso! Dunque, se queste cose son vere, come volete che hora a me dispiaccia di donare a voi un pezzo di telaccia, un foglio di cartaccia, havendovi dedicato l'arbitrio, ch'e di gran lunga superiore a queste cose? M'havete troppo offeso, m'havete ingiuria[to], e tanto basti…perché non volete ch'io più mi pervaglia delta vostra cortesia intorno alle materie delta Poesia, vi pro testate di non voler più da me né pitture né disegni. Sete il padrone, a questo non so che dirvi; fate quello che Dio v'ispira, a me non basta l'animo d'operare diversamente."

[590] Borelli, letter 50: "Oh Dio, e che diversita! Io studiare e speculare tutto il giorno e la notte, come potria fare per incontrare il gusto del Ricciardi, che cosa potria dipingere, che cosa potria designate per darli nel humore, biastemare la fortuna che m'habbia fatto così povero da non poter donare la maggior parte di quello che dipingo a

The potential of the gift to encapsulate a relationship – and the threat that the practice of gift-giving posed to the stability of that bond – was also a concern of Rosa's precursors and contemporaries: Erasmus, for example, wrote in a dedicatory letter to his friend and pupil Pieter Gilles that only "friends of the commonplace and homespun sort" based their idea of friendship on the exchange in "material things", emphasizing the importance of modest, but intelligent gifts – books foremost among them, as signs of the mind – as the most salient and appropriate representatives of selves among virtuous and learned men.[591]

Many of the paintings by Rosa that Ricciardi collected, such as the Met portrait, were likely presented to him as gifts for which no financial recompense was required.[592] Ricciardi's friend and biographer Giovanni Cinelli Calvoli records that the Pisan received from Rosa "many valuable paintings as gifts [*in dono*]".[593] Ricciardi's inventory also lists, along with various "*teste*" of philosophers and unidentified figures by unnamed artists, a "*consiglio de filosophi*" (or "meeting of philosophers"[594]), perhaps a composition by Rosa along the lines of the *Philosophers' Grove* that he painted for Carlo Gerini. In addition to the Met portrait [Fig. 64] Ricciardi likely owned the *Ponte Rotto* [Fig. 33] and *Marina delle Torri* [Fig. 36].[595] For Giulio and Ugo Maffei, Rosa

---

quelli che veramente mi son amici, fra quali voi eravate l'unico, il Beneamino. E voi, con una corrispondenza più che barbara, vi date ad intendere ch'io non dichi da davero, e che l'interesse d'un quadretto e d'un disegno ci possi avelenare e rompere le santissime leggi dell'amicitia!"

[591] Jardine, "Towards Reading Albion's Classicism," 21; *The Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 3: 43-44.

[592] On other possible works by Rosa intended as gifts for Ricciardi, also see letters 46, 50 and 51 (regarding a "S. Giacinto"). Rosa also helped Ricciardi (and his friends) to find paintings by other artists for their collections. Borelli, letters 176, 189, 225, 234, 252, 254, 261, 278, and 279. Ricciardi also sent Rosa paintings by other artists in order to make alterations to them, including a painting by a "Filippo", which De Rinaldis suggested referred to the Dutch painter Philips Wounwerman (? 1619-Haarlem 1668), and probably the same picture to which Rosa refers in letter 302, when he says "it seems Flemish to me". De Rinaldis, *Lettere*, 100 n. 1; Borelli, letters 224, 258, 281, 302 and 317.

[593] BNCF MS Magl. IX. 67, 832; G. C. Calvoli, "La Toscana letterata ovvero Storia degli scrittori fiorentini."

[594] Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 94; inventory of Ricciardi, 179v.

[595] Fumagalli notes that these two paintings were acquired in 1820 by Ferdinand III di Lorena from the painter Fedele Acciai, after the extinction of the Ricciardi family. AGF MS filza XLIV, ins. 6, lettera di Antonio Ramirez Montalvo, February 1 1820; also see M. Chiarini, in *La Galleria Palatina*, II: 342, cat. 551a-b; cited by Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza,* 69. The two paintings appear to have been pendants.

painted in addition to the *Self-Portrait as an Artist* a series of small "*mascherate*", a *Sacrifice of Abel*, a *Queen Esther*,[596] and decorated a broken clavichord case with a "singing skull" [Fig. 48].[597] Rosa's letters to Giulio indicate that he was making a number of paintings for him: In 1652, he was painting him "two large pictures", perhaps as gifts on the occasion of the marriage of Ludovico Maffei and Giovanna, the daughter of Raffaello Maffei, or possibly given in thanks for the family's generosity.[598] Other possible gifts include the "*teste*" that Rosa sent from Rome in 1650 to his friends Luigi Lanfreducci and Pietro Pandolfini; the monochrome *bozzetto* on wood for the late *Death of Empedocles* [Fig. 127], which bears a dedication to Cosimo Fabretti; a *Landscape with a Philosopher* for Simonelli;[599] an unidentified painting for Volunnio Bandinelli; and a painting (perhaps never executed) of "Divine Wisdom" solicited by Carlo Dati in 1663, for which the writer boldly offered the artist an extensive list of his own learned musings on the subject.

The *Marina delle torri* was bought by Ferdinand III di Lorena for the Palazzo Pitti in 1820. Di Montauto, *ibid*, 166.

[596] Neither painting has been identified. Festa doubts Rosa's authorship of a painting of the *Sacrifice of Abel* in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj in Rome. Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei," 3.

[597] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 462-3. Ebert-Schifferer notes Alberto Veca's discussion of the painting: the "violent frontality" of the skull, different to the skull in the Munich *Vanitas* [Fig. 63], suggests a kind of 'burlesque' conception that would have shocked and surprised the sitter preparing to sing and play on the instrument. Ebert-Schifferer, "Il teatro filosofico della vanità," 78; see Veca, "Una vanitas per Napoli," in *Forma vera: contribute a una storia della natura morta italiana*, ed. Pietro Lorenzelli and Alberto Veca. Exhibition catalogue (Bergamo: Galleria Lorenzelli, 1985), 163-181, esp. 165, 171. On the Maffei collection, see Festa, "Per una biografia di Salvatore Rosa. La Galleria di Palazzo Maffei," *Rassegna Volterrana* 61-2 (1987): 373-89.

[598] Borelli, letter 143. See Festa, "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei," 3-4. There seems to have been some disagreement among the Maffei over who was the rightful recipient of Rosa's paintings. On September 22 1651, Rosa wrote to Giulio: "Tutti i quadri e disegni ch'io ho messo in casa vostra Signor Giulio carissimo non ho hauto mai intentione di donarli al comune ma solamente a voi al quale io professo somma amicitia et oblighatione. Toltone però quelle due teste che donai al Sig. Marc'Antonio e quel rame alla Sig.ra Caterina. Il resto è tutto vostro, confessandomi del resto oltre modo obligato a tutti i Sig.ri Vostri fratelli." Borelli, letter 110. For other paintings by (or acquired by) Rosa for Giulio, see Borelli, letters 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, 143, 148.

[599] For the "teste" see note 197 above. Also see Borelli, letters 84 and 85. For the wood *bozzetto*, see Salerno, *L'opera completa*, no. 232; the inscription on the back reads: "Al Sv Salvatore Rosa. Al Sig. Cosimo Fabretti fiorentino. Pisa / franca". For the painting for Simonelli, see Salerno, *L'opera completa*, cat. 217; he located the panting in the collection of the Marchesi Incisa della Rocchetta-Chigi, in Rome. There is also a painting by Rosa listed among the works lent to one of the late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century exhibitions at S. Salvatore in Lauro that bears a connection to Simonelli: "testa di donna in profilo mano del Rosa, misura di due palmi con cornice dorata, cambiata in una Madonna in rame al Sig. Simonelli". Meroni, *Lettere e altri documenti*, 89; document, 288-291. For Bandinelli's request for a painting from Rosa in 1651, see letter 85. For Dati's letter, see Gamba ed., *Scelta di Prose di Carlo Ruberto Dati*, 172-6; and Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 90-1, 95-6. Dati mentioned with admiration the *Moral Philosophy* [Fig. 31] Rosa had painted many years earlier for Cordini.

Prints as Gifts: Affection and Self-Interest in the Practice of Dedication

In addition to circulating his etchings and the *concetti* for them among his closest friends, soliciting their opinions on their merits, Rosa also occasionally dedicated them to friends as tokens of amity. The practice of dedicating prints is a particularly conspicuous instance of collusion between the affective and self-interested dimension of the gift. By dedicating his prints of novel, obscure subjects to close friends, Rosa not only paid an affectionate tribute to colleagues who supported and encouraged his professional ambitions but located his inventive novelty directly in relation to the "liberating" condition of friendship itself (and printmaking, for that matter) as a category of commerce.

In his angry letter to Ricciardi of 1650, which I cited at length above, Rosa alluded to his friend's rather impertinent solicitation of a dedication. In addition to the Met portrait, which Rosa may well have dedicated and given to Ricciardi partly in an attempt to appease his friend's persistent impatience and mistrust, Rosa also dedicated to him an etching of *The Martyrdom of Atilius Regulus* (1662) [Fig. 113]. Various other prints were offered to other friends: the *Figurine* of c. 1656-7 received a dedication to Carlo de' Rossi – a text devised by Ricciardi himself (whose jealousy seems only to have been further exacerbated by his participation[600]); a print of the *Rescue of the Infant Oedipus* (1662-3) [Fig. 114] was given to Giulio Martinelli; and a *Fall of the Giants* (c. 1663) [Fig. 116] to Orazio Quaranta.

By dedicating his etchings – works of art intended for broad circulation – to dedicatees he identified as "friends" (irrespective of the true nature of their relationship), Rosa sought to proliferate not only his own virtuosity and fame, but to situate that ritual in the discourse of friendship. These declarations of "friendship" were not merely a ploy directed at securing favour or soliciting patronage, but a strategy aimed at *overturning* this more traditional motive: dedicating

[600] See Borelli, letters 203, 344 and 345.

prints to persons who were *already* good friends permitted an assertion of the artist's (albeit ideal) position of freedom and lack of dependency on patrons. In this sense, the dedication of prints to friends offered a form of copyright or branding in itself: the democratic ideal of friendship automatically freed the artist from the parameters of the traditional economy that obligated him to his patron, and the *invenzione* and its iteration in prints was safeguarded by the impenetrably intimate and democratic ideal of friendship.

The humanist practice of dedication was inherently self-serving, conducted in expectation of a return, but governed by an ideal of altruistic reciprocity.[601] Books, poems and any variety of texts were historically dedicated to courtly patrons in expectation of reward, financial or otherwise. The practice was also taken up by court artists of the fifteenth century onward, who applied the same principles as their humanist forebears.[602] The dedication of a text or work of art to a friend, rather than a courtly patron, was infused with the same kind of expectation. The process followed a series of steps: "The artist chose an image to etch a copperplate, found a benefactor, wrote a complimentary phrase about that person, incised the approved phrase on the copperplate, and presented the patron with many copies of the print for a fee."[603] As Francesca Consagra notes, even though prints frequently bore affective dedications as "gifts", in the *seicento* "the process was often more a business transaction than an expression of friendship. The owner of the copperplate did not have to know the prospective benefactor personally and could offer to dedicate a print in a letter or through a mediator. If the proposed benefactor approved the project, he would pay a fee for the

---

[601] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 150. The practice of dedication can be traced to the dedicatory letters of the third and fourth centuries ACE, which were "as a rule…written in the hope of financial reward and future support." Ulrich Maché, "Author and Patron: On the Function of Dedications in Seventeenth-century German Literature," in *Literary Culture in the Holy Roman Empire, 1555-1720*, ed. James A. Parente Jr. et al. (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 195-6. In the *Praise of Folly* (1511), Erasmus famously critiqued the opportunism and insincerity of the practice of dedication in his own day.
[602] Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 95-97.
[603] Consagra, "The Marketing of Pietro Testa's 'Poetic Inventions'," in *Pietro Testa*, ed. Cropper, lxxxix.

honor, which varied in amount."[604] The significant recompense involved in accepting a dedication might motivate a prospective patron to turn down the offer.[605]

As Evelyn Lincoln is quick to point out, early-modern viewers paid significantly more heed to dedications than their modern counterparts. The print's primary "selling point" was often its dedicatee, especially if he or she was more famous than the artist.[606] This is a significant consideration in attempting to understand Rosa's decision to direct his dedications to friends: by identifying his dedicatees as "friends", Rosa not only participated in the affective dimension of favour-seeking but signalled his own position of pre-eminence via parity with, and proximity to, his dedicatee. Even more significantly, in dedicating a print of his own devising (rather than producing one on commission) Rosa was entitled to ownership of the plate and did not have to relinquish it to a patron.[607] While it was usually to the artist's benefit to choose a subject that "reflected the interests" of the dedicatee, in Rosa's case the iconography was more often than not highly personal. In this regard, Rosa's dedications to friends reflect the role of these colleagues in supporting (and frequently sharing an interest in) his novel and self-referential iconography and its dispersal on the art market. In his endeavour to turn the practice of dedication into a method for attaining professional autonomy, Rosa's dedications to friends removed his prints from their monetary and commercial bounds, prefiguring the confident "authorial self-esteem" of his Enlightenment successors who generally moved away from the practice of dedicating to patrons altogether.[608]

---

[604] *Ibid*, xc.
[605] *Ibid*, xc
[606] Lincoln, *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker*, 135, 138. The viewer would take note of "the name and position of the dedicatee, the elegant wording of the dedication, the degree of familiarity in the address, and the specificity of favors already received."
[607] In this Rosa may well have shared with Pietro Testa an approach to dedicatory printmaking as a "free" venture, seeing in its practice the opportunity to "choose and interpret his own subjects, keep the copperplates, receive money for the dedications, and rededicate the plates, obtaining yet more income while avoiding official registration." Consagra, "The Marketing of Pietro Testa's 'Poetic Inventions', xc. Consagra notes that "[s]everal of Testa's prints have empty wide lower margins, which suggests that they were conceived with a dedication in mind."
[608] Maché, "Author and Patron: On the Function of Dedications in Seventeenth-century German Literature," 201-2; also see Wheatley, *The Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend* (London: Elliot Stock, 1887), 26.

Rosa's decision to dedicate the *Atilius Regulus* to Ricciardi may be connected to his friend's later, failed petition for a copy of the original painting owned by De' Rossi, painted in about 1657.[609] The print also resonates, however, on a much more personal level. The Latin inscription in the etching reads: "To Giovan Battista Ricciardi, special friend/ Atilius Regulus in the change of headlong Fortune remains a firm centre in the midst of so many nails."[610] Rosa's effort to distinguish Ricciardi as "special friend" ("*amico unico*") points to the artist's more general and frequent preoccupation with reassuring his Pisan friend of the sincerity of his devotion. The subject of the etching, too, the Stoic death of an idol of masculine fidelity, lends itself rather well to this purpose. The theme of the etching, and the painting from which it is derived, seems to have been created in response (like the Met portrait) to Ricciardi's *canzone* for Rosa, the "*Sotto rigida stella*", roughly contemporaneous with the painting. The subtitle of the *canzone* urges its addressee to adopt "*costanza*" in the face of cruel fortune, a theme that resonates particularly well with the etching's subject.[611] In his *canzone*, Ricciardi refers specifically to Marcus Atilius Regulus who "in order to raise himself as a statue in the midst of the hatred [of his enemies], turned the spikes into many little drills."[612] The story of the martyrdom of Regulus, who was Roman consul from 267 to 256 BC and who died at the hands of his Carthaginian enemies, was popular in the early-modern period as a tale of great strength and supreme masculine virtue: upon betraying an oath he had made to his enemies, rather than seeking asylum he returned to them as prisoner and submitted

[609] In 1662, Rosa told Ricciardi the "Atilio è uscito fuori col vostro nome". Borelli, letter 271. In another letter he told him he could not send him a print of "Attilius" since he was in short supply ("per haverle scarse"). Borelli, letter 279.

[610] English translation by Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's 'Death of Atilius Regulus'," 395. The second state of the engraving contains the inscription: "Io. Bapte. Ricciardi Amico Unico/ Atilium Regulum in praecipitis Fortunae vertigine tot inter clavos firmioris constantinae centrum. Salvator Rosa Inv. pinx. Scul". The first state of the print is inscribed "singolarissimo" rather than "unico".

[611] "*Che non hanno intervallo o termine le avversità, e che l'essere scopo delle disgrazie è proprio della Virtù; quindi si deve compor l'animo a prepararlo con costanza.*" See Appendix II. 1. In one manuscript transcription of Ricciardi's poem the work is itself entitled "La Costanza", although this might be a result of confusion with Salviati's poem of a similar name. See Appendix VII. 4.

[612] Appendix II. 1. "E per ergersi statue in mezzo a gl'odi/ Cangia in tanti scarpelli Attilio i chiodi." (vv. 119-120)

himself to their tortures.[613] The story emphasizes the masculine virtues of fearlessness, tranquility, dignity, bravery and honor, as well as those of fidelity and friendship.[614] It is also a tale of the cruel twist of fortune, a favorite subject of both Rosa and Ricciardi and the dominant theme of Ricciardi's *canzone*. By invoking Regulus as the paragon of the triumph of fidelity over the trials of fortune, both Rosa and Ricciardi (whose poem likely suggested the subject to the artist[615]) constructed a complex and erudite homage, based in a novel *istoria*, to the virtue and value of friendship itself.[616]

In addition to the *Figurine* dedication, Ricciardi may well have supplied Rosa with the inscriptions for his other prints, all of which Rosa wanted to be as morally didactic as possible. In 1663 he told Ricciardi about his etchings of *Atilius Regulus*, *Democritus in Meditation*, *Diogenes Casting Away the Bowl* and the *Fall of the Giants*, and asked that "The dedicatory epistles, either Latin or vulgate, must teach us a little; with all this I will try to satisfy you."[617] Rosa's stipulation

---

[613] Rosa was inspired in his composition by Giulio Romano's fresco in the Palazzo del Te and Diana Scultori's engraved version of the same work, which shows Regulus lying down in the barrel. This was contrary to most of the accounts (including Ricciardi's description in his *canzone*) which describe or imply that he was standing. In the *Punica*, possibly the longest of the ancient accounts of Regulus, Silius Italicus notes that eventually Regulus was forced by tiredness to lean against the spikes and so they pierced his flesh. Silius Italicus, *Punica*, trans. J. D. Duff. Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1934), I: 321. Thus Regulus could naturally not lie down for fear of being pierced by the spikes. This seems strange considering his predilection for novelty, however it is possible that both Romano and Rosa desired to show the crucially painful moment itself, in which Regulus was forced by tiredness to lie down and submit to the spikes.

[614] Seneca, who was likely one of the primary sources on the story for both Rosa and Ricciardi, cites Regulus's value as an exemplar of masculine virtues intimately tied to the ideal of male friendship, citing his goodness, bravery, steadfastness, honor, patient endurance of suffering and torture, and – the quality in which all these other characteristics reside – virtue. Seneca, *Epistles*, vol. II., 39, Epistle 67. Seneca makes Regulus into a paradigmatic exemplum of the martyr who endures torture bravely, highlighting in particular the masculine nature of the Roman hero. Seneca, *ibid*, 85, Epistle 71. These qualities were also emphasized by other ancient authors, including Horace, Cicero, Livy, Silicus Italicus, Appian, and Valerius Maximus, and were taken up by early-modern writers like Boccaccio and Montaigne in their accounts. Boccaccio saw in Regulus's conduct the value of devotion to friends in particular. Boccaccio, *De Casibus Illustrium Virorum*, V: xlviii-xlix. On the ideal of *virtus*, see Wilcox, "Exemplary grief: gender and virtue in Seneca's consolations to women," *Helios* 34: 1 (2006): 1.

[615] Wallace, *Etchings*, 74.

[616] As a gift, the etching (in a manner akin to the Met portrait) embodied the literal exchange of ideas that comprised friendship, and in its subject matter it conveyed the ideals which codified that relation. Just as Ricciardi had compared Rosa to the heroes and philosophers of antiquity in his *canzone*, in Rosa's etching he responds in kind by comparing Ricciardi to Regulus. Like the portrait, the *Regulus* etching was intended to express the friends' shared interests and ideals and of the intellectual debt that Rosa owed to Ricciardi – a mutuality that is also implicit in the subject's *topoi* of exemplarity and emulation.

[617] Borelli, letter 296. "Le dedicatorie, o latine o volgari, ci deveno importar poco; con tutto ciò procurerò di sodisfarvi."

that the verses "teach us a little" highlights his intention that the prints and their subjects proliferate his identity as a learned moral philosopher. As in the case of the *Regulus* print for Ricciardi, the pithy sayings in Rosa's other etchings perhaps had a personal resonance for Martinelli and Quaranta, too.

In the *Rescue of the Infant Oedipus*, the Latin dedication to Martinelli reads: "Giulio Martinelli, Dearest Friend/ Oedipus here, with his pierced feet upturned to the stars, shows that each man goes to his own fate".[618] The tale has a variety of sources, including Apollodorus, Seneca, Sophocles' tragedy *Oedipus Rex*, Jacobus de Voragine's *The Golden Legend*, among others.[619] Upon learning from an oracle that his son would kill him and marry his queen, King Laius of Thebes ordered his infant child Oedipus (whose name means "swollen-footed") to be spiked through the feet and left exposed on Mount Cithaeron, where he was subsequently discovered and rescued by a shepherd of Polybus, the King of Corinth. As Wallace notes, Rosa chose to depict the moment of the child's rescue, when he was taken by the childless King of Corinth to Polybus in order to be adopted by him; in an ironic twist of fate, the rescue ultimately led to the fulfillment of the oracle's prophecy.[620] Wallace also pointed to Rosa's novel interpretation of depicting the child hanging from a tree, a motif that does not appear in any of the sources. In combination with the inscription, Rosa likely intended to signal Oedipus's ironic and inevitable fate: "[t]he crippled feet of the child Oedipus are turned to the stars but will never touch them. Instead his headlong posture prefigures his tragic fall."[621] Martinelli, a Florentine about whom very little is known, likely

---

Rosa does not specify whether the dedications are intended for the etchings in question, but this is likely the case. Wallace suggested tentatively that they may have been intended for the *Genius* and *Apelles* etchings. Wallace, *Etchings*, 79, note 96.

[618] "Al Sig.re Giulio Martinelli Amico Cariss.mo/ Oedipus hic fixis, verfisque ad sidera plantis / Edocet ad sortem quemlibet ire suam. / Salvator Rosa Inv. pinx. Scul." English translation by Wallace, *Etchings*, 304.

[619] Apollodorus, *The Library*, 3, 5, 7. Tomory notes that "Rosa has borrowed the tree from some later commentary, post *The Golden Legend* in which the Oedipus story is connected with Judas." Tomory, *Salvator Rosa. His Etchings and Engravings after His Works*, 13. For Sophocles's *Oedipus Rex*, see Sophocles, *Works*, trans. Francis Storr (London: Heinemann, 1929), I: 6-139. For the other sources, see Wallace, *Etchings*, 100-1.

[620] See Wallace, *Etchings*, 100.

[621] Wallace, *Etchings*, 101.

befriended Rosa between 1635 and 1640. Rosa mentions him frequently in his letters to Giulio and Giovanni Maffei, and he appears to have been on close terms with Giulio as well as with Simonelli and Mercuri.[622] It is probable that the print's subject held an interest for both Rosa and his friend. Its marked iconographic obscurity, too (as with the other prints) may have appealed as a means to represent the secretive and exclusive nature of their bond.

The *Fall of the Giants* for Orazio Quaranta is inscribed: "Oratio Quaranta, Harmonious Friend/ They are raised aloft that may be hurled down in more headlong ruin."[623] While the subject of the etching is taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (I, 154-156), which tells the story of the Giants' futile attempt to build a "rival mountain to besiege Olympus", the text of the inscription derives from a passage in Claudian Claudianus's *In Rufinum* (I, 22-23): "No longer can I complain that the unrighteous man reaches the highest pinnacle of success."[624] It is easy to see the appeal of Claudian's passage, which describes in detail "the greed, bloodthirstiness and lust for power of Rufinus, and his ultimate downfall", to Rosa's predilection for tales of the defeat of unjust power. The same idea is embodied in the story of the Giants' fall. Wallace interprets the image and inscription in connection with Rosa's mistrust of Fortune, but it is also applicable to the artist's more pervasive invective against the power structures of his time, and the patronage-economy of art

[622] Borelli, letters 26, 56 and 71. Martinelli is usually mentioned in connection with Simonelli and Mercuri, who all send their greetings together in Rosa's letters to Giovanni and Giulio Maffei. In 1665 Rosa was sending letters via Martinelli for Ricciardi. For Rosa's epistolary references to Martinelli, see Borelli, letters 26, 56, 71, 80, 81, 88, 154, 157, 160, 165, 308, 309, and 315. In October of 1665, Martinelli was 75 years old and sick in bed. Borelli, letter 315.

[623] "Horatio Quaranta Amico Homogeneo/ Tolluntur in altum,/ Ut lapsu graviore ruant./ Salvator Rosa Inv. pinx. Scul." English translation by Wallace, *The Figure Paintings of Salvator Rosa*, 79. A preparatory drawing for the *Giants* is in the British Museum. Mahoney, *Drawings*, group 70.

[624] Wallace, *The Figure Paintings of Salvator Rosa*, 80; also see 98-100. Claudian, *In Rufinum*, 1.22-23; Loeb, 1932, I: 28-29. *In Rufinum* 1 and 2 are on 27-97 of the Loeb ed. Wallace notes that Rufinus, "who sought to wield a scepter, who clothed himself in rich purple and gold, and built pyramids to his own glory, meets his end by being horribly hacked to pieces by an enraged mob. Claudian observes in this connection (440-441): 'Put not now your trust in prosperity; learn that the gods are inconstant and heaven untrustworthy'." On Ovid, see Tomory, *Salvator Rosa. His Etchings and Engravings after His Works*, 12.

in particular.[625] Quaranta was a poet, writer and Jesuit priest, involved with the Inquisition as a *Consultore della Sacra Congragazione Indice*.[626] Originally from Salerno, he was nominated by the *Eletti* of Naples as a Neapolitan historian and asked to write a history of the region. His nationality was likely an important point of connection in his friendship with Rosa. Quaranta lived in Madrid for a decade as plenipotentiary minister for the city of Salerno and as legate for the King of Poland, after which he returned to Rome.[627] He was also a member of the Roman *Umoristi* and, although he was involved in compiling the Index, his continued friendship with Rosa in the 1660's (and Rosa's assessment of him as a "harmonious" friend) suggests he may well have been among the select few who defended the artist against accusations of plagiarism.[628] Baldinucci included Quaranta among the list of Rosa's friends – the Roman "men of letters and persons of high affairs" – who supplied him with information for his biography of the artist.[629] Rosa mentions Quaranta in a letter to Ricciardi of 1663, the same year as the *Giants* engraving, where he cites with irony his authority as a poet: "as Quaranta and Melosi say, to say that the poets are honourable men would be to lie through one's teeth".[630] It is conceivable, in view of Quaranta's own court position and Rosa's estimation of him as a "harmonious" friend, that Quaranta shared something of Rosa's disdain toward the cruel acts of Fortune and the iniquitous exploits of more mundane power-structures alike.

---

[625] Wallace, *The Figure Paintings of Salvator Rosa*, 80. He considers that Rosa may have intended a particularly pessimistic commentary on the "sheer perversity of Fortune" who only raises men in order to "crush them more completely." He sees the same idea at work in the *Regulus* etching (Wallace, *ibid*, 100), which, in my own interpretation, depicts the protagonist's downfall as an acclamation on Rosa's part, rather than a condemnation – this is particularly evident from the inscription in the etching itself which pits Regulus *against* cruel Fortune.
[626] His religious writings included *La vita di S. Genesio, notaro e martire* (Rome, Nicolò Angelo Tinassi, 1682) and a *Vita del beato Giouanni di San Facondo dell'Ordine di Sant'Agostino scritta da D. Orazio Quaranta consultor del Indice in tre libri diuisa nel secolo, nella religione, e nella Gloria* (Rome, Nicolò Angelo Tinassi, 1673).
[627] Borelli, letter 292, note 1; see Nicolò Toppi, *Biblioteca napoletana* (1678), 229.
[628] Maylender, *Storie delle Accademie*, 5: 380; also see Borelli, letter 47, note 1.
[629] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 463.
[630] Borelli, letter 292. "come dice il Quaranta, et il Melosi, al nome di poeta ci va il menti per la gola che siano huomini honorati."

Wallace has argued that the *Oedipus* and *Giants* etchings were intended by Rosa, as with other of his prints, as an iconographic matched pair to be displayed together.[631] Significantly, both the *Oedipus* and *Giants* are among the etchings that Rosa gave his devious "*Pinx.*" inscription, hoping to secure a commission – perhaps even from Martinelli or Quaranta – for paintings on the same theme. But in 1666, Rosa wrote to Ricciardi that he had still not received any requests for canvases on the subjects.[632] The subject of *Oedipus* was an utterly novel idea, but the *Fall of the Giants* (though not a commonplace subject by any means) had already achieved notoriety via Giulio Romano's fresco at the Palazzo del Te, and a fresco by Guido Reni.[633] The alternative obscurity or celebrity of the two themes, then, may have played a role in their failure to attract a prospective patron – notwithstanding the possibility of their appeal to their dedicatees.

As I noted above, Rosa's persistently enigmatic *Figurine* (c. 1656-7) [Figs. 90-95], the series of sixty-two plates of figures that he dedicated to Carlo de' Rossi, are the most palpable instance of the artist's intention to assert and proliferate his talents as a graphic artist and figure painter. In dedicating them to De' Rossi, Rosa not only intended to "show off" his skills to a prospective collector, but aimed to credit his trusted friend and supporter for the role he had played in helping to secure that identity. This is clear from a letter of 1656, where Rosa asked Ricciardi for his assistance in devising the dedication:

> "I would like you to do me the favor of sending me a single Latin or vulgar phrase on the following subject. I have carved 25 small figures in *acquaforte*, which I would like to dedicate to [one] of my friends here in Rome to whom I profess a kind of obligation, having found both his heart and purse always ready in my every need, so I [...] would like to dedicate this booklet to him: and [...] the dedication should not contain anything other

[631] Wallace, *Etchings*, 52, 98. Wallace also contends that "[i]n etching style and technique the *Giants* and *Oedipus* are the richest and most varied of all of Rosa's large prints." Wallace, *ibid*, 97.

[632] Borelli, letter 335. Morgan cited paintings for both subjects, locating the *Giants* (probably erroneously) in the Palazzo Pitti and the *Oedipus* in an unnamed collection. Morgan, *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, 295, 302.

[633] As Tomory notes, the Oedipus is a subject "virtually unique to Rosa, Pigler recording only a French illumination in the preceding centuries." Tomory, *Salvator Rosa. His Etchings and Engravings after His Works*, 13. In addition to Romano's fresco at Palazzo del Te, and Guido Reni's fresco (known via a chiaroscuro woodcut by Bartolomeo Coriolano, in two versions dated 1638 and 1641), Wallace also points to the likely influence on Rosa's conception of the subject of another well-known image: the scene of *Minerva Expelling the Giants* in Pietro da Cortona's ceiling in the Palazzo Barberini in Rome. Wallace, *Etchings*, 94-95.

> than this: Salvator consecrates and dedicates to the good law of friendship of Signor Carlo Rossi …"[634]

Ricciardi appears to have responded with a lengthy Latin script, written in his hand on the reverse of the letter, although it is uncertain whether he sent it to Rosa in this form or revised it first:

> "Friendship also has tablets of its laws,
> and these it hides in minds
> more than on bronze engravings.
> SALVATOR ROSA
> dedicates these bronze tablets to
> CAROLO RUBEO
> the sweetest of friends
> so that the tablets which a playful hand carves
> may earnestly testify to those laws which a Genius
> has written in a sincere heart."[635]

Worthy of particular note is Ricciardi's emphasis on two of the most vital components of friendship – sincerity and the "laws" of friendship – both of which are essential to Rosa's free identity.[636] It is possible that even at this relatively early date Ricciardi intended to take a dig at De' Rossi, his great rival for Rosa's affections, by first implying that friendship was more profoundly experienced in a mental than physical form. In any case, Rosa dispensed with the elaborate metaphor in his final, considerably shorter dedication [Fig. 90a]: "Salvator Rosa dedicates these prints of playful leisure to Carlo de' Rossi as a pledge of outstanding friendship".[637]

---

[634] Borelli, letter 203: "Vorrei che mi facessivo gratia di mandarmi un periodo solo o latino o volgare sopra la seguente materia. Ho intagliate da 25 Figurine d'aqqua forte, le vorrei dedicare ad [un] mio amico qui in Roma al quale professo qualche sorta d'oblighatione trovandolo sempre pronto ad ogni mia necessità col core, e con la borsa apperta, ond'io ... li vorrei dedicare questo libretto: e ... dedicatoria non vorria che passasse, né contenesse altro che questo: Salvator consacra e dedica alla buona legge dell'amicitia del Signor Carlo Rossi, e del resto vi riverisco di tutto core di Roma questo dì 14 d'Ottobre 1656."

[635] "Adi I. nov.re 1656 in Pisa/ Habet et tabulas legum suarum amicitia,/ illasq. sculptura plusquam aenea/ in animis celat./ SALVATOR ROSA/ has aeris tabluas/ CAROLO RUBEO/ amicorum suavissimo/ D.D.D./ ut istae quas ludens incidit manus/ serio testentur illas quas unus Genius/ genuino scripsit in corde." Limentani, "Nuovi Studi e Ricerche," 38-9, notes 21-22. English translation by Wallace, *Etchings*, 17.

[636] Wallace also noted the correspondence of Ricciardi's reference to a "sincere heart" with "several of the *concetti* of the *Genius* etching, done some six years later, which shows Rosa's genius handing over his heart to a personification of Sincerity." Wallace, *Etchings*, 17.

[637] "SALVATOR ROSA/ Has Ludentis otij/ CAROLO RUBEO/ Singularis Amicitiae pignus/ D.D.D." Ricciardi seems to have taken the opportunity to show off his erudition and typically "over-elaborate *seicentismo*" with a lengthy composition. Limentani, "Nuovi Studi e Ricerche," 38-39.

The frontispiece to the series depicts a male figure dressed in a plumed hat, standing behind the large placard that bears the dedicatory inscription. Above the placard there is a large urn which appears to be giving off clouds of smoke (the symbol of evanescence, but also of ineffective artificiality and insincerity[638]). The figure turns to look over his right shoulder at an old woman with sagging breasts and wild hair behind him, who screams and throws her hands up in the air, seemingly in protest at the declaration before her. Adam von Bartsch identified this figure as the allegorical personification of Envy ("*Invidia*"), and both Wallace and Nancy Rash Fabbri have elaborated on this identification.[639] Fabbri argues, convincingly, that the figure of Envy embodies Rosa's desire to prove himself as an artist, and to respond to his envious critics. She interprets this personification, in combination with the reference to an altar (suggested by the smoking urn), directly in connection with a passage in Rosa's satire *L'Invidia*, written 1652-4: here, a disheveled figure of Envy prevents the artist from inscribing his name on a plaque in the Temple of Immortality, constructing an analogy between Rosa's suffering of slander and Apelles' *Calumny*.[640]

Fabbri considered that the gesture of the male figure in the frontispiece, who points directly to the artist's name, constructs a clear visual connection between the identity of the

---

[638] On smoke as "evanescence", see Wallace, "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus*," 27. For Rosa's use of the metaphor of "smoke", see chapter two, 95 and 142. Fabbri considered the smoking urn to be a sign that the placard in Rosa's print is placed near an altar. Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 330.

[639] Bartsch, *The Illustrated Bartsch*, 278, no. 25; Wallace, *Etchings*, 17, 135; Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 329-30. Wallace also points out that the dedicatory page exists in more versions than any other of Rosa's prints telling of the import Rosa gave to the series in its entirety, but also, I think, of the value he placed in the dedication. See Wallace, *ibid*, 17.

[640] Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 329-30. Rosa, *L'Invidia*, vv. 53-4; 46-48: "Era ad onta là su del Tempo ingiusto/ Scolpito in adamante in su l'Altare/ De' piu celebri nomi indice angusto." The passage on Apelles' *Calumny* is vv. 499-505. In the etching, the roles of the two characters have been reversed, and "Envy appears with flying hair and a wild glance, but she no longer bars the artist's path. Instead, the artist's Fantasy, raised upon a platform…looks down at Envy and proudly indicates that, in spite of her, Rosa's name has been inscribed on a tablet near an altar, indicated by the smoking urn." Fabbri, *ibid*, 329-30. On the motif of Apelles' *Calumny* and its employment by early-modern artists, see David Cast, *The Calumny of Apelles. A Study in the Humanist Tradition* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981), esp. 155ff. Rosa's citation of Apelles' painting is also significant in relation to his desire to display novelty in the *Figurine*, in view of Alberti's regard for the subject of Apelles' *Calumny* as an example of excellent invention in history painting. Alberti, *On Painting*, ed. Grayson, 88.

personification and Rosa himself.[641] The "identity" to which the figure points, however, is not just Rosa but Rosa *as the friend of* Carlo de' Rossi. This is a significant point, for while scholars have been eager to emphasize the self-laudatory and self-assertive nature of Rosa's image, few have acknowledged the explicitly social nature of that self-identification. Here, it is not just Rosa who bravely confronts the defiant claims of envy, but Rosa and his friend De' Rossi. Rosa implies that it is friendship itself that facilitates his triumph. The figure of Envy, who looks not at her male companion but at the placard in his hand, withers at the sight of the placard not only as an indication of her adversary's achievement in inscribing his name (one that is also, not incidentally, multiplied in the practice of engraving represented by the print itself), but also at its proclamation of amity: she is the rival of talent, achievement, and *virtù*, but also the enemy of friendship, as Rosa's comments in his letters to Ricciardi frequently make clear. By drawing a connection to De' Rossi in an otherwise self-referential image, Rosa aligned the artistic identity he desired to promote with the role his friend and sponsor played in that professional success.

In his letters, Rosa identified the prints only as "*figurine*",[642] and this, together with his description of them as "playful leisure" ("*Ludentis otij*") in the dedicatory inscription, supports the general scholarly consensus that they are devoid of any specific allegorical meaning. Fabbri suggested that Rosa intended with this phrase to refer to the conceit of the "*bel gioco*" of the artist testifying to his own merit, on the model of Apelles.[643] Equally likely, however, is a desire to convey a spirit of witty and lighthearted camaraderie with De' Rossi himself, who shared both Rosa's intellectual interests and sense of humor. It seems plausible to suggest that Rosa chose to

---

[641] Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 330. In agreement, Wallace also compared the figure to the protagonist in Rosa's "*Genius*" etching, noting the correspondence of both their appearance and pose. Wallace, *Etchings*, 17. Fabbri also noted the similarity of the figure's pose, who points with his right hand to the inscription, to another of Rosa's allegorical self-images: the London *Self-Portrait as a Philosopher* [Fig. 10]. The similarity, however, lies less in the pose itself than in the conspicuous display of a placard with an erudite aphorism.

[642] Borelli, letter 203 (October 14 1656).

[643] Fabbri, "Salvator Rosa's Engraving for Carlo de' Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*," 330.

honour De' Rossi in particular with a set of images that celebrated his skills as a figure painter because of the banker's unwavering sponsorship of Rosa's earliest forays into that genre in the competitive Roman art scene. But there was self-interest at work in this dedication, too. By offering prints that touted his skills as a figure-painter to De' Rossi, Rosa was once again exploiting his friend in a deceptively self-promotional economic ploy. Here, Rosa proliferated in printed form the same gift-economy that De' Rossi had helped sustain by indulging in Rosa's requests and buying his work when no one else would, and thereby allowing Rosa to demand high prices from other clients. In naming De'Rossi as his recipient, Rosa likely intended to capitalize on the broader public awareness of De' Rossi's collecting power, perhaps in the hopes of securing commissions from others on that basis.

V. 8. The Reality of Rosa's Financial Situation

It is difficult to piece together a comprehensive picture of Rosa's actual finances throughout the entirety of his career, but certain clues from the biographies and his own letters suggest the nature and extent of his income at various points, as well as its often fluctuating nature. To judge from the amount he left at his death (between eight and twelve-thousand *scudi*[644]), and from the notes his biographers make of his well-dressed appearance and accretion of certain high quality possessions (like the silver bathroom basin), he seems to have lived quite well, especially in the latter part of his career, despite his philosophical claims of poverty or denunciation of wealth and his habit of spending freely and lending money to friends. Financial success also appears to have come to him early on: the first record of a sale of one of his paintings in Naples, a *St. Lucy* for the Jesuit priest Flaminio Magnati in October 1638, indicates he received forty ducats (about the

[644] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 499-500; Passeri, *Vite*, 438.

same as forty *scudi*) for the canvas – an impressive price, as Scott notes, when one considers that Ribera was then asking for one-hundred *scudi* for a full-length figure painting.[645]

Rosa also suffered financial stress at various stages of his career, but the sources are occasionally contradictory with regard to its nature and degree. During his late Florentine and early Roman years, after Rosa had distanced himself from the Medici and had (according to Baldinucci) spent exorbitant amounts of money on his academic dinners (sometimes thirty or forty *scudi* a time[646]), Rosa was repeatedly pleading his poverty and asking both Giulio Maffei and Ricciardi for money and other favours.[647] Baldinucci claimed that Rosa arrived in Rome with only three hundred *scudi*, despite accruing a sum of about nine thousand *scudi* from his Florentine court employment.[648] He complained to friends about his state of relative indigence shortly after his arrival in the city, and between 1649 and 1655, attempting to re-establish himself in the Roman art scene, Rosa and Lucrezia were forced by financial restraint to give up more than one newborn child to the orphanage of the Innocenti at Santo Spirito in Sassia.[649] Passeri, however, claimed that Rosa left Florence for Rome with a significant amount of money, arriving in the city with a "liveried servant" and decked-out with a dress sword with silver-guard, "all full of ostentation."[650] In July of 1652, amid a stream of complaints of poverty, Rosa offered three hundred *scudi* to Ricciardi, asking

---

[645] Scott, *Salvator Rosa*, 12. For Rosa's painting of *St. Lucy*, see Prota-Giurleo, "La Musica a Napoli nel Seicento. (Dal Gesualdo allo Scarlatti)," *Samnium* ii: 2 (1929): 47; and *idem*, *La famiglia e la giovinezza di Salvator Rosa* (Naples: A Spese de l'autore, Largo S. Domenico, 12; Benevento: Tipi Istituto Maschile Vittorio Em. III, Chiostro S. Sofia, 1929), VII: 14. Scott has pointed out that Rosa would have had a very successful career if he had remained in his native Naples; his early works in that city, such as a *St. Jerome* and *St. Nicholas of Tolentino* at Fabriano, were a success.
[646] Passeri, *Vite*, 424; Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 454. Baldinucci also notes that the expense of the academy's dinners was shared among the members.
[647] In 1649, Rosa complained to Giulio about the minutiae of his various financial woes, whining about the cost of baby food and chicken broth. Borelli, letter 31. He also turned to both Giulio and Ricciardi for help in acquiring dowries for Lucrezia's sisters Lorenza and Catera. For Rosa's requests for financial help, see for example Borelli, letters 48, 50, 53, 60, 90, 94, 96, 101, 113, 140, 149, 154, 156, 157, 161, 164 and 334. Ricciardi made his own financial contribution in May of 1651. Borelli, letters 101 and 334. Rosa also helped Giulio with some financial transactions in Rome, (letter 140) although protested over the favor somewhat by pleading his poverty. He also seems to have incurred a small debt in borrowing money from his friend, which he eventually repaid. (letter 179)
[648] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 454.
[649] For his general complaints see Borelli, letters 41, 45, 49 and 50; for the newborns, see letters 31, 112, 171, 189, and 227.
[650] Passeri, *Vite*, 425.

him to excuse his insistence that he take it, "not being accustomed to possessing such sums, as someone who lives from day to day."[651] In 1659 Rosa had managed to save a hundred *scudi* for the purposes of a sojourn with Ricciardi at Strozzavolpe.[652] By May of 1661 Rosa was finally preparing to leave, and sent ahead to his friend fifty *scudi* and ten *paoli* for their provisions, and in order not to incur any danger by carrying it on his person during the journey north.[653] Baldinucci's biography suggests that it was around 1661 that Rosa claimed to be able to make "one hundred *scudi* an hour", boasting of his gains to Paolo Minucci's servant during a visit to Florence.[654] The anecdote, however, may be less an accurate record of earnings and more a *topos* in the service of emphasizing Rosa's philosophical change of attitude toward both making money and to saving it.[655] In April of 1661, Rosa angrily retorted Ricciardi's exaggeration of Rosa's fortunes by claiming that the six-hundred "miserable" *scudi* in his possession were hardly enough to call him successful.[656] The following December Rosa told Ricciardi that he had a thousand *scudi* at his disposal, and that his friend should feel free to avail himself of Rosa's generosity whenever he had the need.[657] By

---

[651] Borelli, letter 138.
[652] Borelli, letter 229.
[653] Borelli, letter 246.
[654] Perhaps Rosa (or Baldinucci) had Rubens in mind, who apparently charged 100 guilders per day. Marten Jan Bok, "Pricing the Unpriced: How Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painters determined the Selling Price of their Work," in *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, ed. North and Ormrod, 105; also see Max Rooses, *Catalogue du Musée Plantin Moretus* (Anvers: J.-E. Buschmann, 1881), 233.
[655] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 499. The biographer's story of Rosa's encounter with the "*filosofo nigro*" seems to have been directly inspired by a popular theme that appears, among other instances, in a tale recounted by Nicolò Franco (1515-70), the secretary of Pietro Aretino, in one of his *Dialogi Piacevoli* of 1539. In Franco's story, "the author introduces an avaricious servant, who reprimands his lord for his liberality, by teaching him the art of managing his court and by showing him all the ways of saving and making money." In the anecdote, "[t]he servant reprimands his lord, asking: 'Where are the accounts? I promise you that whoever spent, kept the money. I can assure you that whoever managed, earned a lot. Why is it not possible to see any accounts regarding the kitchen, the pantry, the stable, the wardrobe? Dear Lord, I am sure that for every capon you eat, the sauce costs the same as the capon. You do not wear any jacket made of satin, which had not been accounted for as golden cloth ... In which court did it ever happen, except in this one, that the servants eat the same bread which is distributed on the lord's own table? You have to do in your household, as is done in all the other courts: you have to give your servants unleavened, badly cooked black bread, as happens in every other court.'" Enormously popular, this text anticipated a current of thought prevalent in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Guerzoni, "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor: The Classic Origins of Italian Renaissance Lifestyles," in *Economic Engagements with Art*, ed. De Marchi and Goodwin, 368 and note 84; Franco, *Dialogi piacevoli*, 1542 ed., 5.78v.
[656] Borelli, letter 245.
[657] Borelli, letter 254.

the mid-1660's, however, during a period of political turmoil, Rosa found it hard to garner commissions or make sales: in 1664, he wrote to Ricciardi that he had made "a thousand *scudi*'s worth of paintings" but was struggling to find buyers for them.[658] As Spear has noted, the practicalities of both artistic practice and everyday life impacted on artists' economic situations and their attitudes toward money.[659] Rosa frequently complained about the cost of materials, an expenditure that could be exacerbated by the errors of judgment made on occasion by his friends (who he frequently solicited for the supply of materials): in 1650, for example, Giulio Maffei had sent Rosa cooking oil instead of the walnut oil he had requested, which Rosa had proceeded to apply, unaware, to a large canvas "that cost hundreds of *scudi*" and another small one, both of which he said he would have to either destroy or redo.[660]

Despite his attempts to remove art from its fiscal boundaries, in his letters Rosa provides some indication of the actual monetary values that he attached to paintings. The rather erratic record makes it difficult to detect a significant change in his valuation over time, but his conception of the monetary value of his paintings seems to have remained high throughout his career.[661] In 1650, Rosa asked for a hundred *scudi* from a prelate who had requested a small battle painting of four *palmi*, in order to "just get it out of my way, and not bother myself with profit."[662] His specification of the size of the painting suggests that it may have determined the price, but the amount was perhaps inflated, too, on the basis of the subject-matter as contrary to his ambitions as a history painter. This attitude is clear from a letter of 1652: Ricciardi had solicited a battle painting

---

[658] Borelli, letter 300.
[659] Spear, "Guercino's 'Prix-fixe'," 601.
[660] Borelli, letter 74. In 1641, in a letter to Giulio Maffei, Rosa had complained about the cost of a canvas stretcher. (letter 4) During the period Rosa spent at Monterufoli in 1650, from June to November, Rosa relied on his friends – especially Giulio and Francesco Cordini – for acquiring painting materials and supplies, undoubtedly finding them difficult to get a hold of at the villa. Borelli, letters 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 73, 74, 75, 76.
[661] Fumagalli's important caveat that a distinction be made between the prices Rosa received for his market paintings and commissioned works should also be kept in mind. Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 106.
[662] Borelli, letter 46.

from Rosa on behalf of a friend, and Rosa reminded him of "the repugnance that I have toward such kinds of painting", despite having just completed the *Battle Scene* for the King of France, to the great benefit of both his reputation and purse. Noting that this genre was his "usual place to exceed the painters who slander me, in addition to the extraordinary hard work that it requires", he conceded for the sake of Ricciardi's friendship to make the painting and to ask for no more than three hundred *scudi*, again reminding him that "I have nearly vowed never again to make similar kinds of paintings, if I am not paid on par with Raphaels and Titians."[663] In 1651 Rosa valued his large *Democritus in Meditation* at a thousand *scudi* – partly on the basis of its successful reception and praise received at the exhibition at the Pantheon – but was nonetheless willing to settle for the "adequate" three-hundred *scudi* he received from the Venetian ambassador Nicolò Sagredo for both the *Democritus* and the *Diogenes*, a price that was not in Rosa's opinion commensurate with the "labor of my pictures" but that he had agreed to on the grounds of his client's reputation and esteem.[664] Also in 1651 Rosa was asked to paint an altarpiece of St. Matthew (possibly the *Parable of St. Matthew* (Naples, Capodimonte) [Fig. 54]), but told Ricciardi that the five-hundred *scudi* on offer was not a sufficient enough sum for an altarpiece and refused to paint it.[665] In response to a request from a German client in 1661 for a painting of an Old Testament subject "by my hand", Rosa told Ricciardi that he had asked for a thousand *scudi* for it[666] – a demand in keeping with Baldinucci's many anecdotes about Rosa's often eccentric procedures of valuation. In 1666 Rosa told Ricciardi that Carlo de' Rossi had given him a "gift" of one hundred *piastre* (about one

[663] Borelli, letter 144: "In quanto alla Battaglia …che voi m'accennate ch'io vi dichi il prezzo, vi dirò con la libertà solita, il mio sentimento. Voi già credo che sapete la repugnanza ch'io ho in sì fatto genere di pittura, attesoché questo è il mio luogho topico da superar quanti pittori mi vogliono dar di naso, oltre alla straordinaria fatica che ci vuole; però, se vi preme, potrete dire a cotesto amico che per vostro amore non li farò spendere più che trecento scudi, dichiarandovi, che quando non fusse cosa motivatami da voi, d'escluderla per qualsivoglia prezzo, sapendosi di già ch'io ho quasi voto di non far simili sorte di pitture, se non mi sono pagate al pari de' Raffaelli e de' Titiani."
[664] Borelli, letter 137.
[665] See Borelli, letters 85 and 101.
[666] Borelli, letter 252.

hundred *scudi*) for the *Atilius Regulus*, which Ricciardi was soliciting a copy of for himself, but that he had been "many times" offered a hundred *doble* (about three-hundred *scudi*) for the painting, and if he had to do it again he would do so "for no less than four-hundred *scudi*."[667] In 1671 he received a satisfactory hundred Roman *scudi* from Marco Antonio Venerosi, the *Operaio* of the Duomo of Pisa, for his painting of *Saint Torpé*.[668] Rosa's most lucrative sale, however, (at least among those known to us) appears to have been the *Battle Scene* for the King of France for which he claimed to have been paid six-hundred *scudi*,[669] a price that could vie with the fees of some of the most successful artists of his generation.[670] A glimpse of the contemporary or posthumous valuation of Rosa's paintings, in particular his landscape paintings and their value relative to works by colleagues and great masters, is offered by a letter of 1674 from the artist and court advisor Paolo Falconieri (1638-1704) to Leopoldo de' Medici regarding the *stime* of paintings in the cardinal's collection:

> "… If the things by Ciro, Carluccio, Salvatore [Rosa] and these other modern painters had to be priced in accordance to the difference of the paintbrush between their works and those of Correggio and Titian, they would vary only a few *scudi*, and yet in reality they sell for a hundred. With regard to the landscapes of Salvatore, I have seen more than one of them, of a little over 3 *braccia*, sell for 500 *scudi* each, yet it seems that landscape-painting is a genre esteemed less than figure-painting. …"[671]

---

[667] Borelli, letter 335.

[668] Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 464. The amount is corroborated in a letter to Ricciardi of August 2 1670. Borelli, letter 381.

[669] See Borelli, letters 144, 148 and 149.

[670] Spear provides a useful list of comparisons: Domenichino received 1200 *scudi* for his *Martyrdom of St. Agnes* (c. 1619-22/25, Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna); the Cavaliere d'Arpino was given 750 *scudi* for his *Coronation of the Virgin* (1615, Chiesa Nuova); Reni made a stratospheric 1600 *scudi* for his altarpiece for St. Peter's of 1604; and Federico Barocci, "one of the most expensive painters in Rome," received 1500 *scudi* for his *Institution of the Eucharist* (1603-7, S. Maria sopra Minerva, Rome). Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi," 313.

[671] "Se le cose di Ciro, di Carluccio, di Salvatore e di questi altri pittori moderni, avessero a camminare ne'prezzi con la differenza che c'è nel pennello fra le opere loro e quelle di Coreggio e di Tiziano, varrebbo pochi scudi, e pure in effetto si vendono a centinaia. De' paesi di Salvatore ne ho veduti più d'uno io, di poco più di 3 braccia, vendere scudi 500 l'uno, e pare il paese è un genere di pittura stimata meno delle figure. …" *Archivio del Collezionismo Mediceo. Il Cardinal Leopoldo*, ed. Miriam Fileti Mazza and Paola Barocchi (Milan and Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi ed., 1998), vol. I (tomo III), 528-530, Appendix XXXI, dated July 21 1674. Interestingly, the 1675 inventory for Leopoldo's collection of drawings lists Rosa among the artists of the "seconda classe" (according to Baldinucci's six-tier classification system), along with Albani, Bartolomeo Biscarini Genovese, Cristofano Allori, Ludovico Cigoli, Domenichino, Filippo Napoletano, Guido Reni, Guercino, Giovanni Lanfranco, Lavinia Fontana, Pier Franceso Mola, Pietro da Cortona, Perugino, Romanelli, Spagnoletti, and others. *Archivio del Collezionismo Mediceo. Il Cardinal Leopoldo*, vol. I (tomo II), 461-2.

Rosa's prediction to Carlo de' Rossi that his paintings would only increase in value after his death seems to have been validated by his posthumous assessors: in 1684, the agent Angelo Doni wrote to Francesco Maria de' Medici, who was inquiring about the work of Luca Giordano, that he had seen the "extensive and noble collection of paintings by Salvator Rosa" in the possession of De' Rossi's heirs, but that the paintings, priced by Ciro Ferri, were too expensive.[672]

If vague, patchy and occasionally blatantly contradictory in nature, Rosa's own comments and those of his biographers reveal that his financial situation was often in flux, but that he was never completely destitute – certainly not as poor as he sometimes claimed – partly thanks to the frequent success of his own pricing strategies and to the monetary support and purchases of friends. Rosa's income and expenditure appear to have been relatively erratic, and both were guided by his desire to uphold a dual ideal image of noble status and moral-philosophical rectitude. More than this, he was constantly comparing himself, in financial terms, to his friends (Ricciardi and Giulio Maffei included) in a way that highlights his belief in money as a persistent barometer of social standing and reputation. He fretted, for example, over the comparable salaries of friends like Antonio Abati and Marc'Antonio Cesti, both of whom he had close personal and professional relationships.[673]

Where, then, did Rosa's money go? The practical expenses of living and working were a drain on his funds. The potentially high cost of materials was ever-present, as was the high cost of living, especially in Rome where Rosa complained in 1649 that the rent was an appalling eighty *scudi* a year,[674] quite high to judge from Spear's assessment of the contemporary situation.[675] Food

[672] Fumagalli, *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 96; letter dated April 1 1684.
[673] In 1651 Rosa lamented the one-hundred-and-fifty *scudi* that Abati had secured for a dedicatory epistle for the Governor of Milan, bemused by his ability to "make money with poetry". Borelli, letter 114. And in 1653, he balked at Abati's expectation of a *scudo* for his "inferior" poetry, when the going rate was a *giulio*. Borelli, letter 162. In 1659 he expressed jealousy at the fifty *scudi* a month that his friend Cesti would be making in his new post as a tenor in the Sistine Chapel choir, "in spite of how ever many paint-brushes and pens are found in the universe." Borelli, letter 231.
[674] See Borelli, letters 26, 27 and 41.

costs in Rome were also high, which may partly account for Rosa's frequent requests for luxury items like wine, meats, cheeses and other delicacies from the Maffei villas during the harvest season.[676] Even more costly, however, were Rosa's principles of comportment and commerce. While his biographers (and Rosa himself) comment on his habit of living relatively simply, they also note his desire to dress well and uphold a relatively high standard of living, and his houses in both Florence and Rome may have been outfitted to receive the many intellectuals and dignitaries who frequently deigned to pay him visits.[677] The inventory of Rosa's last house on the Via Gregoriana in Rome lists at least ten rooms, filled with all manner of furniture and decorations, along with a modest but noteworthy collection of paintings.[678] Rosa also endeavoured to keep a servant, a necessity for anyone desirous of maintaining high social standing and another expense that gave him cause to grumble.[679] Art dealers could also be expensive, and while the contractual nature of Rosa's relations with his dealers is unclear, it is apparent from his own comments (particularly concerning Cordini) that he deemed the relationship to be potentially costly. The failure of Rosa's bank investment with Carlo de' Rossi may also have had a significant impact – at the very least, it points to an inability on Rosa's part to invest his money well, trusting in friends to

---

[675] Tuzia and her husband, the tenants of Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi, paid 18 *scudi* a year for two rooms in their house near S. Spirito in Sassia. In 1609, Adam Elsheimer is recorded as paying 60 *scudi* a year for accommodation in the Campo Marzio. The Borghese family gave Guido Reni, in addition to his monthly stipend of 9 *scudi* plus bread, wine, and firewood, an allowance of 50 *scudi* a year for rent. In Rome's cheaper quarters rent was about 12 *scudi* a year, a bit more in the Via Giulia, from 25 to 30 *scudi* in the area of the Via della Scrofa, and in the more "up-market" zone near the Trinità dei Monti, where many artists lived, about 35 to 40 *scudi* a year, to a maximum of 100. Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi", 312.

[676] On the cost of food in *seicento* Rome, see Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi", 312: "an ordinary worker spent roughly three-quarters of his income on food, of which a third was for bread, leaving little for rent, clothing, and heat. To buy an easel painting by a contemporary artist of standing was beyond consideration, for it would have cost more than a year's income."

[677] Baldinucci notes that Rosa often received "great personages" to his house in Rome, usually laymen rather than ecclesiastics, who were "moved by a desire not only to see his beautiful paintings, but also to enjoy his of readings, which he made with his own voice, of satires". Baldinucci, *Notizie*, 446-447.

[678] Rosa's inventory, in Volpi, "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti," 96-97. The silver basin reported by Baldinucci is not listed, but a number of other silver objects are named, including a crucifix, cutlery and candlesticks.

[679] Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi", 311. For Rosa's complaints in 1649 about rent and finding a decent servant who was "not a ruffian", see Borelli, letters 26 and 27.

take care of it for him.[680] The expense of making prints in solicitation of a commission, without any guarantee of success, as well as dedicating prints to close friends rather that potentially more lucrative patrons were also risky, costly maneuvers. Rosa's refusal to paint the genre scenes and landscapes that the art market demanded, favouring large-scale histories of obscure – and occasionally dangerously controversial – subjects did not help matters. His strategy of giving his paintings to clients as "gifts", moreover, did not always achieve the expected outcome of a high "honorarium" in return. His related habit of giving works of art as gifts to close friends, too, from whom he expected either no or very little monetary recompense, was financially disadvantageous. Added to this was Rosa's refusal to adhere to an older system of pricing – on the basis of labour, size or the quantity of certain iconographic elements – to which many patrons or clients continued to adhere, another possible hazard in his attempt to solicit a high price from a prospective buyer. These tactics, in combination with his habit of giving money to friends, were pursued in the aim of supporting an ideal self-conceived position of liberality, and Rosa's complaints about poverty were motivated as much by a realization of the practical need for funds in order to uphold this position as they were by a moral-philosophical disdain for wealth. (Mancini had deemed comfort and affluence more important for the artist than poverty and need in the pursuit of glory, since money produced time and good quality while hardship elicited only quantity.[681]) Both the reality and ideal of Rosa's economic position, then, suggest the intrinsically social nature of his identity, and his reliance upon the egalitarian principles and day-to-day experience of friendship to support it.

V.9. Concluding Thoughts

With this chapter I have tried to offer insights into the social dimension of the *seicento* artist's economic experience, with Rosa as a particularly revealing yet frequently overlooked

---

[680] See Borelli, letters 305, 315, 316, 328.
[681] Spear, "Scrambling for Scudi," 317; Mancini, *Considerazioni*.

example. Rosa's lofty philosophical ideas about money, for which he claimed either a distaste or lack of concern, conflicted greatly with the reality of his financial need and his desire for admiration and fame – the one rarely far removed from the other. Rosa made plenty of bold proclamations about the worthlessness of money and about his own generosity with what little money he had, yet he was not shy when it came to complaining or bragging about the amounts his pictures sold for. The financially-based pressures associated with being a visual artist in the seventeenth century left little room for the painter-philosopher to actualize his philosophical pretensions. Rosa sustained this ideal via the performance and promotion of a unique identity (in both his person and artistic style), characterized above all by the qualities of *stravaganza*, *bizzarria* and *capriccio*, and used this persona to market himself as a collectable brand. In this he was particularly fortunate to have had so many supporters who shared his predilection for fantastical and obscurely erudite iconography. The friendships that produced this like-mindedness became an essential component of his broader professional strategy, cultivated and reiterated in a series of rituals and an affective discourse aimed at securing financial freedom. In this Rosa's uniqueness lay less in the nature than in the degree of his approach – a programmatic, unrelenting (and often conflicted) mission to overcome the challenge of reconciling freedom and success.

Epilogue

This project is intended not only as a contribution to the study of Rosa, but as a starting point for a much more extensive consideration of the early-modern artist's pursuit of professional autonomy, and the role played by social relationships in that endeavour. As I noted in the introduction, this area of research has received increasing attention in recent years by scholars who aim to revitalize and redirect our understanding of historical subjectivity and its impact upon the lives and careers of early-modern individuals – many of whom have made significant contributions to our own sense of self. Rosa's own enduring appeal lies not only in the extraordinary, and often entertaining, nature of his "paradoxical" situation, but in his close connection to so many of the characteristics we identify with modernity, with ourselves. I have tried to show that Rosa was equally as representative as he was unique, a self-appointed spokesperson of a much more pervasive ideological current who succeeded in his mission to be known as exceptional and idiosyncratic. I have also indicated at various points the necessity of friendship for many of Rosa's colleagues in their own professional ambitions and attempts to carve out unique and self-directed *personae* – some of these personalities have begun to be explored by scholars, while others require a great deal more scrutiny.

In order to fully understand the nature of the artist's acquisition of professional autonomy, this study also requires expansion into the broader spectrum of social experience. Friendship was a critical bond in the affective dimension of self-fashioning, but it was not the only one: the panoply of other types of intimate bonds, including blood ties (parents, sons, daughters), emotional and sexual relationships (mistresses, lovers, courtesans), and rivalrous associations (enemies, critics, rivals) – a category as essential to Rosa's identity as friendship, but one that requires significantly more attention than I was able to give it here – contributed just as meaningfully to process of Rosa's and his contemporaries' self-manufacture. Rosa's relationship with Lucrezia Paolini, for example,

was no less important than any of his bonds of amity with intellectual and academic colleagues. Nor were his family relations, who are conspicuously absent in his correspondence with friends – suggestive, perhaps, of a rift that made the surrogate family of friends that much more important for our artist.

The complex nature of the artist's attainment of autonomy – a crucial facet of the profession that has come to define the modern artist – has yet to receive systematic consideration by art historians. As both a representative of his time and a harbinger of new conceptions of subjectivity, Rosa offers an important introduction to a much more complicated phenomenon, frequently acknowledged in the scholarship as canonical but rarely probed for the conditions of its development. Future research conducted on the basis of issues I have begun to lay out here will seek to fill this longstanding lacuna.

Appendices

I. *Poems and Letters by Salvator Rosa*

I. 1 Salvator Rosa, "Lamento" for Giambattista Ricciardi

Published by Cesareo, *Poesie e lettere*, 133-5, on the basis of the codice Riccardiano 3472, miscellaneo cartaceo del sec. XVIII, p. 340; also published in variation, on the basis of Burney's transcription in his 'Libro di Musica,' in Morgan, *Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*, II, 313-16, and Limentani, *Poesie e lettere*, 50-52.

I

1 Da ch'uscij dall cuna
Non ha tregua nè fine il duolo mio.
Ricordati, Fortuna,
Che son nel mondo e son di carne anch'io.

II

5 Venni solo alla vita
Per stentare e patir, sudar da cane;
E tra pena infinita
Speme non ho d'assicurarmi un pane.

III

9 Per me solo si vede
Sordo il Ciel, scuro il Sol, secca la Terra:
Ov'io di pace ho fede
Colà porta il gran Diavolo la guerra.

IV

13 S'io fo il bucato, piove;
S'io metto il piè nel Mare, il Mar s'adira:
S'andassi all'Indie nuove,
Non vale il mio teston più d'una lira.

IV

17 Son di fede Christiano,
E mi bisogna credere all'Ebreo;
Sallo il Ghetto Romano
E il guardaroba mio Ser Mardocheo.

V

21 Ma, di grazia, osservate!
Quando si sente un caldo dell'Inferno,
Nel mezzo della state,
Io marc[h]io col vestito dell'Inverno.

VI

25 Suol dir chi ha da mangiare,
Che i commode e i quattrini al fin son sogni:
Che dolce minchionare
Haver pari l'entrate a i suoi bisogni!

VII

29 Villa non ho nè stanza;
Altri han d'argento in fin'a l'orinale!
Ricco son di speranza,
E per fede commisso ho lo spedale.

VIII

33 Non vado al Macellaro,
Bench'avessi a comprar di carne un grosso,
Che per destino avaro
Non mi pesi la carne al par dell'osso,

IX

37 S'io son desto o nel letto,
Sempre ho la mente stivalata e varia:
Senz'essere Architetto,
Fabbrico tutto il di castelli in aria.

X

41 Cielo! son pur Pittore!
Nè posso figurarmi un miglior segno:
Sto sempre d'un colore,
Nè mi reisce mai alcun disegno.

XI

45 Legni Iberi e Francesi
Col nocchiero pennello all'onde io spalmo:
Dono ad altri i paesi
In tempo che non ho di terra un palmo.

XII

49 S'io vo a Palazzo a sorte,
L'Anticamera ogn'or mi mostra a dito:
I satrapi di corte
Con le lingue mi trinciano il vestito.

XIII

53 Credete al vostro Rosa,
Che senza versi e quadric il mondo è bello,
E la più sana cosa
In questi tempi è' l non haver cervello.

XIV

57 Ve la dirò più chiara:
Oggi il saper più non si stima un fico:
Da me ciascuno impara
Che chi segue virtù sempre è mendico.

XV

61* Non so che sia Fortuna
Pago à prezzo di stenti un di felice,
Non ho sostanza alcuna
E ch'io speri e ch'io soffri, ogn'un mi dice.

*This stanza is found in the Burney ms., after v. 49 above, but is missing from the Riccardiana ms, in Appendix I.2.

I. 2 Salvator Rosa, "Sonetto contro quelli che non lo credevano autore delle Satire"

Published by D. Romei, *Salvator Rosa. Satire*. Milan: Mursia, 1995, 49.

I

1 Dunque perché son Salvator chiamato
crucifigatur grida ogni persona?
Ma è ben dover che da genía briccona
non sia senza passion glorificato.

II

5 M'interroga ogni dì più d'un Pilato
se di satiri tóschi ho la corona;
più d'un Pietro mi nega e m'abbandona
e più d'un Giuda ognor mi vedo a lato.

III

9 Giura stuolo d'ebrei perfido e tristo ch'io,
tolto della Gloria il santuario,
fo dell'altrui divinitade acquisto;

IV

12 ma questa volta, andandoli al contrario,
lor fan da ladri, io non farò da Cristo,
anzi sarà il mio I'indo il lor Calvario.

I. 3 Salvator Rosa, letter to a "Marchese di Milano"

Published by Ozzola, *Vita e opere*, 245-246; BiASA Ms 77 (96361), 81r-83v.

Illmo Sig. re. Se i Sig.i Caval.ri di Milano,

Oltre alla generosità della mano, anco con la cortesia della lingua usano di premiare le fatiche degli artefici si potrà chiamare duplicatamente felice chi sotto di codesto cielo esercita i suoi talenti. Ma io che so quali sono le tempre del secolo nel quale viviamo, dirò che queste son solamente prerogative del bell'animo di V.S. Ill.ma, non già comuni inclinazioni. Mostrerò dunque all'Invidia i generosi tratti della sua lingua a mio favore, acciò si raffreni nel mordere le cose applaudite dalla sua benignità, e mi farò lecito (in riguardo delle sue cortesi attestazioni) di lusingarmi per questa volta a credermi per quello che veramente non sono. Sig.r Marchese, so ch' Ella porta un'anima impastata di Cavalleria et adorna di non ordinaria prudenza, non isdegnerà dunque l'offerta che le fo del mio Animo, che, come cosa manco imperfetta del pennello, avrà più proporzione con la singolarità dei suoi meriti, ai quali riverentemente m'inchino.

Di Roma questo di 24 di Giugno 1662.
Di V.S. Ill.ma
Devot.mo et Obbligat.mo Servitore
Salvator Rosa.

I. 4 Salvator Rosa, letter to Don Antonio Ruffo, Messina, August 21 1663

Published by Borelli ed., *Salvator Rosa: Lettere*, letter 289.

Illustrissimo Signore,

Dal pontualissimo Signor de Rosis ricevo una lettera nella quale con troppe generose dimostrattioni Vostra Signoria Illustrissima premia le mie fatighe poiché non contenta d'haverle riconosciute con la mano ha voluto anche agiungervi gl'honori della sua penna (tutta due motivi degnissimi del suo bell'animo) al quale con ogni prontezza consacro ogni mia habilità con assicurarla di trovarmi sempre pronto per

l'esecuzione de' suoi comandamenti che in mancanza di non poterli sodisfare per colpa delle debolezze della mia arte, corrisponderò almeno con le vive espressioni delle lodi, e della gratitudine. Il Cielo conservi con Vostra Signoria Illustrissima le tante sue virtuose inclinazioni, et a me non manchi di compatirmi i mezzi da meritar le sue grazie e baciandoli le mani li prego dal medesimo il colmo d'ogni prosperità di Roma questo dì 21 di Agosto 1663.
Di Vostra Signoria Illustrissima

Obligatissimo e devotissimo servitore
Salvator Rosa

I. 5 Salvator Rosa, letter to Don Antonio Ruffo, Messina, April 1st 1666

Published by Borelli ed., *Salvator Rosa: Lettere*, letter 321.

Illustrissirno Signore e padrone osservandissimo
Ho promesso più di una volta al Signor de Rosis di servir Vostra Signoria Illustrissima ma perch'io non depingo per arrechire ma solamente per propria sodisfazione è forza il lasciarmi trasportare dagl'impeti dell'entusiasmo et esercitare i pennelli solamente in quel tempo che me ne sento violentato. Ond'è necessità che Vostra Signoria Illustrissima compatisca questo qual si sia in me oblighata vocazione, assicurandola che venendomene l'appetito ella sarà da me se non sodisfatta almeno pontualmente obedita e di core. Li fo riverenza questo dì 1 di Aprile 1666.
Di Vostra Signoria Illustrissima

Obligatissimo e affezionatissimo servitore
Salvator Rosa

I. 6 Salvator Rosa, letter to an unidentified patron

Published by Lucilla Mariani, "Un album di appunti di Salvator Rosa," *Accademia e Biblioteche d'Italia* XVII: 6 (1943), 340.

"M.(onsignore) R.(everendissimo)
Nel partire che fece Sua paternità di costì, restai mortificato grandemente, in considerare la mia male fortuna, che ad (sic) lui haveva hauta, dico p(er) essere sta(ta) fatta degna de' suoi comandi, ma patiencia n(on) p(er) questo voglio nè intendo che sia partita la nostra amicitia e (per)chè per essermi pervenuto all'orechio io suo desiderio n(on) ho voluto mancare di afaticarmi p(er) procurare di trovare ancor io qualche cosa spirituale come V. S. (?) ha comandato ad altri, essendosi forsi difidato della mia persona, mi dispiace n(on) haver potuto ritrovare altri che queste poche cose che n(on) stimerò (?) certo di sua sodisfatione dunque sua paternità molto reverenda si compiacerà restar servita di agradire il poco p(er) il molto che havrei voluto poter fare p(er) V. S. a quale professo havere particolare obligationi la prego ad essermi un'altra volta più cortese in comandarmi ch'io in servirla procurerò quella solicitudine che più in me sarà posibile."

II. *Poems by Giovan Battista Ricciardi*

II. 1 G. B. Ricciardi, "Sotto Rigida Stella," Canzone by Ricciardi for Salvator Rosa

Published by Cesareo, *Poesie e Lettere*, 138-148; from codice 1990 in the Biblioteca Angelica di Roma (cartaceo, dal secolo XVIII, miscellaneo, a c. 211) and variants in codice 2048 in the same archive); entitled: "Che non hanno intervallo o termine le avversità, e che l'essere scopo delle disgrazie è proprio della Virtù; quindi si deve compor l'animo a prepararlo con costanza." Canzone del Sig. Gio. Battista Ricciardi al Rosa pittore.

I

1 Sotto rigida stella
Chi nacque per languire
Non aspetti altro mai che influssi atroci.
Ha la sorte rubella
5 Immortale il martire
Et i di men furenti ha più veloci.
Nel sentier del Ferètro
Muove di vita il passo
E della tomba al sasso
10 Batte, nè resta mai, con piè di vetro.
Muore alla fine; e l'ostinata Guerra
A farlo calpestar lo muta in terra.

II

Sempre inhumano il caso
Ruota le cose humane
15 E celato ne lassa il quando, e il come.
Dal desio persuaso
Crede l'hoggi al domane
Ma del gioir non trova altro che il nome;
Che da fonte inesausta
20 Con immutabil serie
Derivan le Miserie
E gl'Infortunii trae Fortuna infausta.
S'una cieca dormi, l'altra fu desta,
E da tempesta usci nuova tempesta.

III

25 Parlo d'affanni a prova;
E di sorte superba
Il sofferto rigor detta alla penna;
Con funesta riprova
Esperienza acerba
30 Ne'suoi mali erudite i mali accenna.
Discesi in questa luce
Con sinistri presage
E tra mille naufragi
Per me non ebbe il Polo orsa, o pulluce.
35 Penai, mai sempre, e incatenar può solo
Col mio stame reciso Atropo il duolo.

IV

Un momento di pace
Non mi concesse mai
D'inesorabil Cielo empio furore.
40 La memoria tenace
Con i trascorsi guai
Dà presente material al mio Dolore,
E son tanto infelice
Che non può la speranza
45 A l'età che mi avanza
Un giorno sol desiderar felice;
Da sventura a sventura io so che vado,
E che la fin d'un male a l'altro è grado.

V

Da i miei torbidi Fati
50 Altro non vanto in sorte
Che fuggitivo il ben, fissi gl'affanni,
E gli spazii passati
Di questa o vita o morte
Numero con le pene, e non con gl'anni.
55 Mi son proprii i tormenti
Come la luce a gl'astri
Che a produrmi disastri
Quasi a gara tra lor fanno i momenti,
E provo in me che a chi non ha ventura
60 L'uso fatto al penar, cangia natura.

VI

Pur da tanta fierezza
Agitato e trafitto
Fra le tempeste mie vivo tranquillo.
Agguerrita fortezza
65 Contr'ogni scossa, invitto
Nel mio lacero seno alza il vessillo.
Piansi già nelle fasce
Gl'accidenti futuri;
Hor ne gl'anni maturi
70 So che deve pesar ogn'huom che nasce.
Così me stesso e soggiogato e domo
A gl'eventi de l'huom, disposto ho l'huomo.

VII

Vota à già la faretra
De l'armi più mortali
75 Nè cessa il saettar, la mia Fortuna.
Porto un petto di pietra,
Ella vi arruota i strali
E su i contrasti miei le forze aduna.
Egual Fortuna atroce
80 Il suo valor non have,

VIII

85 Segno è di mente grande
L'esser esposto a i dardi
Che l'implacabil Dea fuggendo avventa;
Quercia che i rami spande
Poderosi e gagliardi
90 Solo d'Euro gli oltraggi in sè sostenta;
Canna che torta cede,
Perch'è vil, si difende;

Con viltade è men grave,
Con virtù che resiste è più feroce.
Non pugna dell area l’altero instinto
Con chi sia preparato ad esser vinto.

Colà gli sdegni accende
Dove trova il destin costanza e fede;
95 Ma le ferite che in un petto imprime
Son caratteri al fin d’alma sublime.

IX

Quel cor degno è di gloria,
Che non curò perigli
E dal timor l’humanità divelse;
100 Adora la memoria
Fra le morti e gli esigli
Di Scipio e di Caton l’anime eccelse.
Un Fabrizio mendico,
Un Rutilio scacciato,
105 Un Seneca svenato
Vanta fra suoi trofei l’honore antico;
Son cote i mali alla virtù virile,
E chi sempre è felice è sempre vile.

X

Vive ne’ prischi fogli
110 Fra gli strazi e gli scherni
L’eleate Zenon, vive Anassarco;
Son del fato gl’orgogli
Balsami sempiterni,
E trionfal della fortuna è l’arco;
115 L’ire sue son temute
Solo dal volgo errante;
Un Socrate constante
Antidoti al morir fa le cicute;
E per ergersi statue in mezzo a gl’odi
120 Cangia in tanti scarpelli Attilio i chiodi.

XI

Di quel giusto Aristide
La fama anco rimbomba
Esposta all’onte d’un furore insano;
Servo Platon si vide,
125 A Menennio la tomba
Quasi mancò, ch’è patrimonio humano;
Trionfò Tuberone
Delle penurie estreme,
Tutti gl’affanni insieme
130 Uniti a’ danni suoi vines Stelpone;
Siam costanti ancor noi, che i nostril scampi
Un di forse saranno illustri esempi.

XII

Rosa, il tempo sen vola
E di lui non si sente
135 O la passata, o la ventura parte;
D’una breve parola
Dura meno il presente;
Nascendo muore, o nel venire si parte
Se si rapida è l’hora,
140 Dunque ogni affanno è breve;
Ciò ch’alla età si deve
Un momentaneo ‘fu’ scioglie e divora.
Ciò ch’ha principio è col suo fin congiunto,
E il presente al ‘fu’ distingue un punto.

XIII

145 Rosa, il nascere è pena,
Il vivere è fatica,
Et il morir necessità fatale;
Così forte catena
Ambo gl’estremi implica,
150 Che distinguer non so Morte, o Natale;
Ci prova eternal forza
In quest’erma palestra;
L’onnipotente destra
Guida i seguaci, e i renitenti sforza;
155 Il decreto del fato il tutto regge,
Ma pria del fato a noi virtù dia legge.

XIV

La ragion ne ricordi
Che sta sovra gl’affetti
E quanto di comune habbiam con Dio,
160 Con impeti concordi
Sudino i nostri petti
Per atterrar, per debellar l’oblio;
Fabro d’illustri carmi
Coroni altrui la fronte,
165 Bontade a noi più pronte
Presti contro l’età le forze, e l’armi,
Siaci il comporre i carmi opra gradita,
Ma il primo studio sia compor la vita.

XV

Tu gran Re de’ pennelli
170 La natura già vinta
Hai, le porpore su ne’ tuoi colori;

XVI

Io che sperar non posso
Ch’al mio cener ignoto
Sopravviva di me favilla o fumo,

Tu de' fregi più belli
La penna ornate e cinta,
Dalla man, dall'ingegno hai doppi allori;
175 Ma de'gemini lumi
Onde chiaro tu sei
Più vago a gl'occhi miei,
È'l candido fulgor de'tuoi costumi,
Quindi mover potrai contro il destino
180 Con tre gran vite un Gerion divino.

Tento al giogo già scosso
185 Ridurre i sensi, a Cloto
Solo questo di me furar presumo;
Se le guerre io disarmo
Dell'interno tumulto,
Nel mio sepolcro occulto
190 Non venga il lauro a coronare il marmo:
Adorando virtù bramo, che l'alma
Martire degl'affetti habbia la palma.

XVII

Vivere ignoto al mondo,
Morir noto a me stesso,
195 È d'ogni mio pensiero il voto estremo;
Con aspetto giocondo
Nel terribil congresso
Dire a morte vorrei: Di te non temo;
Se l'animo io compongo
200 A sprezzar quell'assalto,
Voglio poggiar tant'alto
Che divenga stupor ciò, ch'io compongo;
Ma chi l'etade a meditar dispensa,
D'esser mortale eternità non pensa.

XVIII

205 So, che la vita fugge
E so, che il vario corso
Rapido al par del sole affretta, e volve;
So che consuma, e struggle
Del tempo audace il morso
210 I fogli, e i nomi, e gli reduce in polve;
So ch'egualmente ingombra
Lete i saggi, e gl'Eroi;
E al fin so che di noi,
Quando rimane assai, rimane un'ombra.
215 Ogni cosa confonde il caos cieco,
E i limiti prefissi il tutto ha seco.

XIX

Di noi mortali ogn'opra
Alla morte è soggetta,
Viviam tra cose al terminar vicine;
220 Ciò che n'avvien di sopra,
Ciò che spiace, o diletta,
Grande instinto natio, rapisce al fine.
Transitorie et alterne
Duran poco le gioie,
225 Duran poco le noie,
Voglion cosi le prescrizioni eterne:
Non è più del gioire il duolo intenso,
Ma 'l fa più grave effeminate il senso.

XX

Pena più nell'amaro
230 Che nel dolce non gode,
Fra qualitadi eguali infermo il gusto;
Quindi del volgo ignaro,
O cecitade, o frode,
Ardisce di chiamare il Cielo ingiusto:
235 Forsennati giuditij!
A che tanto esclamare?
Sono i mali, e 'l penare
Tributi della vita e non supplitij:
Sembra il penso di quella a noi severo,
Ma può portarlo un huom? dunque è leggiero.

XXI

La mente affascinata
De i miseri profani
Si sognò quei fantasmi, affanni, e doglie;
Virtude essercitata
245 Ride a quei nomi vani,
Anzi messe di gloria indi raccoglie;
Son chimere l'angosce,
Sono larve le pene,
Ciò che succeed è bene,
250 Ma la fragilità non lo conosce.
Sono affatto del mal le cose ignude;
Ma sono il bene, e 'l mal, vitio, e virtude.

XXII

La costanza non cade,
La vita non risorge,
255 Quindi tragge la vita ogni divario;
L'istessa povertade
Diversa in sè si scorge
Vergognosa in Cumene, illustre in Mario;
La gloria, e 'l tradimento
260 A spontaneo martiro
Spingon Mutio e Topiro;
Generoso, et infame ecco il tormento;
Vuoi la morte d'honor priva, e feconda,
Mirala in Banto vil, forte in Coronda.

XXIII

265 Rosa, quest' è l'inganno
Del deluso intelletto,
Cangia i nomi alle cose, e le confonde,
Chiama dolore, e danno
L'utile, et il diletto;
270 E sa che sotto l'un, l'altro s'asconde;
E ben ch'il tempo esprima,
Ch'a torto egli si duole,
Creder però non vuole,
Che sol misero è l'huom quanto si stima;
275 Del Ciel si lagna, e pur ne' casi sui
Non han colpa le stelle, il male è in lui.

XXIV

A noi fortezza altera
Armi la destra, e lunge
Dall'ondeggiare altrui, ridiamo in porto.
280 La fortuna severa
Co'suoi dardi ci punge;
Sprezziamla pur, chè il suo furore è corto;
Durar più la sua possa
Di noi stessi non puote,
285 Che le bugiarde ruote
Volger ella non sa dentro la fossa;
Adamantino usbergo, e saldo scudo
Contro tutti i suoi sdegni è un teschio ignudo.

XXV

Della tomba trovarci
290 Nel laberinto estremo
Non può, se troncò a noi la Parca il filo;
Indarno a saettarci
L'ire armerà: sicuro
Una pietra ci sia riparo, e asilo;
295 L'infaticabil braccio
Mova l'empia a piagarne
In fin, che questa carne
Ci lega il piè coll'odioso lacci:
Si sa che star non può ferma, e composta
300 Una massa di polve a i venti esposta.

XXVI

Ma che? Soffriamo in tanto,
E spezzi al fato il corno
Soffrenza in un cor bella Regina;
Credi, Rosa, al mio canto:
305 Presto verrà quel giorno
Ch'alle nostre vittorie il Ciel destina;
Tra'l foco, e 'l vento, i pregi
Dimostran l'Oro e l'Elce,
E l'indurata selce
310 Se percossa non è, cela i suoi fregi.
Sia fulminato e scosso il fragil velo;
Glorioso è cader per man del Cielo.

II. 2 G. B. Ricciardi, *Il Tempo*, Canzone del Sig. Gio. Battista Ricciardi al Sig. Francesco Cordini

Text taken from two separate manuscripts: BNCF II IV 253, 162r-171v, and BNCF II III 484, 23r-33v.

I

1 Su le rupi Carpatie (io stesso il ridi)

Proteo cantare; Ad'ascoltarlo intorno
corse l'umido Armento,
tacque il roco fragor del Salso Argento,
5 l'aura lascio dj ragionar col giorno;
rapitj i Humj algosj
dalla dolce Armonia cingean sù i Lidi
il canoro Pastor d'assedio adorno
egli i misterj ascosi
10 della fugate età lieto esponea
con insolitj accentj, e sj dicea

II

Prima che fosse il Tempo, e fosse il Mondo
era l'eternitade, e intera, e bella
durava in sè ristretta.
15 Hor sè fù innanzi al tempo, e fù perfetta,
dunque il Tempo non è parte dj quella.
Egl'è ben un immago
della natura eterna, e nel secondo
spazio del corso suo dj cui favella.
20 Questo progresso ungo
de brevj instantj in cuj l'un l'altro opprime
l'immota eternità col moto esprime

III

Falto è il Tempo col Mondo; Essa chj pensa
che le Tempre dj lui caduche, e fralj

IV

Oltre alle vie del Sole, et oltre à i fissj
35 raggi del firmamento ove ne meno

25 fossero innanzi al Cielo.
Con le stelle che adora Efeso, e Delo
il Tempo à un tempo istesso hebbe i natalj.
al rotar delle sfere'
ei fù misura, e della Mole' immense
30 distinse col suo piè l'orme fatalj
ei con frodj Guerriere
fuggendo uccide il Mondo, e à luj preservire
l'assidice Mortj ond'ei rinasce, e vive.

giunge la mente à volo
fuor del confin dell'un, e l'altro polo
spalanca un Antro horrendo il cieco seno.
Antro che ignotj, e stranj
40 portentj svela à suoj nascorj abissj
con lume palpitante, e mal sereno;
che de gl'Astoj Contanj
vi riflettono appena i bassi aspetti
un incerto fulgor de i rai soggettj.

V

45 Sembra l'erma spelonea altra, et Enorme
voragine d'Averno; il Caor siede
à custodine il vareo.
Sovrà i lacerj fianchi inalza in Areo
Terstudine che in sè vacilla, e cede:
50 un Sol macigno intero
non si ritrova in quella Mole informe
che sola appar d'ogni Rovina erede
lacrima humor severo
sù quei putridj sassi ei sassi fiange
55 quasi fera del Nil ch' uccide, e giange.

VI

Terribile ornamento Angue squamoso
su la ruvida porta attoto ingiro
sta d'Architrave in vece.
L'aria cui di purgarsi al Sol non lece
60 spirando un grave odor nega il respiro.
stilla dentro alle soglie
la Clessidra ad ogn'hor senza riposo
del pianto humano il lubrico zaffiro.
L'Arenario raccoglie
65 le cenerj de Regni arsi da i Fati,
e in Cor rinnuova i precipizi andati.

VII

In quest'horrido speco il Tempo alberga,
il Tempo dormatore, il Tempo edace,
ch'ogni cosa dissolve;
70 sordido Nembo di corrotta Polve
un immonda Corona al Crin gli face;
tripartite ha le chiome;
triplice il petto, e triplicate terga;
e con trè corpi è Perion verace;
75 spiega in trè Nomj un Nome;
distingue una possanza in tre possanze;
e divide un sembiante in trè sembianze.

VIII

L'un de corpi è il presente. O come breve
di statura, e di forma! ei senza carmj
80 si trasmuta, essi cangia
vivo, e vero Saturno i figli mangia,
ne sà far distinzion frà carne, e Marmj:
non hà core, e non ode
onde non frena il precigizio lieve
85 per pietade, ò timor di preghi, o d'Armj;
è nudo perche rode
ciò che indanno lo veste, e che lo copre
ne si lacia velar chi tutto scuopre.

IX

Ha si rapido il pie ch'avanza i lampi
90 Et appena il pensier ne scorge il moto
Nello spazio trascorso,
Ma benche sia così leggierj al corso
Gravissimolo rende un pondo ignoto
Quindi avvien che i vestigi
95 Negl'istessi lo amanti imprima, e stampi
Quando sembra vicino è già remoto
Fabio d'alti prodigi
Non ha giunture onde ne men si piega
Calato, e nella destra ha falce, e sega.

X

100 L'altro corpo è spassato, ei di rapine
S'adorna, e veste, ha tutti i membrj offesi
Dissipati, e sconvoltj
Quasi rozzi frammentj insieme accoltj
Sono incognitj alcuni, alcunj intesi
105 Dalle pupille humane
Le parti ch'al presentela piu vicine
Si lasciano veder chiare, e palesi
L'altre che son' lontane
Restan' confuse, e quanto più e scosta
110 Ciascuna dal presente è più nascosta.

XI

Perche più non camina, e più non opra
Piede, o mano non ha; dietro gli vanno,

XII

Il terzo copro suo futuro e detto,
Ma quai fattezze egli habbia, o qual figura

E la storia, e l'obblio
Quella cerca illustrarlo, e al bel desio
115 Memoria, e verità scorta gli fanno:
Questo all'incontro offusca
Ciò ch'ella squopre, e in suo soccorso adopra
S'ignoranza, e'l timor ch'ombre gli danno,
E la torbida, e isca
120 Invidia, che lo vede segue, e lo seconda
Del torrente Leteo gl'arreca l'onda.

Alcun ridir non puote;
125 Volano intorno a luj tenebre ignote,
Et un denso vapor fulto l'oscura,
Ogn'umano disegno
Suda per ravvisarne il dubbio aspetto
Tra'l dubbio onor di quella nebbia impura;
130 Ma che l'occhio e l'ingegno
Inutilms.e per vederlo anela
Che quanto piu si traccia ei piu si cela.

XIII

Tale il Tempo sen'va. Mirabil mole
Di piu ruote composta in mille giri
135 Risvona entro lo spero;
Il Tempo vola, e la rapisce seco,
E l'instabilità par che gl'inspiri
Periferia dentata
Volta i cerchi velore al par del Sole,
140 E gli fregia un color simile all'Iri
Con arte inusitata
Guida, et accorda il volator maligno
Della macchina ignota il vasto ordigno.

XIV

Ei con la propria manda moto, e legge
145 Alla ruota maggior, questa è construtta
Si materia, e di forma
E dal moto di lei regola, e norma
Prende ne giri suoi la mole tutta:
La natura discorde
150 Di due ruote minorj unisce, e regge
Perche alcuna di lor non sia destrutta
D'antipatia concorde
Le vertigini lo tempra, e non rompe
L'una genera ogn'or l'altra corrompe.

XV

155 Mosse da queste due spiegano unite
Qualti'altre ruote la volubil fuga
In contrarie vicende
Quella è tulta feddezza, e questa avende,
La terza inumidisce, e l'altra asciuga;
160 Due leggiere, e due gravj
Han sempre eterna pace, eterna lite
Ch'or s'accosta, or alletta, or fugge, or fuga;
Queste volgon le chiavj
Di vastissimo cerchio in cuj si mira
165 Come nasce l'etude, e come spira.

XVI

Qui senza restar l'anno bimembre
Consuma in se delle sue parti estreme
Le reliquie cadenti
Su gli atomi volubili, e correnti
170 Cresce degli anni il redivivo seme
Sù la ruota incessante
Dal futuro Gennai fugge il dicembre
Il Verno ancor non nato in calza, e preme
L'autunno agonizzante
175 Fugge l'anno se stesso, e non si stanca
E tra le fughe sue crescendo manca.

XVII

Maraviglie dirò cade, e risorge
Sul natal, su la tomba, e in un confonde
Il ferebro, e le fasce;
180 E fimera fenice, or muore, or nasce,
E se medesimo in se medesimo asconde.
Postumo di se stesso,
E di se stesso antecepor si scorge
Di santi parti sue larghe, e profonde
185 Si vede il solo adesso,
Et uccidon l'adesso appena nato
Due momenti un futuro, et un passato.

XVIII

Qui con pie seguace i mesi agara
Cinti di salma, e con la Luna infronte
190 Stampan' orme velori
Pugnano insieme indomitij, e feroci
E s'incalzan correndo all'orizonte
Entro un diverso volto
La fraterna sembianza appar' ben chiara,
195 Pur' non depongon mai l'offese, e l'onte
La statura è non molto
Varia fra loro, e non riposan maj
E son' i primi due men vecchi assai.

XIX

Qui trattan i giorni aspri dicellj
200 E sorgono a sfogar l'ire fatali

XX

210 Qual Cidonia scelta il corso muove,
Ciascuno al gran conflitto un sol tra tantj

Gladiatore di luce
Vicend cuol'è 'l danno, e gli conduce
A scambievole strage odio immortale.
Restan da gl'Idi uccise
205 Le gia superbe None, e cedon quelli
Alle calende poi con sorte eguale;
In cento, e cento guise
Lo sdegno fradi lor piu si conscentra
E mentre cade l'un l'altro subentra.

Un solento rivolge il parso,
Et è pigro cosi, che stanco, e lasso
Appena ogni quart'anno ci farsi avanti,
215 Qui ralto si volve
L'esercito dell'ore antiche, e nuove
Tutte varie d'altezza, e di sembiante;
L'ore d'acqua, e di polve
Sparsa han la buina, e la dorata chioma
220 L'ore che fu tant'anni ignote a Roma.

XXI

Qui anch'esse fan querra, è l'armi alterne
Muovon d'ombre, e di luce. Irai la sera,
Gli orrori il di divora,
Cade all'alba trafilta in sen l'aurora,
225 E poi l'alba al meribbio,e pied s'altera
La vincitrice Notte:
Così trionfan con vittorie eterne
De momenti i momenti. In Tolta schiera
Le distanze interrotte
230 Volgon i brevi giri, e quindi a noi
Un istante distingue il prime, e 'l poi.

XXII

In tal guisa si strugge, e si consuma
Nel gran cerchio l'età. La terra è sparsa
Nei cadaveri estinti
235 Reston gli aspetti lor quasi indistinti
E quella luce moribonda, e scarsa
Qui gli anni d'Egitto,
E de Greci, e di Romolo, e di Numa
Giacon con l'ala lacerata, et arsa
240 L'anno di Giulio invitto
Tutti gli ucise, e trionfante spense
In un con l'anno Ebreo, L'anno
Acarnense.

XXIII

Su la confusa strage agili, e brevi
Spiega il Tempo i suoi voli. Egli non tenne
245 La fuga un punto immota
Con costante incostanza i vanni ruota,
Ne d'arrestarlo mai stanchezza ottenne;
Volan quasi faville
Di polve irrequieta atorni lievi
250 Al ventilar delle voraci penne,
E quell'aride stelle
Altro non son, che le vestigie, e i senni,
Che si veggon di voi sceltri, e Diademi.

XXIV

Sta la Cronologia quivi in disparte
255 E del veglio triforme al corso intenta
L'esamina, e distingue,
E su cento volumj, in cento lingue
Ogni moto di lui scrive, e comenta:
Trieteridi, e Lustri
260 Le fancorono intorno, e con bell'arte
Mostran l'Olimpie a lei l'età gia spenta,
Con i calculi industri
Gl'intervalli tra scorsi ella richiama,
E riscontra con lor l'opre, e la fama.

XXV

265 Siedonle avanti esecutriej, e serve
L'Epoche, e l'Ere, e i computi discordi
Tentan ridurre in vano
Ch'emulo a lei l'Anacronismo insano
Turba, e confonde i numeri concordi;
270 Egli con modi ingiusti
Scaltro inventor di macchine proterve
rende i secoli antichi, e muti, e sordi;
Quindi i fatti vetusti
Rider non ponno, e in danno ella s'affanna
275 Perch'o nulla n'intende, o che s'inganna.

XXVI

Entro il gelido speco infausta, e folta
Congenie di sepoleri il fato aduna;
Con orrido lavoro
Qui la tomba è dell'età dell'oro
280 Che già col mondo hebbe comun lacuna;
Note lacere, e guaste
Narran sul marmo che vi fù sepolta,
Ma non v'è già di lei reliquia alcuna
Sorto immensa cataste
285 Di ruine indistinte è l'urna occulta,
E col pallido pie l'Edra l'insulta.

XXVII

Mirasi appreso a lei l'arca abbattuta
Che nel suo grembo dell'argentea etade

XXVIII

Vicino a questi due di spine onusto
Sorge avello minore: il museo nacque

Le nobil ossa accolse;
290 Ma inguisa il tempo dissipolle, e sciolse,
Che poca terra alfin son diventate;
Sta sul coperchio infranto
La fatica a lej figlia, e in voce muta
Accenna altrui le ceneri avanzate;
295 Ella piange, e 'l suo pianto
E' un amaro sudore in cui diffusa
Lava quel sasso ove la madre è chiusa.

300 Sul margine deserto;
Nel macigno di lui roso, et aperto
La breve età del bronzo estinta giacque
Vi si scorge pur anco,
Ma disfatto in carcami il freddo busto
305 Cui della dolce pace il miel non piacque;
Qui con l'ire al fianco
Il guerriero furor suona la tromba,
E falta Eco mortal mugge la tomba.

XXIX

L'ultimo monumento asconde, e serra
310 L'iniqua età del ferro il corpo esangue
In ruggine è converso;
Tiede su l'orlo di veleno asperso
La cruda tirannia tinta di sangue;
Qui la gran bilancia
315 Della fugata Astrea rotta è per terra
Luditrio alpie dell'avarizia esangue;
Fosca il ciglio, e la guancia
Scherza col tradimento ivj la fraude;
E lieto il vizzio al tradimento applaude.

XXX

320 E già spenta, o mortalj egri, e delusi
L'età del ferro, ella fù più virile
Dell'età, che trascorre
Usa il nome di lei questa che corre
Perche non c'è sin or nome più vile,
325 Tra tutti i nomi infami
Quale esprimer potra gl'indegni abusi
Di quest'età si sordida, e servite?
Del troncane gli stami
Nemesi ultrice, e con orrendo esempio,
330 Cada il secolo ingiusto, o sia men empio.

XXXI

Cosi Proteo cantò. L'acque, e l'arene
Lieto applauso feria. D'un breve salto
Nell'onde ci si sommerse,
Il Ceruleo cristallo a lui s'aperse,
335 E sonora tornò la spuma in alto.
Francesco in note alcune
Il mutabil pastor nato in Pellene
Narrò del tempo il fuggitivo assalto;
Le mistiche figure
340 Altri riveli alla futura gente
Tu sia tanto a i miej detti alza la mente.

XXXII

Quasi folgore ardente il Tempo cade,
E gli spazzij disfà; ma non per questo
Breve è la vita umana,
345 Breve rassembra alla vil turba insana,
Ch'ha sognante il pensier quan'è più desto
Ell'è grande, e n'avanza
Seben s'impiega, e la ventura etude
Unisce a se con fortunato innesto,
350 Con investa possanza
Ogni nostro operar virtù governi
Basteranno i momenti a farei eternj.

XXXIII

Quanto visse Alessandro? ei giunse appena
Al sesto lustro, anzi non visse interi
355 Della sua vita gli anni,
Quanti gliene rapiro i gran tiranni
Or il fato, or lo sdegno, or i piaceri?
Pochi alti di virtude
Tolsero a lui la condizion terrena
360 Falti contro la morte i di guerrieri.
Virtù su l' ossa ignude
Sparse i balsami suoi dentro alle tombe
E la Fama di poi le cangia in trombe.

XXXIV

Volgi meco all'incontro Vaccia il guardo
365 Quasi del viver suo gli anni perdutj
Numerò con la destra
Suol del senno l'etade esser maestra,
Epur la trapassò simile a i buitj;
L'ore oziose, e pigre
370 Tutte dico e all'obblio languido, e tardo,
E del Tempo i suoi di furon rifiuti,
Qual Aquila, o qual Tigre
Un secolo sparigli. Or chi in'addita
In tant'anni di vita un dì di vita?

XXXV

375 Francesco a te, che sin adora un punto
Non vivesti a te stesso, ei di donasti

XXXVI

Cosi del Tempo i taciturne oltraggi
Schernirà del tuo nome il nobil grido,

Degli amicj alla sorte;
Promette la Virtù doppo la morte
Anni di vita incircoscrittj, e vasti;
380 Saetta il tempo in danno
Oltre al sepolcro; è quella pietra appunto
Il termine, ch'a lui confina i fasti.
Rinascerai sù l'eterno
Di stigi ad onta, e della Parca il giogo
385 E se novello abbuccerai nel rogo.
Vinta l'età per sempre;
Hanno i secoli ancor brevi le tempre
390 Perchi dell'ozio vil torpe nel nido,
Virtù sola è l'Ulisse
Di quest'empio Ciclope, e i forti, e i saggi
Toglie vittoriosa al dente infido;
Gli anni di chi ben visse
395 Non estingue il terebro, anzi gli avviva
Che la vita di Gloria è ricediva.

XXXVII

Breve è la vita mia; poi che di lei
Nessun falto che fusse illustre, e chiaro
Le penne al Tempo svelse;
400 Mi diede il Cielo inelinazzioni eccelse;
Ma negommi le forze il Fato avaro,
Odio gli anni trascorsi,
Perche nulla di grande oprar potei,
E della colpa d'un destino amaro
405 Io sostengo i rimorsi;
Odio i presenti, che trapasso oscuri,
E perche non ho Gloria odio i futuri.

XXXVIII

Così del Tempo i rapidi furori
Mi contendon ch'io speri oltre alla fossa
410 Prorogare i miej giorni;
E privo il nome mio di gesti adornj
Resterà nel sepolcro in un'con l'ossa;
Ma se di fama eterna
Misi nega acquistar Gloria, e splendore,
415 Gia ch'eguale al desio non è la possa;
Almen la Gloria interna
Havrò de vinti affetti, ignoto altruj
E Virtù doppo me saprà, ch'io fuì.

XXXIX

In noi dunque, ò Francesco un' fermo ardire
420 Incontro al Tempo a guerreggiar s'accinga;
Ma con pugna diversa
Sfida con l'opre tù l'etade avversa,
Io d'affetti armerò turba solinga;
Chiaro applauso di Gloria,
425 Raccontando di te gl'impeti, e l'ire,
A'i posteri sarà nobil lusinga;
La mia muta vittoria
Nel segreto haverà palme segrete
E'l mio trionfo il Campidoglio in Lete.

II. 3 G. B. Ricciardi, "Che la forza del Dolore eccede la capacità dell'umano intendimento, Al Sig.[r] Volunnio Bandinelli Aio del Ser:[mo] Principe di Toscana, Canzone del Ricciardi"
BNCF Magl. VII. 868 – Var: Poesie diversi, 540r-543r.

I

1 Piango le mie miserie, e so ch'altrui
Non sia palese il pianto
Che troppo alta cagion lo detta al ciglio:
Ei d'ignoto penar lubrico figlio
5 Appresta le cadute
A chi vuol rintracciar l'arme di lui:
Di fatal violentia areano ineanto
Lacrime sconosciute
Dall'interno del suoi fromada di lumi,

II

Intelletto finito a duolo immenso
Non ben s'adegua; è 'n vano
15 Cosa tenta capir, di sè maggiore.
Fugge l'altrui notizie il mio dolore.
Sol conosce se stesso;
E'l sente sì, ma non l'intende il senso,
Troppo astratto da lui, troppo lontano.
20 In se da se reflesso
A me medesmo ancor s'asconde, e vela;

10 Ma di quei mesti fiumi
Neppun cerchi i principj: ha note l'onde
Il nilo de' miei pianti, e i fonti asconde.

La cagion mi si cela,
E pur veggio gli effetti: i mali estremi
Anno i frutti palesi, ascosi i semi.

III

25 Cicatrizzar non può l'antica piaga,
Ch'io porto, e sento ognora
Negli spasmi di lei l'angosce usate;
Ma col noto dolor pene celate
Vengon miste, e confuse
30 Forse di nuovo mal l'alma presaga
Anticipa gli affanni. Annunzia allora
Le tempeste racchiuse
Quando freme l'Egeo senz'Euri avversi.
Forse avvezzo a dolersi
35 Sempre da nuova causa il cuor deluso,
I motivi del duol prende dall'uso.

IV

Quante volte esclamai: Perchè mi doglio?
Occhi, perchè languite?
A perpetuo grondar chi v'ha dannati?
40 So, che non resta mai da' suoi latrati
La memoria trafitta;
Ma ragionano in voi d'alto cordoglio
Lagrime più solinghe, e più romite.
Legge l'anima afflitta
45 I parosismi di novella febre
Nelle vostre palpebre;
Poichè del lagrimar l'usanza acerba
Il solito tenore in voi non serba.

V

Sulle vostre ruine, e i vostri mali
50 Voi gemete talvolta;
Ma ritrovate pur conforto al fine.
Or del costume uman rotto il confine,
Un non so che vi sforza
A distillare ognora acque immortali,
55 Ed in onde a versar l'alma disciolta.
Sento espressa la forza,
E discerner non so chi mi costringe.
Ahi, che questa è una Sfinge,
Per cui non trovo Edipo; e ben comprendo,
60 Ch'ella m'ucciderà, s'io non l'intendo.

VI

S'apro la bocca, al sospirar m'invita,
E con ferree ritorte
A' lamenti mi trae destin crudele.
Volli parlar di gioia, e voi querele
65 Mi cambiaste l'accento:
Parti dal labro articolato in vita,
Giunse all'orecchio articolato in morte.
Di mentito contento
Se fu la fronte mia giammai dipinta;
70 In quella gioia finta
Contra 'l torrente, che inondommi il viso,
Felpi indarno d'un labro argine il riso.

VII

Eccessiva agonia durar non puote;
Stringe gli spazi suoi,
75 O la potenza al fin cede all'oggetto:
Ma del mio tormentar vario è l'effetto;
Non ammette intervalli;
E son le pause a lui del tutto ignote:
Che non solo occhi miei, sgorgan da voi
80 I flebili cristalli;
Ave l'alma i suoi lumi, e più frequente
Allaga il sen la mente:
Si rasciugan talvolta i vostri rai,
Ma le luci del cor non restan mai.

VIII

85 Queste, ch'escon da voi, sorgenti vene,
D'un Oceano interno
Son traboccanti rivi, angusti rami.
Per filar di mia vita i neri stami,
Prestai l'umore a Cloto,
90 E deplorai, pria vhe perduto, il bene.
L'orrido influsso d'un destino eterno
Piagommi anco remoto;
E fu nel presagir la mia fortuna
Erudita la cuna:
95 Pianse l'occhio indovino i proprj eventi,
E conobbe da lungi i suoi tormenti.

IX

Così già nelle fasce il mio martire
All'etade inesperta,
Che nulla conosca, non giacque occulto:
100 Crebbe poscia co' gli anni, e fatto adulto
Improvviso gigante

X

Gran collirio agli affetti è la stanchezza,
110 Che l'assiduo penare
Rende stupido al duolo, e i lunghi affanni
Tolgon l'uso del senso a' proprj danni.
Pende incerto il pensiero,

A momenti avanzò le forze, e l'ire;
E trattò l'alma a violenza aperta;
Nè pure un breve instante
105 Lasciò voto di pene: a' di gli spazj
Misurai co' gli strazj;
E collo stuol delle mie folte offese
Il numero degli astri in van contese.

Nè creder può la sostenuta asprezza.
115 Ma le presenti mie procelle amare
Serban la fede al vero;
E quest'ultimo di non lascia in forse
Le disgrazie trascorse;
Che soffrir non potria vita si dura
120 Chi l'abito non fé nella sventura.

XI

Ma per molto penar, l'aspra mia doglia
Le sue tenaci tempre
Nulla scema di forza, o di polpanza;
In virtù dell'età se stessa avanza;
125 E più fervida, e viva
Conserva in me del sospirar la voglia,
E lusinga le luci a pianger sempre;
Si dal cor mi deriva
Vasto un diluvio, ch'all'altrui pupille
130 Partecipa le stille:
Ogni ciglio, che versa, un doppio rio
Bagna i lamenti suoi col pianto mio.

XII

Per segreti a' rivi, a' fonti
Spinge se stesso, e porta
135 Peregrini i suoi flutti il mare ondoso,
Per gli abissi del suol corre nascoso,
E sconosciuto svena
In sembianza di fiume il fianco a' monti.
Così negli occhi altrui l'onde trasporta
140 L'infinita mia pena;
Che non posson di lei l'immensa mole
Versar due luci sole:
Cerca il soverchio umor l'esito altrove,
Ma l'origine sua da me si muove.

XIII

145 Così, Volunnio, per fatale instinto
Pur un momento breve
Non posso trapassar privo di duolo:
Sol pensando alla morte, io mi consolo,
Che la falce vorace
150 L'affanno vincitor farà mio vinto,
Quale a' terpidi venti esposta neve.
Manca l'ora fugace;
E so, che al fin di lei gli avidi insulti
Danno pace a' singulti:
155 Qualche fiutto, o fortuna anno i tuoi sdegni,
Se il non temer la morte a un cuore insegni.

XIV

Tu, Volunnio, che puoi carchi di pregj
Contar gli anni all'Etade,
Canuto il crine, e più canuto il senno;
160 Tu, che Pallade, e Clio reggi col cenno,
E l'eroiche virtudi
Nel sentier della gloria additi a' regi;
Tu che sommo valor, somma bontade
Famoso in sen racchiudi;
165 Tu, che cinti rimiri i proprj onori
E d'oliva, e d'allori;
Tu puoi del fato mio spezzare il telo,
Che chi da norma a' Ré, da norma al
Cielo.

XV

Sciogli i canori accenti, e l'aurea cetra
170 Spieghi l'usato metro
Ad emular nell'armonia le sfere.
Sospenderà lassù l'ire severe
Intenta al plettro eburno,
Posto l'arco in oblio, l'empia faretra.
175 Da te rapito volgerassi indietro
Il mio fero Saturno.
Sò, che il Getico Orfeo ne' regni ombrosi
Introdusse i riposi;
Tu non tratti di lui corde men belle,
180 Ne' l'Inferno in rigor vincon le stelle.

II. 4 G. B. Ricciardi, "Amico sulla corda"
BNCF Magl. VII 868. Var: Poesie diversi, 555r-556v.

I
Vane preghiere chi di vita è privo
Mandi pur disperato, e gridi al vento;
Che voi con saggio, e doloroso accento
Per muovere a pietà gridate al vivo.

II
Nè la misericordia è fatta sorda
Al vostro roco, e laenterol suono;
Che un cembalo scordato, e male in tuono
Effetto è di pietà mettendo in corda.

III
Domini pure empio destin fatale
Sul viver vostro, e vi condanni a torto;
Siete ad onta di lui vivo, e non morto,
Sebben fa celebrarvi il funerale.

IV
In prigion festi voto a più d'un santo,
Non men che faccia un moribondo in letto;
E fu il vostro pregar cotanto accetto,
Che vi trovate sollevato alquanto.

V
Anzi di più, perche vantar polpiate,
Che il fil di vostra vita non è frale,
E che nol può troncar Parca letale,
Da grossissima fune appendolate.

VI
Se vi dolete d'esser sventurato,
Perche si varie sian vostre sfortune,
Son gravi le cadute, ed importune,
Ma siete ad ogni tratto rinnalzato.

VII
Se nude si dipingono le Grazie,
E voi le membra avete disvestite;
Eccovi almeno in parte raddolisce
Colla Cor nudità vostre disgrazie.

VIII
Voi ne vivete, che il buon puo vi faccia,
Senza che polpa alcun mostrarvi a dito;
Per uomo spensierato, e infingardito
La vita sostenendo colle braccia.

IX
Ma che dico? v'ammiran le persone
Per buon criminilista, e letterato,
Mentre di cio, che an gli altri giudicato
In iure sostenete conclusione.

X
Bon è vero però, giacchè il timore
V'alpale nel ripeter gli argomenti;
Di comune opinion volgion le genti
Non siate per uscirne con onore.

XI
E sapete, vi giuro per mia vita,
De torturio avete argumentanti,
Che sebben mascalzoni, ed ignoranti,
Tutto il trattto lo sanno a mena dita.

XII
Ma veggio ben, che voi restate offeso,
Che il giudice vi ponga alla tortura,
Onde aggravato da noiosa cura
State sopra di voi molto sospeso.

XIII
Con volto più giocondo, e più soave
Vorrei vedervi; perchè a dirne il vero,
A voi, che state sempre sul leggiero,
Per ora non vi comple star sul grave.

XIV
Se il ripeter si da per le difese,
Le leggi in vero a voi son violate;
Mentre con raddoppiar nuove strappate,
Nella reputazion darvi l'offese.

XV
Instate dunque per l'appellazione
Chiedete un altra pena temporale;
Che non s'appetta ad ogni tribunale
Ma al foro Episcopal la sospensione.

XVI
Ma sento dir, che voi sete sforzato
D'un tal gastigo a rimaner contento,
Perchè cosi con pubblico strumento
V'ha il giudice costretto, ed accordato.

XVII

Quanto che v'è di buon sicuro sete,
Vi porterà rispetto ogni persona,
Se a guisa di chi in capo ha la corona,
Lunghe le braccia a vendicarvi avete.

XVIII

Atlante, e Alcide l'incurvata schiena
Vi fa parer, che sostentiate il cielo;
Ma io er dirla non vi stimo un pelo,
Se scender non vi vedo in questa arena.

XIX

E se eleggete un posto cotant'alto,
Che ineguale mi rende al vostro merto,
Ambi non passerà più di concerto,
Ch'io non posso seguir chi va di salto.

XX

L'amicizia tra noi svani sovente,
Che lasciaste dà birri sollevarvi;
E se l'animo mio ho a palesarvi,
Stabil voglio l'amico, e non pendente.

II. 5 G. B. Ricciardi, "Democrito redivivo"
BNCF Magl. VII 868, Var: Poesie diversi, 577v.

I

Spogliato già della corporea salma,
D'Acheronte varcai gli orridi lidi;
Ma non però tra gli urli, e tra gli stridi
I risi suoi disimparò quest'alma.

II

Ond'è Pluto l'altier: sè fia, che in calma
Le tempeste (mi disse) e miri, e ridi;
Ritorna al mondo, e questa età deridi,
Che più d'ogn' altra al vizio offre la palma.

III

Così trovo in mirar la luce, o belle,
Che di riso giammai non fu sì degna
La sciocca umanità sotto le stelle.

IV

D'aver virtù la nobiltà si sdegna:
E 'l genio vil del popolaccio imbelle
Nuove forme di riso al labro insegna.

II. 6 G. B. Ricciardi, "Vita umana fugace, consigliera"
BNCF Magl. VII 560. Gio. B.[a] Ricciardi, Poes. Varie, 67r-68v.

I

O del Cor passioni indomite
Sempre deste, e che chiedete?
Se di pace avide sete
Del desio sopite il fomite.

II

E non speri il senso fragile,
Che durar possa il diletto
Ch'a rapirlo inorda Aletto
Spiega il volo averito, ed agile.

III

Quindi pensa anmo attonito
Di goder breve stagione
Ferrea legge al Mondo impone,
Che tra i fior nasca l'Aconito.

IV

E quand' anche intatti, e liberi
Ti piovessero i contenti
Nel piacer perdi i momenti
Su'l piacer mentre deliberi.

V

Ruota il Sole i dì voludili
D'ogni stral veloci al paro,
E l'usure un marmo avaro
A pagar ci trae de'giubbili

VI

Muove il piè lieve, ed instabile,
E' la vita, e la fortuna
E' di lor sotto la luna
Non si sa chi sia piu labile

VII
Quanto c'è lacheri incorpora,
Ogni cosa Atropo atterra;
L'oro al fin si cangia in terra,
Ed in sindone, la porpora.

VIII
Dunque, omai nel petto imprimiti
Che trà poco ai dà finire,
E ch'intorno al tuo gioire
L'ore ladre an posto i limiti

IX
Stà fisso; In van consideri
D'allungar lo spazzio al fato,
E quel ben, che fà beato
Non è quel, che tu desideri.

X
E che val, che lunga serie
Conti l'uom o' età volante
Per morir, basta un'instante,
Chi più vive hà più miserie.

XI
Gli anni umani in cui tu specoli
Brevi è vero anno le tempre;
Ma se tu timiri al sempre
Son momenti ancora i secoli.

XII
Dunque sol pensa ad accrescere
La virtude, e non la vita
Che virtù rende infinita
Quell'età, che non può crescere.

XIII
Mai non seppe il tempo abbattere
Chi già rinse i proprij affetti;
Perche sol dentro ai difetti
Nel morir vive il carattere.

XIV
Fiamme or d'ira, ed or di Venere
Concepisci a poco, a poco,
Il nutrir nel seno il fuoco
Argumento è d'esser cenere.

XV
Nel furor, le voglie laie
A frenar và sù la fossa;
E contempla in frà quell'ossa
Qual sia Silla, e qual sia Taide.

XVI
[in margin: "prescrivere"] S'al pensier soprai descrivere
Quel parlar, ch'indi rimbomba,
Ti sarà là sù la tomba
Il morir scuola di vivere.

II. 7 G. B. Ricciardi, another version of the "Vita umana fugace", here entitled "Chi vince le Passioni ha vera pace"

BNCF Magl. VII 560, Gio. B.[a] Ricciardi, Poes. Varie, 22r-23r.

I
O del cor passioni indomite
Sempre deste che chiedete
Se biamate haver la quiete,
Del desio sopite il fomite.

II
Speri indanno animo attonito
Di goder lunga stagione
Ferrea legge al mondo impone
Che tra fior nasca li Aconito.

III
Nella mente ò folle imprimiti
Che fra poco hai da finire;
E che in torno al tuo gioie
L'ove ladre han potre i limiti.

IV
Ruota il sole i di volubili
De pensier veloci al vano,
Gl'usure un marmo avaro
A pagar ci trahe da giubili.

V
Questa vita in cui tu specoli
Breve, e vero, ha le sue tempre;
Ma le tu rimiri il tempre,
Son momenti ancora i secoli.

VI
Fiamme or d'ira, et or di venere
Conquisci a poco a poco
Il nutrire nel seno il foco
Augomenta che rei con ere.

VII

Pensi, in vano, in vano consideri
Di produr l'ove al tuo fato,
E quel ben che fà beatu
Non è quel che tu desideri.

VIII

E che val che lunga ferie
Conti l'Uom a' età volante?
A morir basta un' instante:
Chi sue vive ha piu miserie.

IX

Non si sa qual sia piu stabile
O la vita, o la fortuna,
L'ambidue soto la luna
Fanno a gara, a chi e piu labile.

II. 8 G. B. Ricciardi, "Iddio", for Fra Bonaventura Cavalli

BNCF Cod. Pal. 285, 38r-44v.

I

1 Ò dell' eterno fabbro
Maravigliosa destra, à cui fù gioco
Di quest'ampio universo il gran lavoro,
L'immenso suo poter tremendo adoro
5 Mentri parlo di tè fievole e roco,
Temerario è quel labro
Che sù gli arcani tuoi si fà loquaci,
Et ingrato all'incontro è quel che tace,
Nel favellar di tè, son' egualmente.
10 E gran colpa, e gran fallo il troppo e il niente.

II

Ogni cosa creata
Narra le lodi tue, di tè ragiona
Con mistica eloquenza il mondo intero,
Or se à gli applausi tuoi m'apro il sentiero
15 Tu ne sensa l'ardire, e su perdona;
D'un alma innamorata
Gli umili affetti à tè non fian discari.
So' che'all oggetto è la potenza impari.
So' ch'un verme son' io di terra impura
20 Ma benchè verm io sia son tua fattura.

III

Degli alati guerrieri
Nati in grembo alla luci à gl'inni avvezza
Sdegni il canto d'un cuor, che tutto è fango;
Ma sulle macchie mie mentr'io le piango,
25 Sparza la tua pietà raggi, e bellezza;
Ne' miei rozzi pensieri
La tua grazia Signor date s'infonda,
E l'egra lingua mia sarà faconda;
La bellezza natia spogli all'ingegno,
30 E fà cigno di gloria un corno indegno.

IV

Ma chi darà le penne
Al desio che ti cerca ancor che cieco
Della immensa tua luce entro à gli abissi?
Tu sei quel sol che non conosce e eclissi,
35 E che l'auge, e'l meriggio hà sempre seco.
Sol che mai non sostenne
Oriente, ed occaso, i cui splendori
Non attrassero mai nufi, ò vapori,
Sole à front' di cui sembra formato
40 Sol di tenebri oscurè il sol creato.

V

Chi dunque addatta i vanni
D'Aquila eccelsa ad una Talpa vile,
E chi m'insegna à sormontare all'Etra,
Per cercarti, ò Sig.^{re} à un cuor di pietra
45 La fede in un sarà lampa, e focile.
Tù non soggetto à gli anni
Gli anni tutti comprendire in te racchiudi,
E innansi à gli occhi tuoi stan gli anni ignudi,
Che del futuro, e del passato l'opre
50 L'ignoranza, e l'obblio per te non copre.

VI

Tu sull'ali dei punti,
Spingi il tempo alla fuga, e pure intorno
Mentr' il tempo raggiri inte riposi,
Per te non han l'età spazij nascosi,
55 Che à te tutte l'età sono un sol giorno.
Per tè non son disgiunti
I novissimi dì da'i dì vetusti
Perchè fosti qual sei, sarai qual fosti.
Tu sempre vivi, e si ritrova insieme
60 In tè la vita, e della vita il seme.

VII

Nell’esser tuo constante
Mancamento non è, non è progresso,
ne distina dall’esser è l’essenza.
Fosti, e l’esser non fù prima in potenza
65 Fù l’atto, e la potenza à un tempo istisso.
Ma quell’antico istanta,
In cui tù fosti non fù prima ò poi:
Non han principio, ò fin gl’instanti tuoi,
Son d’un altra maniera, e d’altre tempre,
70 Perchè ogni tuo momento è eguale al sempre.

VIII

Non soggiaci à vicende
Stan le sorti al tuo piè chine, e devote,
Ch’è gran fato del fato il tuo volere.
Mai non senti divario, e’l suo potere
75 Tè ch’ogni cangio fai cangiar non puote;
Perdita non t’offendi,
Nè giova acquisto, alla pienezza estrema
Dell’esser tuo nulla s’accresce, ò scema;
Perchè solo à tè stisso il tutto sei.

IX

80 Sei geloso, e sicuro
S’adiri, e sei tranquillo ami, e non ardi,
Tallor ti penti, e non soggiaci à doglia;
Muti ogni cosa, e mai non muti voglia
Ogni cosa rimiri, e in tè sol guardi.
85 Inciveoscritto e puro
Riempi il tutto, e pur non resti incluso,
Cirecondi’ il tutto, e pur non resti escluso;
Sei presenti per tutto, e sol lontano
Dall’empio stai, che ti ricerca invano.

X

90 E pur mentri freggendo
Vai gl’iniqui, et i rei non però manchi
d’esser parte ancor donde sei lungi,
Ch’ove non sei per grazia, ivi tu giungi
Con veloce vendetta, e mai ti stanchi.
95 Amabile, e tremendo,
Operoso, e quieto, e posi, e voli,
E stando fermo in tè passeggi i Poli.
Scorri le cose, e non arrivi, ò parti,
Tutto per tutto, e non diviso in parti.

XI

100 Così moto non hai,
Et assegnasti al moto il passo alterno
E fabbricarti il loco essendo immenso
Non senti affetti epur creasti il senso,
E producesti il sempo essendo eterno.
105 Tu sei fosti, e sarai
Acciò e sempre et infinito, e pure
Inumeri facesti e le misure
Non hai natale ò transito, ò confine
e facesti il principio ò il mezzo ò il fine

XII

110 Da qual ampia miniera
La materia estraesti, e come ornasti
La di lei nudità rozza, ed informe?
Tu le insegnasti a desiar le forme
e desti a gli elementi ire e’ contrasti.
115 In dicordia guerriera
Festi l’umido, il secco, il caldo, il gelo
Desti alla luce i rai, gl’influssi al Cielo
Tu ed maniere incognite e nascose
Ordine, e quantità desti alle cose.

XIII

120 Tu fortissimo invitto
Fai con il nome col grande e temuto
L’universo tremar d’alto spavento
Vola il fulmine tuo sull’ali al vento
À fiaccar nell’Abisso il corno à Pluto.
125 Contr’ il perfido Egitto.
i naugragij per te, l’onda deritta
Sul crin’ de faraon porta alla mitra
e un sasso sol ch’in tua vita s’invia
abbatte il vero, il mistico Golia.

XIV

130 Cadono à terra i muri,
Se l’auri in nom’ tuo frangi una tromba,
E picciol suono hà qualità di mina.
Fabbrica un’orso al filisteo rovina,
E rinascendo un crin gli apri la tomba.
135 Finsero ingegni impuri,
Che la notti allugnar già pè bisogno
Per generar quel trionfanti in sogno.
Ma de’ tuoi veri Alcidi è pregio augusto
Dilatar’ à i trionfi il giorno angusto.

XV

140 Tù primo, e sommo bene
Sei nella tua bontà cosi sublime,
ché divenir non puoi, men’ buono, ò meglio,

XVI

150 Dunque in te furo, e sono
buone le cose, e della tua possanza,
han’ la bontà comunicata, e impressa.

creasti, e fù la creazione un speglio
che della tua bontà l'imago esprime,
145 quindi l'acque e l'arene
la luce, il celle stelle, e ciò che apparve
nella tua creazion buono ti parve.
E qual cosa non buon a esser potea,
Se fù la tua bontà del' tutto idea!

Non han però la bontade istessa
Ma dissa tua bontà sol la sembianza
155 Sempre ugualmenti buono
Promovi, e spingi al ben' tutti i mortali
Ne'sei men' buon' quando non vieti i mali
Che quando i mali a non vietart inclini
Son di tua providenza ottimi i fini.

XVII

160 Tu sei perfetto in guisa
Ch'alla tua gran' natura in te compita
Nulla si può detrarre e nulla manca.
Perfezzion più perfetta in van' si stanca
à tracciar' col pensier la mente ardita
165 Ne distretta, e precisa
E la tua perfezzion' ne sol possiede
Quel ch'adesser perfetta in se richiede
Ma' ciò, che di perfetto have ogni cosa
Con perfetta eminenza in Lei si posa.

XVIII

170 Le gran' mole de cieli,
e ciò ch'il girò lor' circonda, e serva
sol con trè dita la tua man sostenta
chi da ti si nasconde in darno il tenta,
quantunque il centro tuo gli apra la terra
175 non fia ch'arte si celi
benchi fuggendo con alati passi
al non e fier' del'nienti anco tornassi,
che ne dal'niente esser può sotratto
chi nascendo da te ne fù già tratto.

XIX

180 Tutto saper' ti scopri
ne dalla scienza ond'ogni cosa intendi
separato ò diviso hai l'intelletto
tù dell'intender tuo sei primo oggetto
e tù sol ti conosci, e ti comprendi
185 ma non per questo adopri
del'descorso le vie chè al'huom concedi
con uno sguardo sol' tutto odi, e vedi
chi cerca il vero agli argumenti accorre
Iddio ch'è verità nulla discorre.

XX

190 A te son della notte
Lucide l'ombre, e dal più cupo seno
Le sue la agli occhi tuoi l'esser puo fondo
tù trascorvendo i limiti del mondo
ciò che sai, ciò che pui rimiri à pieno
195 tù le cose prodotti
non sol vagheggi, ma di più contempli
disse cose future in te gli esempli,
e negli eterni tuoi santi Idiomi
se possibili ancor' hanno i lor' nomi.

XXI

200 Tesson da te discosto
la materia e la forma il vario nodo
onde legan' di poi l'ordin' fatale
tù genere, non hai, ne può ne vale
determinasti, ò diferenza, ò modo
205 a natura, e il supposto
l'essenza, e l'esistenza in te si stanno
e pur' in te composizion non fanno
nell'entita non hai limite alcuno
l'esser indipendente e l'esser uno.

XXII

210 Uno in essenza e trino
nelle persone sei tu primo e solo
d'al tuo non generato eterno Padre
senza principio alcuno ò seme ò madre
generarsi il tuo verbo il Gran figliuolo
215 lui nell'esser divino
è uguale à te tù mente et ei consiglio
ne men' vecchio, è dite benche sia figlio
l'esser Padre, e figliuol' sol' vi discerne
ma son' fra' voi le relazioni eterne.

XXIII

220 Da voi d'amore accesi,
procede il puro amor' spirito uccio
à voi nell'esser Dio pari, e consorte

Restan' le menti, in questo mare absorte
d'onde esce, e torna un triplicato vivo?
225 da che saran' comprese

XXIV

230 Voi che intender volete
Stigi, e nottole ree l'autor del lume
mentre l'ombra, e l'error quagpui ci abbaglia;
chi sia tra voi ch'a dimostrar' mi vaglia
come trè, che son dio sian' un' sol' lume
235 dite se voi potete

questi per troppa luce oscuri arcani,
al deponete i vanni Scavi humani
sicuro à questo sol'vola, e dimora
sol' che meno lo cerca, e più l'adora.

come i secoli innanzi, e innanzi al sole
sia coeterna al'genitor' la probe?
dite come spirando i sommi amanti
non sian' duo spirator', ma due spiranti.

XXV

240 Come genera un'altro
con l'intender se stesso, el Padre, e come
da lui distinto il figlio, e non diviso
dite, ò critici voi del Paradiso
voi, che di raggi à arrogante il nome
245 qual' è di voi si scaltro
che mi palesi in qual' algebre occulta
dell'unita la trinita resulta,
come lo spirito à niun' de due succeda
ne generato sia, mà sol proceda.

XXVI

250 Come generi ò spiri
l'eterno Padre, e il figlio in un con lui
spiritensi, ma generar' non possa
come lo spirito à loro ugual' di possa
spirar non voglia, ò generare altrui
255 ò fabri di dissive
volgetevi à tracciar, con van'desio
la colpa in voi, non la natura in Dio.
L'immensità da lui non cape un cuore
ben che capisca immensità d'errore.

XXVII

260 Voi voi dell'impietade
superbe Anfesibene à cui non basta
pardir'si sfacciato una sol'fonte
sapete pur che le saette hà pronte
la destra di colui el'al'Ciel sovrasta.
265 Io le remote strade
della divinità cercar' non oso,
et a piedi lei dormo e riposo
Sig:[r] allor t'intendo allor ti vedo,
quando humilio l'ingegno, e dico Io Credo.

II. 9 G. B. Ricciardi, "Lettera scritta dall Sig.[re] Gio. Batt. Ricciardi essendo ai bagni di Lucca, Al Sig.[re] Lanfreducci"

BNCF Magl. CL. VII no. 871 – 'Poesie diverse', 163r-163v.

I

Mentre voi godete i freschi
Lanfreducci io sono ai bagni
Per far dentro a questi stagni
Un bucato a i guidaleschi.

II

Per guarir del mio ginocchio
tutto il dì sto' in mezzo a un lago
onde io son quasi presago
di cangiarmi in un Ranocchio.

III

E saria cosa da risa
s'io che qua venni carpone
diventato un Ranocchione
ritornasi in salti a Pisa.

IV

Però mentre in questo stilio
fo' la Zuppa d'uno stinco
sto' nell'acque, e un vino io trinco
che fa girne in visibilio

V

Ma color ch'ammarar gl' huomini
guidan meco a più potare
come fulpe appunto il beve
un peccato in Cenadomini.

VI

Ch'io non bea dice il Ceruvico
io che vo' trincar le prodico
e se ciò Mi negha il medico
può cantare al par d'un musico.

VII
Se mi trovan senza bombola
che mi sporino una costola
e se mai da me discostola
mi Salutin con la frombola

VIII
Quant'a me Paleno, e Androaco
s'hanno a far per loro il recipe
finche d'Aura io sia partacipe
vivo del Vino nello stomaco.

II. 10 G. B. Ricciardi, "Ad un' Amico che domanada un Sonetto, e non dice sopra che, Sonetto"

BNCF Magl. VII. 621, 79r.

I
Se volete un Sonetto io vel faiò
Se più la misa[?] mia stanca vorrà.
E quanto dici verso anch'e fu aurà
E se opervate cominciato l'ho

II
All'altro quadernario intorno stò
Che 'l primo par che sia finito già
E senza piu aggirarmi in qua, e in là
Interj i quadernarj ecco vi dò.

III
Alli verseito me ne vengo giù
Se forse li faro che spero su
Et eccon uno, or ne volete più?

IV
Se manca l'altro noi 'l farem così
Ma che più stolto mi raggiro? orsù
Non volevj un sonetto? eccolo qui.

III. *Poems by Francesco Rovai*

III.1 Francesco Rovai, "Di Francesco Rovai ai gent.mi SS. Et P.roni Col.mi i S.ri Accademici IMPROVVISI

BNCF Ms. ii ii 285, no pagination.

I
Chi non porta il Cervel sotto le schiene
Confesserà, che non è cosa al mondo
Meglio che fa le cose e presto, e bene.

II
Fate operare un chi abbia un po'del Tondo
Mena, rimena, dà, picchia, e martella,
Ci ruota, ruota, e poi riman nel fondo.

III
Un che sa poco arrabbia, e v'arronella
Per for due versi, e pensa a un orciolino,
E gli men fatto intanto una scodella.

IV
Abbraccia adagio, adagio il fuocolino,
Ma l'Incendio, che l'era anda trova,
Non da Tempo, che fogga anco al vicino.

V
Il Torrento che pregno è della Piona
Abbatte in un Baleno ogni rifaro
Il pensar di tenerlo è vana prova.

VI
O stuol d'Ingegni prezioso, e raro
Cari IMPROVVISI miei, voi presti sete
E dei Torrenti, e de gli Incendi al paro.

VII
Non pensi d'arrivarvi onda di Lete
Poi che non prima io mi veggio alle mosse
Ch'alla META veloci eccoi giungete.

VIII
L'acqua hor par del marmo acqua di fosse,
Hor da ver Lodovico è l'Ariosto,
Il furioso ha le gotte, e 'l Tasso tosse.

IX
Voi sete ardenti piu ch'il sol d'Agosto
E d'Agosto lo stile anco in piace
Ch'insegna i mali odor tener discosto.

X
È della Rosa ognun di voi seguace,
Ed ella ch'è cagion, che noi fiorite
V'infiamma e move, e davvi il Brio vivace.

XI
Ira le Rose o Signor voi non dormite,
Ma d'un flag'el di Rose armando il Braccio
Fugate l'ozio, e 'l cieco obblio fenite

XII
Lusinga femminil non davvi impaccio,
Che se vener v'accosta, ecco la Rosa
Punta la fa languire à marte in braccio.

XIII
O delizia del Ciel cara e vezzosa

D'Atomi fatto il mondo altri si finge,
Da te sola veggio fatta ogni cosa.

XIV
Quanto il Cielo apre al guardo, o 'l mar distringe
Quanto la Terra ha di giocondo in grembo
Scherzi son d'una Rosa, allor che pinge.

XV
Alba, Sera, Seren, Tempesta e nembo
Valli, Colli, Fior, Frondi, Huomini, e Fere
D'una Rosa feconda escon dal lembo.

XVI
E forme han tanto belle, e tanto vere,
Che con lor la gran madre hor si consiglia.
Per trarne in generar nuove maniere.

XVII
Ond'io colmo direi, di meraviglia
Figlia non più la ROSA è di natura,
Ma d'una ROSA la natura è figlia.

XVIII
Versi, tornate à tomba, è troppo oscura
La strada che prendete, ecco Talia
Mi fa Visaccio, e quasi anco paura.

XIX
Io torno à noi, che la Costalia Via
Correte à spron battato, e in un instante
Fate al Tempo che fugge una malia.

XX
Scorrato resta il vecchierel tremante
Mentre siamo ognun di voi trasuola
Barbaro di Parnaso arcivolante.

XXI
Chi lo CAVALGA, e chi dalla poggiola [in margin: "Andrea Cavalcanti"]
Lo spinge à ROTOLAR dentro un vallone,
Chi la veste gli straccia, e chi la stola.

XXII
Piu d'un Cazzotto, e piu d'un sorgozzone
Gli apparecchia di Pindo il fiero ABATE
E lo fere, e lo suena, e in ferra il pone.

XXIII
Cede l'antica, e la moderna etate
Al Breviario suo vago e canoro
Dove l'Hore Berniesche ha registrate.

XXIV
Modreator del sacro Romio Coro
Le suore di Parnaso egli confessa
E gli apron queste ogni secreto loro.

XXV
La Gloria del suo Chiostro è la Badessa

ed ella che li ha preso lor per devote
Non può star senza lui, egli senz'essa.

XXVI
Ma contro a Tempo, e contro all'empia Cloto
[in margin: "Malatesta"] Sento da MALA, et ingegnosa TESTA
Capate dor, che mai non vanno à voto.

XXVII
Quando il Tempo si pensa alla la Cresta
Un LIPPO che più d'Argo acuto sa il guardo

Un gran fendente in sul groppon gli assesta.

XXVIII
Lodate ò muse un giovano gagliardo
Che SIGNOREGGIA ogni improvvisa sente
Ma troppo ardito a i colpi, o troppo tardo.

XXIX
Con lunga Picca un pugnalin pungente
Accoppia questi, et una spada porta
Che su l'ottuso filo sa piu d'un sente.

XXX
Con essa vuol partir come un Torta
La Testa al vecchio, e gia l'avria divisa,
Ma per quell gran Teston la sega è corta.

XXXI
Prende la Picca, e fier come marfisa
Piattona il Tempo, ond'egli affin si muore

Non so se da suoi Colpi, o dalle Risa.

XXXII
Seguelo un Ganzomel tutto sapore
Che l'AMBROSIA ha nel nome, e nelle spoglie
Pur troppo avvezza altrui ferir nel cuore.

XXXIII
Dalla Faretra un sodo nardo toglie
Ma mentre al dato segno egli lo drizza
Voltasi il vecchio, et ci di dietro il coglie.

XXXIV
Seco un altro Ingegnon corre la lizza
Che la SALUTE ha nel cognome impressa
Ma fa scempio del Tempo e'l martirizza.

XXXV
Al fin tutto lo stuolo à lui s'appressa
De veloci IMPROVVISI, ecco di Rime
Grandine tempest subita, e spessa

XXXVI
S'alza un duono canoro, e va sublime
Oltre le nuti, oltre le vie de' venti
E'l Tempo, e Cloto, e'l negro Lete opprime.

XXXVII
Freddo il ROVAIO, à qesti tuoni ardenti
Colsa stordito il sen d'alti stupori
Tace ammirando, e co suoi fiati algenti
Rimansi in Villa à far seccare Allori.

Delle Ill.me loro cortesiss.e

Vero obb.mo Ser.e
Rainero Fucasco

III. 2 Francesco Rovai, "A Salvator Rosa che havea dipinto Astrea, che volava al Cielo"
BNCF Magl. VII. 872, 611r.

I
Tra nubi Astrea sovra l'Olimpo avesa
ROSA ne tuoi color da noi si parte;
ma bella intanto, e dall'obblio difesa
a te che al Ciel la fughi il Ciel comparte.

II
Grida Natura ah ch'alle fughe intesa
qui delle glorie tue mantiensi a parte
qual pia sarà? se in un illustre offesa
oltraggiando le dee s'eterna or l'arte?

III
Medusa orrenda in apparir gia fea
di marmo i volti. Or di stupor secondo
vien marmo un core all'apparir d'Astrea

IV
O Rosa ingiusta il tuo fiorir giocondo
sfiori miei pregi. E allor la giusta dea
che tu nel mondo entrasti usci del Mondo
del Rovai

IV. *Poems by Antonio Malatesti*

IV. 1 Antonio Malatesti, "A Salvadore per una Cena"

BNCF Magl. VII 220, 376r-379r.

I

1 Voi sete o Salvadore un huomo grande
e con parole sempre vi salvate [this line is crossed out in the ms.]
in far cene agl'amici, e desinari
e credo che a cercar tutte le bande
5 del mondo non si trovi un uno pari
noi faresti parer buone le Ghiande
mentre non fate spendere i danari
pero la gente volentier s'attacca
a casa vostra ove son polli a macca

II

10 Ma se si dice per proverbio antico
che le galline vecchie fan buon brodo
le vostre che non mai vidder parico
in gioventù che gli facesse nodo
son state tali a dirvela da amico
15 che la minestra pronto i non vi lodo
e voi potete senza dubbio alcuno
darcela a cena in giorno di digiuno

III

E s'egli e ver d'una certa gallina
ch'al tempo antico per[*illegible*] di mana bonda
20 la qual faceva l'huore ogni mattina
non mi par ch'alle vostra corrisponda
perche questa ora d. la s croce hina
ed 'ero grassa se che parea tonda
dove le vostre eron magre stentata
25 egli serocchini quei che l'han mangiate

IV

Or se i Capponi fan venir le gotte
quando sono un po grassi, e un po tigliosi
noi siam sicuri a tutte quante l'otte
di non avere a diventar gottosi
30 che chi le vostre gallinelle inghiotte
senza che sa vi dorma, o si riposi
sicuro e di guarir da tutti i mali
per ch'una serve pbe serviziali

V

E guirerai al corpo di mia vita
35 che a quelle poverave sventurate
non avevi cavata la pipita
e per questo non erano ingrassate
o l'arno fatto trista riuscita
per esser chiove un' o tua volte state
40 poi ch'han guirera a noi carti vicini
che voi fat'areo incatta di Polsini

VI

Ma questo poco importa noi l'abbiamo
mangiate, e altri la del pagar l'assunto
le frutte vostre poi noi le lasciarne
45 per che le non protean mandar giu l'unto
eran di noazza del frio d'adamo
perche inguiar non si potevan punto
e ingoriate che son chi ce ci stia
che dopo il parto la piu fame che pria

VII

50 In quanto ai lampredotti me la passo
tra le galline e lor non fo vantaggio
perche se quelle prive eran del grasso
questo non men del burro, e del formaggio
Un altra cosa vi dire piu basso
55 che se si crede a chi n'ha fatto il saggio
del cavò, e burro in cambio era restate
un certi certo odor dell'esser mal lovado[?]

VIII

Ma voi che sete al nome Salvadore
e col parole sempre vi salvata
60 in questa cosa ove ne va l'onore
averete le scuse apparecchiate
e direte che nacque il tristo odore
dalle persona a mensa collocate
non da voi che cosi huom di buona laga
65 togliesti il meglio affetto di bottega.

IX

Direte che i piattelli, e le scodelle
erano invetr'ate, e cotte bene
e la pignatte tutte buone, e bella
onde da lor quell tristo odor non viene
70 e che la vostra bottega e di quelle

che sta fornita come si conviene
ne gli mani altro in questa settimana
che i corni della note di Befana.

IV. 2 Antonio Malatesti, "La Melagrana"
BNCF Magl. VII. 356, 287r.

I
La Corona che ame vien per natura
morta di che rampollo al mondo io regno
ma il vedermi abitar fuor delle mura

II
mostra ch'io ed Regina e ne ho il legno.
L'esser io poi fruttifera e sventura
per che [*illegible*] alla prima ch'io m'impregno

III
crepo e fuor mentro per la crepatura
mille epui figli e tutti grandi d'un segno
Questi finti di portora e vestiti

IV
tutti i diversi d'or mostransi ornati
prema che sien fuor del mio ventre uniti.
Ma prova o dati in preda a i disgustati,

V
o per sapiar del popol gl'appetiti
messe al governo [*illegible*] degl'ammalati
vanno in conversazion ed gl'ammalati.

IV. 3 Antonio Malatesti, "O Baldassari che non sola hai volto"
Poesie Diverse, in BNCF cod. Magl. CI. VII, vol. 219, 30v; reproduced by Eva Struhal in "*La Semplice imitazione del naturale". Lorenzo Lippi's Poetics of Naturalism in Seventeenth-Century Florence*. PhD Dissertation. Johns Hopkins University, 2007, Appendix IV.

I
O Baldassari, che non solo hai volto
ad dipinger le Cupole, e le Sale
ma delle Muse il Coro virginale
hai nel tuo studio spesso anco raccolto

II
Vien or che con la sferza i' mi son volto
contro di Don Tarsia pittor bestiale
e diangli per guarirlo dello stolto
una spogliazza che non faccia male

III
Vieni or ch'è meco il Vanni, il Lippi, e il Rosa
con cent'altri divisi in più quadrighe
armate chi di verso e, chi di prosa

IV
E gli darren sin ch'ei la fuga piglia
una caccia tremenda virtuosa
come merta un Pittor delle stoviglie.

V. ***Poems by Antonio Abati and Andrea Cavalcanti***

V. 1 Andrea Cavalcanti, "Una Conversazione di Gioco vulgarmente, detta una Badia al Sig. Antonio Abati invitandolo a giocare"
BNCF Magl. VII 872, Varie Poesie diverse, 765.

I
Quei due giocatori vostri di Primiera
e de Teston fatali calamite

II
E verrebber saper la cagion vera
perche le carte stazzonai fuggite

si maraviglion che voi non venite
ad'arrischiar due resti in questa sera

che non sempre alla guerra s'han ferite
e suol fortuna ancor mutar la cera

III
Ben che sia scuro il Ciel breve e la via
stassi a disagio, et aspettar vi fate
eppur siate l'istessa cortesia

IV
Dunque venite presto, e non tardate
ch'e proprio un voler darci gelosia
esta mal la BADIA senza l'ABATE.

del Sig. And.[a] Cavalcanti in
nome della Conversazione

V. 2 Antonio Abati, "Risposta del Sig.[re] Abati" (in response to the previous poem by Andrea Cavalcanti)

BNCF Magl. VII 872, Varie Poesie diverse, 766-767.

I
Non rispondo signori al vostro invito
col rime o consonanze di sonetto;
che il suon de miei quattrin se n'e fuggito.

II
Divorcie in altro metro il mio concetto
e per che va in CAPITOLO L'ABATE
risponderò con un capitoletto

III
Se a primiera mai piu giocar mi fate
mi venga un FLUSSO e smerdini la vena
e m'entrino nel culo le minchiate

IV
Mostrommi un pezzo la fronte serena
l'empia fortuna, or vistomi POETA
pregalarmi voltami la SCHIENA

V
Non ho piu come pria la faccia lieta
e temo andar dei MATTUTINI in lista
pensando ai miei quattrin giustia compieta

VI
Primiera mia come sei bella in vista
con perdi agevolmente in una sera
quel ch'in molt'anni a gran pena
s'acquista

VII
Con un campione poi gioco a primiera
che non vuol la metà ma vuol la meta
cacostoppin[?] per la sua bella CERA.

VIII
Con un dottor ch sa com'un Profeta
ma in questa cosa sola e un ignorante
che non sa quel che sia perder moneta.

IX
Non voglio in somma che Fiorenza cante
questi due versi quando non mi vede.

X
Pertroppo staffilar de CAVALCANTE
L'ABATI andò verso MILANO a piede.

V. 3 Andrea Cavalcanti (?), "Salvatori Rosae Napolitano Poeta e Pictori" (excerpts)

BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 9r-9v. The manuscript is somewhat illegible.

Vero Genio, et ingenio admirabili penicisso[?] et epthata partier intigui
[...]
Hec ROSA vere Musarcum è vivi desio leita, Mercuri induston[--]
educata cura, Apollinis privilego peremnis, non à Cytherea
purpure ardorem mututa, sed tribuit.
[…]

Genuio lume Parthenope, auspit Roma, Florentia coluit dice
suspiut orbis universus.
Huis vigilis, et studio spectantium occuli pudicam voluptate,
aures obleitamontum innoquim[?] ferunt acceptum,
Pittura spiritum Poesis uberem proventum, eniditio lucem
Amicitie, et Fidei numina
incrementem, venerationem, et decus.
[…]
Tante itaq virtuiti, epanimo plaudens, vertiati, non
amori obsequons
Andreas Cavalcantes interiturae amicitiae
Teneram, Minerva suadente, ultro exibet.

V. 4 Antonio Abati, "Diogene nella Botte" for Rosa, in honour of the painting of *Alexander and Diogenes* (c. 1640-5)

Published in Abati, *Poesie postume*, Vienna 1676, 114; published in part by Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il cardinale Francesco Maria Brancaccio tra Napoli, Roma e Firenze", *Storia dell'Arte* 112: 12 (2005), 135 n 89.

Un Filosofo antico à cui rimasa
Non era in patria sua Vigna, nè Casa
Perche mostrar voleva
A le persone dotte
Che Casa, e Vigna haveva
La sua vita faceva dentro una Botte
È ver, che in primo aspetto
Sembrava à gente molta
Huomo di pazze tempre
Perchè la casa sua fatt'era à tetto
E per mostrar che fusse fatta à volta
Andava in volta sempre;
Ma parch'egli lo sapea
Nè Tartaro parea
Benchè di Botte havesse,
A molti un dì queste ragioni espresse
Un Filosofo mio pari
Ch'entro cella volubile ha il Tugurio,
Da cervelli assai lunari
È chiamato un volubile Mercurio.
Se ne mente
Chi dirà mia mente matta
Ogni gente
Ne la Botte assuefatta
Al ben far sempre si piega
Perch'ha il cervello suo sempre è Bottega
[...]
Nè parer deve strana
Di Botte l'inventione,
Che se la vita humana
Hebbe già di militia il paragone
Stimo un concerto di voler divino.
Che l'humana militia habbia il Bottino

[...]
Un pregio tal da la Vinaria mole
che s'Alessandro vuole
Chiamarsi il Magno, io chiamerommi il Bevo
Senza far tante spese
D'Appartamento doppio
Qui verno e state agiatamente accoppio
E la camera mia serve ogni mese
[...]

V. 5 Antonio Abati, "Al Signor Nostro c'haveva figurata la Fortuna sedente in un Globo di vetro, in atto di sparger oro con una mano, e di chiuder gli occhi con l'altra", in honour of Rosa's painting of *La Fortuna* (private collection, UK)

Published in Abati, *Poesie postume*, Vienna 1676, p. 391; published in part by Volpi, "Salvator Rosa e il cardinale Francesco Maria Brancaccio tra Napoli, Roma e Firenze", *Storia dell'Arte* 112: 12 (2005), 135-6, n 92.

I
Oh gradita a i mortali
Stravaganza gentil d'Astri pentiti
D'ogni intorno scherniti

II
Sembran dotti campion Lerna di mali
E vite gli ordin fatali
Torcer benigno il Cielo si riconsiglia

III
E di Virtù la tua Fortuna è figlia
Non d'un aureo tesoro.
Larga hai la man, nè avaro tatto il cela,

IV
Ma schernitor de l'oro
Stampi al mortal la Deita' che anela,
Quindi Virtù rivela,

V
Che più Divin de la tua Diva sei,
Se Fortuna non hai, Fortuna crei
[...]

VI
Cieca non è qual fue
Che da illustre pennel fatta è visiva
[...]

VII
Stassi di cieca in atto,
Mentre a sete di Rei, piove i tesori,
Ma da varco di tatto

VIII
Scerne a ciglia socchiuse i tuoi lavori
Quasi a vantar colori
Nel sembiante de l'orba i rai tu rechi,

IX
Che non son de' Color Giudici i ciechi
Su fragil vetro assisa
Schernita hai lei, ch'a le preghiere è pietra

X
Ma de la Dea derisa
Un vetro fra l'Eternità t'impetra,
Anzi a ragione arretra

XI
De l'esca sua l'audace Tempo il dente:
Frato Vetro talhor rode il rodente
[...]

XII
Muto pennel de la Fortuna è il fabro.

VI. *Poems by Francesco Cordini and Averano Seminetti*

VI. 1 Francesco Cordini, "A Salvator Rosa, che faccia il ritratto di Girolamo Signoretti"

BRF, Cod. 3148, 338; published by Elena Fumagalli, in *Filosofico Umore e Maravigliosa Speditezza*, 67.

I
Dà di mestica, o Rosa, a un canovaccio
e fa spianar, ma sia da cesso, un doccio
e stemprando i color grossi in un coccio
piglia poi per pennello un strofinaccio

II
E dipingi costui c'avrà gran spaccio
per mascheron da fogna, o d'acquidoccio
comincial dove vuoi, perch'è un fantoccio,
che tanto è farli il cul, quanto il mostaccio.

III
Sciocchi furo il Bassano, e l'Andovrandi
l'un co' i colori, e l'altro co' i concetti
gli animali in formar più memorandi

IV
che gli averian n'un sol tutti ristretti
quanti al mondo ne son piccolo, e grandi
se avessero dipinto il Signoretti.

VI. 2 Francesco Cordini, "Sopra Girolamo Signoretti, Libraio, e Stampatore, Capitolo, Al Sig.[re] Averano Seminetti"

BNCF Magl. VII. 364, 199r-201v.

I
Io non piglio già mai la penna in mano,
S'io non mi sento innanzi una gran vena
Come la vostra Signore Averano

II
Ha che d'inchiostro l'ho macchiata, e piena
Vedrete a quanto arriva il mio cervello
E se la Musa ben me la dimena.

III
Sarà il suggetto mio sopra di quello
Amico nostro, grande di persona
Appunto quanto è picciol di cervello.

IV
E se ben io mettendol in Canpona
Non vi pensate ch'io gli voglia male
Perche si è carità se si cogliona.

VI. 3 Averano Seminetti, "Risposta del Sig. Averano Seminetti al Capitolo del Sig. Francesco Cordini"

BNCF Magl. VII. 364, 202r-209r. Reproduced here only in part.

[…] O mi piace il tuo stil, cosi burlisco
Vi è più ch'allo spagnolo il ravanello
O il nostro vin di Chianti ad un Tedesco.

Ma con gli Amici libero favello
Solo forse bassato esser potrai
A bassar questo di poco cervello.

[…]

Ma ti posso ben dire alla sprovista
Che non per questo l'Amico s'offende
Perch'ho veduto anch'io più d'un sommista.

Costui, chi lo cogliona lo riprende
Le riprender chi orra è necessario
De ture il coglionarlo ci s'intende. […]

VII. *Poems by Other Friends*

VII. 1 Valerio Chimentelli, "Il Natale della Rosa"

BNCF Ms. ii. ii. 50, 67r-75r, "Il Natale della Rosa. Recitato in Casa del sig.r Salvator Rosa nel giorno del suo Natale, Del Sig.r Valerio Chimentelli"

Corre nell'ampiellla de' Cieli suona carro d'oro immortale, il grand; auriga del giorno: Senza tema d'errore che lo travij, libero da stanchezza che lo rassenga, non soggetto ad inciampo, che lo rimuova invariabil mai sempre nel moto, regolato neigizi infaticabil nel corso. Così regge il freno de'gl'enni, dà norma alle stagioni, distingue l'ore a' mortali, perchè lo calle quaggiù della terra i lor mal sicuri passi dirittamente conduce. Or come ardisce malconsigliata lingua con temeraria licenza affermare, che egli nel grembo del Mare quasi stanco si colehi: che mal frendando le briglie de' poco esperti destrieri, precipitoso ne voli a sommerger se stesso vireparabilmente nell'onde? Or come non perdona inconsiderate parlare i Titoli di nascente, e di cadente a quell'esterno pianeta, cui diede la natura titolo si spezioso, e si degno d'esser padre di vita; anima de' viventi? come' dico quel celeste corriero, che 'n si breve spazio di poc' ore angustiss.e gl'immensi campi delle sfere sovrane rapidamente tranpalsa, or nasce, or muore per vani detti di bugiardissima bocca?

Dovuti rimproveri in vero alla stoltezza di così fatte parole, contro le guali già correrei ancor io ad Impugnar l'anni d'una severa censura, se dà più alti sentimenti riscosso l'addormentato mio ingegno, non fussi costretto ad acconsentire, che ben si dice allora nascer il sole (con tutto che non mai privo di vita, sempre ricco di luce) quand'ei fà pompa di sue rare bellezze, e di suo vago splendore, invitando le pupille de'riguardanti ad ammirarlo, e le lingue a celebrarlo: allora per contrario si dice morire, che egli involandosi a noi, non lascia di se stesso altr'orma, che tenebre odiose, e funestissima notte. Quello è vero natale, che a vera vita è principio, e quella è vera vita, e vera nascita al Mondo, che a guisa del sole porta seco i raggi più illustri di memorabil nominanza, e forza le lingue anche più rozze a favri tromba di sue chiarezze, e di suoi sovranj prega risonar per tutto il glorioso rimbombo. Ne crediate, che viva chiunque nacque, s'ei non vive alla lode; ne chiunque vive senza lode, esser maj nato a suoi giornj; anzi talora a mezza vita rinasce chi d'improviso all'alte imprese, e magnanime generosamente s'appiglia; e muore non mai vissuto colui, che tra gl'orrori d'una vita sconosciuta più tosto fù sepolto, che visse, indifferente alla vista de gl' Vomini, dalla tomba il natale, e dalla vita la morte non disuguagliando.

Già m'accorge Udit.zi, che dalla cena festosa di questa fiondeggiante campagna, che spira d'ogn'interno una primavera gioconda; dalla mensa geniale, che qui lietamente risplende, dalle voci, e da'plausi, e dalla gioia ridente, che sul volto di questi miei seguace senza contegno riflesse da gl'odorosi diademi, che le tempie, e il seno, e l'animo deliziosamente gli adornano, v'accorgesse ancor voi, che oggi è l'avventuroso nascimento della Regina de fiori. Giorno così solenne nel mondo, così sacro agli Dei, così fausto a' Mortali, così memorando nelle stagionj, così privilegiato nell'anno, così gloriosio alle piante, così dedicato, e dovuto alla gioia universale di tutti i cuori. Ma qual sarebbe (Lietissimi Ascoltanti) il Natale fortunato della Rosa, se ella, come sopra divisammo, non nascesse in quel Modo, che si dice nascere il sole, del quale è furiera, e seguace non hà ella mai sdegnato di testimoniare gl'ardori, se ella dico non dando a conoscere la gloria di sue sovrane virtù, e l'altezza di sue prerogative sublime, non portasse seco come un sole nascente e la luce, e lo splendore. Acciò tanto si dica nascere in questo giorno la Rosa, quanto a gl'occhj d'ognuno sorgono in un luminoso oriente le sue pregiatissime lodi, le quali se non può la fratezza di mio stile tutte impriovero alle ure orecchie dicevolmente narrare, son certo almeno, che e per testimonianza di Plutarco la Rosa piantata vicino all'aglio, fà nobile acuisto di fragranza maggiore, vicina oggi alla fetida pianta di maledico, e appassionato Aristareo, spanderà più soave l'odore di suoi fioritissimi pregi. Non

vorrei già, che reputaste per iperbolio aggrandimento, se presumo d'esaltar la sua mastita con quegl'encomi più ampli, che la rendano illustre, e gloriosa nel gener suo, a differenza de gl'altri men degni virgulti della vil famiglia de fiori, che su le glebe selvaggio, ò dentro i boschj più folti, senza nome, e senza luce sconosciuti, e calpestati, ne ad uso, ne ad ornamento degl' vominj non si tosto nati languiscono.

Dentro mura deliziose di ben custodito giardino sovra letto di frondi natie, e sotto placida tenda di tranquillissimo Cielo in seno a primavera nascer veggo la Rosa. Che se argumento di gran nobiltà, e gran chiarezza fù sempre il luogo, e il tempo del nascimento, eccovi il mio fiore ne suoi natali sommamente dotato di non ordinarie prerogative. Mà poiche questa medesima lode ad altri fiori denegata non viene, e degli stessi pregi vien' pure arricchita la Rosa; quand'anche vicino a rozza capanna sovra siepe incoltivata, e deserta neglettamente riposa: dirò che ella per dar pregio, e non per ricevere, negl'amenissimi giardini si trapianti. Quivi ella su lo stesso materno maiestatamente inalzata, vestita comparisce di leggiadrissima porpora, ricinta di fiondi, coronata d'oro, e guernita d'aiulei per dichiararsi la regina de fiori, e per mostrare d'aver meritato sià essi non senza gran laude il principato. Ma in qual pelago di confusissima audacia son io vicino a sommergermi, togliendo a voi il contento d'udire, a me la speranza di guignere in porto, se da odi così vulgari, e comunali ho sciolta del mio fra le discorso inavvedutamente la nave. Ah che più avveduto consiglio mi richiama a contemplarti, o vaghissimo fiore, come maestra sapiente de gl' vominj, come esemplo misterioso di moralissimi intendimenti. Che se di regina ti diedi la lode, ben porti seco l'idea di per fettam.be regnare. Si specchi pur in te chi del carico pesantissimo d'imperare altrui, frù spezialmente non sò se aggravato, o arricchito dal Cielo, e impari a vestire gl'ostri, con cui maiestoso si renda. Ma da quelle istesse foglie di porpora che si ordinatamente inte composte si mirano, intenda essere proprio altrettanto di chi regno il comporre gl'affetti, e regolar le passionj: coll'odore amabilissimo della elemenza rapire gl'animi de' suditi: coll'oro beneficare i meritevoli, e colle spine del gastigo gli scelesati punire. Sovranissima preminenza fù sempre di questa gloriosa regina, che ella altrae di tal sorta gl'affetti di ognuno, che non è donzella, che non ami adornarsene il seno, sposa che non goda fiorirne il letto, nuzziale, garzone amante, che non la gradisca, fanciullo, che non la colga. Onde è perchè simbolo di benevolenza, e di conciliazione d'affetto solevano gl'Indiani Magis, colme le mani di rose, ambire alla grazia de' potentati grandi, tentando ancora di conguistare con esse i favori più segnalasi da sommi Dei.

Quindi Filostrato con grazioso paralello la Rosa ad Amore simigliantissima scorge; nascense anche gli nella primavera; egli ancora delicato, e leggiadro; co' cape gli anch'esso dorati; colle spine de' dardi; colle foghe dell'ali, con la face di fiammeggianse rossore. Dovrei qui soggiugnere, che non altronde, che dal sangue cadente dell'istessa Madre d'amore, apprese candida per addietro la Rosa, il bel vermiglio del volto. Dovrei qui narrare con libanio sossita, che fra le tre Dee rivali, colà nel Monte Ida, pendendo ancor la gran lite, mentre quelle n'altendevano il giudice, formò Venere intanto di Rosa fra via raccolte pomposa ghirlanda alle tempiola quale accrebbe tanto di merito alla bellis.ma Dea, che l'altre due di consenso correndo a quella incontro, tagliendole la corona di testa, indi osseguiosamente baciata, e ripostale in fronte, cedere vollero a lei sola come deovuto il pregio della contesa maggioranza. Effetto com'io diceva della singolare eccelenza di questo lodatissimo fiore, che alla vista sola di se stesso potè tranquillare gl'animi già sdegnosi di tre Deità garreggianti, e far' sì, che una di esse lo sceltro, e le richezze del mondo, l'altra il valore, e la sovranità delle virtù, come vili, a si grand paragone non osassero di cimentare. Che per ciò io punto non mi maraviglio di quell'affettuosa nutrice, che non con altre preghiere stanede a gli Dei per la felicità del suo amantis.mo alunno, che con dire: *Quic quid caleaverit hic rosa fiat*, come in Persio si legge.

Ma sento già che con occhio troppo livido riguardando così fatti pregi della Rosa, la condanna più tosto di soverchia delicatezza, come incentivo di lusso pernizioso, e d'effemminati piaceri. Onde a ragione comparisca alla non dissimigliante ad amore, affetto così indomito, e così nocivo a mortali; A ragione s'altribuisca l'infame culto di essa alla Dea delle lascivie, tolga la Rosa il colore da Venere e Venere gl'attributi dalla Rosa, l'una dall'altra gli splendori rapisca, e l'altra all'una somministrj le glorie. Da queste ferite invidiose, che a lascerar vanno gl'onori del nostro fiore nascente, esco più viva ad esalar la fragranza dei suoi vanti gloriosi, ed io son tenuto nella continuanza dell'intrappreso sentiero a riconoscere la Rosa per quella scuola accennata d'occulte discipline, e d'allegorie insegnamenti ripiena. Ritratto senza dubbio

d'Amore, e di affettuosa corrispondenza esser dicemmo la Rosa, che con sua dolce altrattiva i desiderij, e le voglie di ciascuno in se derivando, violentem.te rapisce. Così và ella insegnando a mortali, che faccian preda del più bel fregio della vita Civile, che è la benevolenza comune. Ma se per mezzi non degni degenera talora l'affetto in illeciti ardori ecco in esa scolpito per avvertircelo con suoa muta favella il rossore della vergogna, come disse Placiade, e le punture del pentimento. Ben'che ammonisce questa morale precettrice, tra guai cancelli di modesta licenza contener si debban gl'amanti; che per o non sia grave il soggiugnero con quel gentilissimo Cigno.

> La Verginella è simile alla Rosa, [in margin: "Ariosto can. 1. 1142"]
> Che 'n bel giardin sù la nativa spina
> Mentre sola, e sicura si riposa,
> Ne gregge, ne pastor se l'avvicina,
> L'avra soave, e l'alba rugindosa,
> L'acqua, la terra al suo favor s'inchina,
> Giovani vaghi, e donne innamorate
> Amano averne, e seno, e tempie ornate.
> Ma non si tosto dal materno stelo
> Rimossa viene, e dal suo ceppo verde
> Che guanto avea dal gl' vominj, e dal Cielo
> Favor, grazia, e bellezza, tutto perde.

Con tal' esempio di se stessa ci richiama dunque la Rosa dal sentiero immodesto di sfrenate lascivie, che ben merita ella d'esserne per tal nome esaltata tacendo all'incontro ogni maligno accusatore, che aspira a denigrare col fumo pestilente di sua lingua maledica gli splendori più vivaci d'un fior cosi vago. Taccia dico chi di tacciarlo ardisce, come esca troppo molle di lusso imoderato, ch'io ben la riconosco per un dono parechiss.mo della natura, prodotto, et allevato sulle prode più rozze de' campi; vili' ancora, perche è vile di prezzo, benche grande, e altero nell'adornai di sue pompe splendidamente la terra. Oh come bene apprendo, che sotto rozzi abituri di rustica gente lontano da gl'abitati palagi più sicuro vive l'uomo dai ferrio di viziose voglie, e dall'insidie del lusso, mentre contemplo la Rosa, che in piaggia solitaria sotto gl'intrecciamenti di amiche foglie riposta più sicura vive da gl'oltraggi di mano rapace, e meno è soggetta alle piaghe d'aratro ingiurioso. Ben'osservo, che ella ai temperatj raggi del sol nascente fà mobil pompa di sua vaghezza; ma che giunto quello al meriggio, ne cuocenti ardori languisce, per additare, che la vita umana nel moderato calor de' piaceri si ravviva, ma nel fervore soverchio del lusso, sfiorando la sua bellezza, sordidam.te auilisce. Felice i mortali, se contenti del lusso innocenti di si bel fiore, non andavan tracciando fin dentro le viscere più cupe della gran Madre, fin dentro i seni più riposti, e ne' lidi più ignoti del Mare gl'ori, e le gemme, per fabbricarne rose più lucide, si, ma non più belle, se l'arte contrafacendo il sembiante di quel purissimo fiore non s'ingegnava di dipingere coll'ago, e co' lavori Rose più industriose, ma non più vaghe. Arricchivano gl'antichi collo spargimento di godo fiore, i feretri, e le tombe, onorandone l'ossa e le memorie degl'estinti: Ma giova credere a me che sotto altissimo simbolo avvertissero gl'Vominj della loro misera caduta, giacche a sembianza della Rosa –

> Così trapassa al trapassar d'un giorno
> Della vita mortale il fiore, e il verde;
> Ne perche faccia indietro April ritorno
> Si rinfiora ella mai, ne si rinverde.

Insegnassero dico, che dopo il termine fatale di brevissimi giorni, altro retaggio non dura, che la rimbembianza virtuosa dell'opere, ch'è quell'odoro che sol riman di noi. Poscia ch'il nesto fragile è defunto. Adopravansi le Rose negl'apparati fertosi, spargevansi quelle ne' conviti geniali, non credo già io per semplice ornamento di deliziosa vaghezza o per lascivo fomento di sensualità più esquisita, ma per tener ricordato nel mezzo de' piaceri, che le me allegrezze son quaggiù momentanee, indivise mai sempre da pungenti spine di compagne amarezze. Ed ecco Sig.ri, che non vi hò punto ingannato nel discoprirvi altri

sensi, altre lodi, di quelle, che apprender soglia la vulgar gente da gl'ammanti esteriori, onde si veste la Rosa. Ecco a voi palesata la sconosciuta maestra d'innocenti costumi: alla cui sguola, oh quanto meglio sarebbe l'addottinarsi, che con ciglio severo, che con rigidi detti, che con barba prolissa, che con toga talare pretender falsamente il vero nome di fiolosofo, e chiudendo poi snetimenti perversi contro la bella precettrice dell'estera filosofia uomitar brutta mente dall'ammorbato seno mille arroganti menzogne, e mille velenosi rimproveri. Allora si, che non invidierebbe sfacciatissimo de trattore la fortuna a quel Lucio, a cui diede la Rosa dallo stabo di crudo e vile animante il far paesagio a quel d'uomo, avvenimento, che ben e'insegna, che chi accortamente eseguisce i saggi ammaestramenti, che dalla Rosa si tolgona, dal grado inagionevole, sue suol porre l'ignoranza, et il vizio, fà paesaggio à meritar' la gloria di veracemente esser uomo. Ma sentiamo per ultimo il gran Poeta di g.ta Patria, che tentando altamente descrivere quell'incomprensibile felicità, ove di grado in grado saziate a pieno quella mente purissime eternamente gioiscono, non indegnò paragonarla alla Rosa, condire.

> Ne'l giallo della Rosa sempiterna,
> Che si dilata, rigrada, e ridole
> O dar di lode al sol, che sempre verna.

Al rimbombo felice, di tante, e si sovrane lodi, ben fù dovere, ch'accompagnaste ancor voi, o miei fedeli compagni il suono de'vostri applausi, per celebrar' in questo giorno il lietissimo nascimento della Rosa, la quale (e vaglia il vero) chi havrebbe saputo giammai, che fusse nata nel Mondo, se ella a guisa del Sole colle spargimento de suoi chiarissimi errorij, non si divulgava per quel fiore diletto così del Cielo, così grato alla natura, cosi giovevole a gl'Vomine? Giovevole dico, come già lo raccisaste: giovevole per i molti usi, a'quali singolarmente la destinano le sue native qualità, e rare virtù; ma giovevol'ancora, per che vi è tal Rosa tra gl'Vominj; che sovra la condizione benche eccellente, di quel fiore, può da se sola maravigliosamente apprestare un convito, nutiendo coloro, che hanno in sorte di goderla, non meno con sapori del cibo, che con gl'amabilissimi condimenti di sua presenza, nella quale spicca a maraviglia l'oro, e la porpora d'uno animo splendidissimo, il verde di mille vivezze, e di mille spiritose virtù, le spine finalmente, che sanno a tempo lacerare, poco amici di quello gl'insipidi, e infruttorosi rampolli. Ma sento ormaj (con tutto che poco mi abbia conceduto discorrere e la scarsezza del tempo, e la ste: rilità di mia lingua) sento dico, in mezzo alla brevità, richiamarmi al silenzio, dovuto qui giustamente agl'encomj della Rosa, della quale è particolare attributo, che –

> Quanto si mostra men, tanto è più bella.

VII. 2 Evangelista Torricelli, "Encomio del Secol' d'Oro"

MS. Galileiani 133*, Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze, 41-52; published in Torricelli, *Opere*. Ed. Gino Lauria and Giuseppe Vassura. Faenza: Stabilimento Tipo-Litografico G. Montanari, 1919. Vol. II, Lezioni Accademiche, 92-99. The present text is taken from the manuscript version; sections of text in brackets [ ] indicate passages from the *Opere* not found in the manuscript.

Se la lode, e gli applausi degnamente si convengono alla Virtù, non è dubbio alcuno Amici, che al vizio con ogni ragione i biasimi, e le maledicenze si converranno. Pare che non possano nominarsi senza i meritati encomi la Giustizia, e la Temperenza, la Mansuetudine, e la Liberalità, la Prudenza, la Tolleranza, e l'altre virtù, alle quali per debito si convengono le benedizioni della fama, e le corone della gloria. Rallegratevi però fortunati compagni; quel secol d'oro, di cui celebriamo le lodi, e rinoviamo l'usanza in questo rozzo, ma delizioso apparato, non può biasimarsi, se non da quelli, che non approvano l'innocenza, e non conoscono la virtù. Al contrario poi quell'età sfortunata, che sotto nome di ferro rappresenta il secolo de tradimenti, e delle crudeltà, non si lodi se non da quelli, che si pregiano nel vizio, e trovano nelle miserie i trionfi. Declamano con elegante facondia contro se stesse, l'Ira, e l'Avarizià, la Fraudolenza, e la Lascivia, l'Ingiustizia, e l'altra schiera innumerabile delle humane calamità; se cio non fusse, troppo gran patrocinio si converrebbe hora implorare alla mia inabilità presso la vostra gentilezza, mentre con obbrobrio dell'età corrotta, scorrero brevemente le lodi del secolo già si felice, e si caro a' gli Dei.

L'oro che ancor non conosciuto se ne stava nelle caverne della terra sepolto, diede al secolo della felicità il cognome dell'oro: forse crederà alcuno per contaminar l'innocenza denominandola dall'autor delle colpe; ma chi non vede che con usanza da tutti ricevuta dal più caro metallo si derivano i nomi, e si assegnano le materie alle cose più reverite? Sentiste già che la Regia del sole fu detta:

Ovid. *Met*. *Clara micante auro*.

ma' del carro.

Senec. *Ep*. *Aureus axis erat, temo aureus, aurea summa*
Curuatura note radiorus argenteus ordo.

Così per l'appunto, disse il maestro di costumi. *Quod optimum videri volunt saeculum aureum appellant*. Ma qualunque sia la cagione, o l'origine del nome, passiamo dalle voci alle sustanze, e contempliamo noi che nella partenza di quel secolo perfetto fu innondata la terra da tutte le colpe, tiranneggiata da tutti i vizij, oppressa da tutte le calamità. Figuratevi, Amici, nella mente quello stato primiero del mondo ancor pargoletto. Che felicitia? mentre nelle provincie indistinte giacevano le campagne senza termine o divisione. Che ricchezza! mentre ciascuno possedeva il tutto, e numerava fra le possessioni quiete quei che hoggi sono Regni combattuti.

Virg. *Georg*. ………*nulli subigebant arva coloni,*
Nec signare quidem, aut partiri limite campum
Fas erat: in medium quaerebant, ipraq tellus
Omnia liberius nullo poscense ferebat.

La fecondità non procurata de campi, e la clemenza delle stagioni mansuete provedevano con benefici spontanei à i bisogni, et à i disagi della mortalità. Lode nondimeno dovuta più tosto à beneficenza di natura, che à possesso di virtù. Non é cosi scarso di prerogative proprie il secol d'oro, che si convenga mendicargli le lodi dalla fertilità della terra, o dalla misericordia del Cielo. Il timore, e la speranza, sono due mostri cosi forti, che ributtati gl'assalti de più fieri filosofi, e schernite le penne della più dotta, e più eloquente antichità, tormentano ma con furie veraci gl'animi de viventi. Felice quel secolo, nel quale i carnefici della mente humana, i due tiranni supremi, che turbano la quiete della vita, non erano ne anche concetti. L'impudicizia, cioé l'avvoltoio fra le capanne de pudichi pastori si raggirana. [Alternative line in the *Opere*: "... l'avvoltoio degli animi, l'inferno de cuori, indarno colla face abborrita fra le capanne de pudichi pastori" ...] Semplicità di vita esercita; durezza di educazione selvaggia; austerità di costumi incorrotti, sprezzavano l'ardore di quelle libidini, che nel mondo hodierno tiranneggiano ogni nazione, corrompono ogni seno, et ogni età.

Se nel secolo deteriorato, nondimeno in una Vita boscareccia, et imitatrice di quella primiera età,

Juvenal. *Prestabat castas humilis fortuna latinas.*

se nel tener gl'encomi della vita pastorale quella penna divina epilogò molte lodi in poche parole mentre scrisse

Casta pudicitia servat domus

che sorte di continenza e di castità crederemo noi Amici in usane allora, quando il secolo d'oro non ripullulava in qualche parte dell'antica Etruria o della rozza Sabina, mà nel mondo tutto universalmente fioriva?

Sono cosi frequenti nel mondo perverso gl'esempi della viltà esaltata; s'incontrano cosi spesso l'innocenza, e la virtù abbattute, che per mio credere non ha' sensi di humanità colui, il quale ad ogni passo non sente sbranarsi il cuore da due mastini arrabbiati invidia, e compassione. Felicissimo però quel secolo, dove ogni vivente non rimirando se non equali à se di merito, e di fortune, non haveva cagione di compatir l'innocenza della mendicità oppressa, overo di perturbarsi per la esaltazione de gl'indegni felicitati; godeva nel comune possesso l'equal distribuzione de frutti selvaggi, e d'altri alimenti per la conversazion della vita necessarij, lieto nell'universal concordia.

Virg. *Georg*. *........ neque ille*
Aut doluit miserans inopem, aut invidit habenti.

Se vedete che i Pastori del secol d'oro non alzino le moli di peregrine marmo fino alle stelle, habitano però difesi dall' inclemenza dell'aria sotto cappanne intenute di fronda, e di canne palustri; non calcano i pavimenti di gemme, ma di foglie, e di fiori: habitano, ma non sotto i pericoli; et escludono non solo il timore delle stagioni noiose, ma anco de fulmini, e de terremoti reprentini. La bassa fabbrica dell' edifizio leggiero

Juven. *Securos dormire iubet pendente ruina.*
Non habitano i Pastori nelle Regie dorate, ma non però timono i tradimenti de servi infedeli, l'impeto de vassalli ribellanti, l'assalto delle nazioni straniere; habitano ma lungi dalla perfidia, e dalla menzogna; dove per il contrario

C. Mapl. Barb. *Fugit Potentum limina veritas*.

Non si veggono nel secol d'oro le mense aggravate dall'argento, le gemme incavate per le bevande, il metallo intenuto nei vestimenti, i letti inalzati d'oro, e di porpora,

Virg. *At secura quies, et nercia fallere vita*
Dives opum variarum; at latis otia fundis,
Speluncae, vivique lacus; at frigida Tempe
Mugitusque Bovum, mollesque sub arbore somni
Non absunt.

Vegliano appresso i Monarchi le cure, e gli spaventi; dormono con i Pastori la sicurezza, e la tranquillità; Vivono alla presenza del Cielo, e non pendono sopra essi le soffitte di metallo indorato, ma

Seneca *Ep*. *In aperto iacentes sidera superlabuntur, et insigne*
spectaculum noctium mundus in preceps agitur, silentio
tantum opus ducens.

Sorgono del pari col Sole; indi pascolato l'armento

Lucretio ………*Prostrati in gramine molli*
Propter aqus rivum sub ramis arboris altae.
Non magnis opibus iucunde corporae curant.

Abbreviano le giornate più lunghe con guiochi, e con scherzi innocenti. Ecco balli ma senza lascivie; canti, e musiche ma di boscarecce sampogne; contese ma senza perfidia, spettacoli ma senza passioni: Vedete là

Virg: ………………. *ubera vaccae*
Lactea demittunt, pinquesque in gramine leto
Inter se advertis luctantur cornibus haedi.

Mirate fra passatempi hora di robustezza, et hora di genio

Virg: *Ipse dies agitat festos, fususque per herbam*
Ignis ubi in medio, et socii cratera coronant
Te libans Lenee vocat; pecorisque magistris
Velocis iaculi certamina ponit in ulmo,
Corporaque agresti nudat praedura palestra.

Che più?
Aureus hanc vitam in terris Saturnus agebat.

Poco tempo dopo, ma però avanti che le trombe marziali si udissero infiamare altrui all'uccisioni, et alle rapine
Hanc olim vitam veteres colvere Sabini,
Hanc Remus, et Frater: <u>Sic Fortis Etruria crevit.</u>

Non parve già al secolo successore che i folti rami d'un albero verdeggiante, o l'ombra delle intrecciate cappanne fussero bastanti per sottrar della vista del Cielo le vergogne dello vita, e le oscenità della libidine; però non è maraviglia ce i innalzarono nella Città sublimi i palazzi tanto superbi. Ma qual follia fù l'inventrice Amici di trasportar per mari cosi lunghi le montagne di Paro, ò le rupi dell'Egitto? quasi che il sassoso Appennino somministrane materia troppo scarsa, e troppo vile, mentre non costava tesori, e non veniva fra perigli. La Giustizia dovendo pure allontanava dal secolo corrotto, abbandonate le Regie de Potenti; fece l'ultime sue dimore fra i tuguri humilissimi de i Pastori

Virg. ……. *extrema per illos*
Justitia excedens terris vestigia fecit.

Cosi la descrive la più sublime di tutte le penne; tale la dipinse il più vivace di tutti i pennelli, mentre ROSA il mirabile, la colori. Della temperanza, e della patrimonia, che altro resta da perderi fuor che il nome, e la memoria? Non vedete voi accumulata in una mensa sola la fecondità, non dirò di una pianta, o di un' horto, ma' di una provincia intiera? Gli animali non di più pascoli, o di più selve, ma di tutte le stagioni, e di tutti gl'elementi? è pur, vero che à molti tori è comune un prato solo; molti, e smisurati elefanti in una sola selva si nutriscono; et il ventre ancor che angusto d'un'huomo non potrà riempirsi se non con i tributi adunati di tutto l'universo? Chi mai crederà che un ventre solo e si piccolo sia quello, a cui si dedicano tante vite d'animali innocenti, per cui si semina in tante provincie, i cui poderi sono capaci di peregrinazione, gl'armenti incapaci di numero? Che un ventre solo sia quello per cui vindemmia nell'Italia il Vesuvio, Siracusa nella Sicilia, Smirna, e Creta nell'Arcipelago, il Libano nell'Oriente, la Spagna nell'Occidente? Una voragine, o piuttosto un abisso senza fondo sarà sempre stimato quello, per cui s'impoverisce l'aria d'uccelli, a cui si votano tante selve, per cui si pescano tanti laghi, tanti fiumi, e tanti mari, non solo del Mediterraneo a noi vicino ma anco del remotissimo Settentrione. Non già mi maraviglio per questo, Amici: perdonisi all'industria golosa, se trasportò le vindemmie di Creta, ò le caccie del Fasi, e di Numidia p accrescer delizie ad una mensa dell'Italia. Erano merci lontane, e difficili si, ma però conosciute et esposte la perspicacia delle gole ingegnore è passata più oltre, e per investigar cibi più occulti, è discesa sin sotterra. Non sono stati sicuri su gli scogli più dirupati dell'Appennino scosceso di Norcia i frutti sotterranei della terra più infelice. Che giovò alla natura perspicace il privar della luce quegli aborti, e seppelirgli fra l'alpi rovinose? frutti equalmente degni degli animali che gli trovano, e delle bocche che gli appetiscono; frutti che non nascono, se il Cielo adirato non tuona:
ma sentite.

Juvenal. …….. *et facient optata tonitrua caenas*
Maiores.

Adunque la corruttela del secolo si estenderà fino à bramare un fulmine per accrescere una vivanda, et invocherà una tempesta per fomentare una lussuria? Lungi pur siano da noi, e dalle nostre mense innocenti frutti cosi contaminati, et indegni, che non nascono se non sepolti, e non habitano che in precipizij figli di terra infeconda, aborti di sterilità, gemelli di fulmini, padri di libidine. Ma chi vederebbe già mai Amici le mostruose invenzioni dell'arte nel condimento de cibi, e nella sozza mistura delle vivande? Non piacciono più al lusso delle gole erudite i parti della natura, ma i mostri. Quindi è che non si apprezzano più nelle cose i sapori naturi, se non mutati, o confusi. Non dilettano le carni de più delicati animali se non vengono alterate da succhi spiacevoli de frutti più aspri, et inappetibili era forse poco aggravio che le oriental Molucche infettassero con tanta merce di fuocosi aromati ogni cibo dell'Europa suogliata? nuova industria, anzi nuova stolidità, confondendo l'ordine de sentimenti, ministrò al gusto i tributi dell'odorato, et unite le vivande con i profumi, tramutò in cibo i più preziosi di tutti quanti gl'odori. La brevità del tempo non mi permette il seguitar quelli, che discesi nella viscere, della madre comune, cercano le ricchezze superflue nella regione de' morti, dove trovano spesso prima la sepoltura, che i tesori. Ma parve poco all'insaziabilità dell' lusso l'invenzione dell'oro, e dell'argento: si riputava povero

Plinio *Nisi haberet etiam quod posset totum statim perire.*

Però nuova industria sagace, con mistura di marmo polverizato, e di herba incenerita, formò vasi trasparenti.

Plinio *Quibus pretius faceret ipsa fragilitas*.

Altri nel profondo del mare cercano al lusso le superfluità o tra i calcoli dell'arena, o nel seno delle conchiglie. Altri mossi dall'avarizia, e scorti dalla temerità per comprar merci straniere spendono fra le tempeste, la vita, e cambiano la sicurezza con naufragi.

Virg. *Exiloque domos, et dulcia limina mutuant,*
Atque alio quaernut Patriam sub sole iacentem.

Le fraudi della plebe interessata, l'ignominie dell'effeminata gioventù, i furori de popol armati, gl'odij intestini, il contagio de costumi, le persecuzioni, l'invidie, i tradimenti, gli spergiuri, e le crudeltà, le rapine, et i veleni, tanti nomi di sceleraggine, tante forme di libidini, di lusso, e di sensualità mi spaventano di maniera, che arresto l'impeto nel principio del corso. M'accorgo nondimeno di esser giunto a quel segno dove non sarà difficile à i nostri purgatissimi giudizi il discernere e sentenziere qual fusse il secolo dell'inocenza e delle felicità, e qual sia quello del vizio; e delle miserie. Godete pur dunque voi, Amici felici, che racchiudete nel petto non solo quelle virtù, che nel secol d'oro si donavano dall natura, ma anco quelle che nell'età del ferro s'insegnano dalla sapienza. Voi che anco nelle recreazioni di allegrezza non ammettete passatempi, se non virtuosi, cavando frutti di gloria, dove altri trarrebbe messe di sensualità: voi che con esercizij lodati vi dimostrate figli ben degni di quella forte Etruria la qual crebbe in questo modo istesso. Sono i vostri lussi conferenze di Poesie singolari, gare ma di eloquenza, controverne ma d'erudizione ed' ingegno. Trionfa nelle nostre mense la sobrietà, ma col contento, e col diletto: vi scherzano i risi, e le facezie, ma congiunte con la Sapienza, e con la modestia a segno tale che io supplicherò sempre la clemenza del Cielo, acciò voglia ò renderci interamente il possesso del secol d'oro, overo continuare lungamente la felicità di questa conversazione, e di questa vita.

finij.

VII. 3 Reginaldo Sgambati "Per la nascita del Gran Principe di Toscana. Al Rosa pittor celebre"

BNCF Ms. VII, 359, Poesie diverse, 263.

I

Prendi, o Rosa, il pennello, e in varie tele
del grande Infante la virtù futura
colma di vago orror diva pittura
quei coloriti oracoli rivele.

II

Mille esprima fugaci arabe vele
mille ardent cader barbare mura
e d'aria l'empio mar, la terra impure
egualmente inondar sangue infedele.

III

Pinga nel'Arno poi lo Scita, e il Parto
bagnarsi il piè cattivo, e fra le prede
ir di Cosmo regnant Espero, et Arto.

IV

Che di Ferdinando al germe il Ciel concede
ferrea virtude, e di Vittoria il Parto
esser non può che di vittorie erede.

Another transcription of the poem, in BNCF Magl. VII. 629 (ff. 19r-v: 'Per la Nascita del Ser:[mo] Cosimo III, del Padre Sgambati al Rosa Pittore'), is followed a second poem on the same subject (the top of the page reads "Dell'istesso nel medesimo suggetto"):

V

Nato è il Toscano Eroe, d'Alcide il segno
Varca o fama guerriera, e in aureo canto,
Parla del gran Natale, e fugga in tanto,
Alle tue voci, il Corsier Tracio, e il legno.

VI

Questi dirai di generoso sdegno,
Armerà sua pietade, e al Trono santo,
Tolto il giogo servil, fra l'Indo, e il Xanto
I termini porrà, d'Etruria al Regno.

VII

Italia il vedrà poi di gloria onusto,
Spargendo a' fidi suoi d'Asia il tesoro,
Frà Saturno, ed Astrea, regnar vetusto.

VIII

Ch'a premiar, a ferir, l'Italo, e il Moro,
Dà Fernando, e Vittoria, il Figlio Augusto,
Aurà globi di foco, e Quercie d'oro.

VII. 4 Jacopo Salviati, "Che la Costanza ne' travagli è gloriosa. Al Sig.[re] Salvador Rosa Pittore, e Poeta. Canzone"

BNCF Magl. VII 868. Var: Poesie diversi, 543v-545r.

I

1 Quel gelido pianeta,
Che di raggi non suoi vago risplende,
A ritrovar la meta
In van degli astri il bel sentiero ascende;
5 Onde avvien, che poi stanco
Dagli argentati pori
Senza dar posa al fianco
Suda fredde rugiade, e imperla i fiori.

II

Se questo eccelso lume
10 Gemma del primo Ciel, febo secondo,
Con eterno costume
Fatica sempre in sull'etereo mondo;
Meraviglia non sia,
Se l'uom, che vive in terra,
15 Per travagliosa via
Suda misero ognor, s'aggira, ed erra.

III

Quindi il fato severo,
Che'l feretro gli appresta, allorch'ei nasce,
Con rigoroso impero
20 Gli apre il dolor, mentre lo stringe in fasce:
Poscia in breve gli addita
Enoro al fugace speglio
Di questa fragil vita,
Quanto d'ogni natal morte sia meglio.

IV

25 Penar dunque conviene:
Ne' volumi lassù così fu scritto;
È vil, chi non sostiene
L'inevitabil mal con senso invitto:
Cerchisi pur la pace
30 Tra sudori, ed alfanni,
Che un Ettore, un Aiace
Tarpar sol puote al vecchio alato i vanni.

V

Per chi forte combatte,
Di cera ha l'empio, e non di ferro il dente;
35 Sembran rotte, e disfatte
L'armi sue crude, a troncar gli anni intente;
Di costanza lo smalto
Un qua non cadde in polve;
Anzi seco all'assalto
40 Il Tempo è quel che perde, e si dissolve.

VI

Sono fetido sasso,
Quanto fu di mortal, resta sepolto;
Breve spazio d'un passo
Chiude di nostra etade il poco, è'l molto;
45 Mentre morte n'assale
Oimè; che dalla tomba
In quell'antro prevale
L'eco sol di virtù, ch'ivi rimbomba.

VII

Si sorprendan le mura
50 Di mole eccelsa, e di guernita rocca,
Cui divori l'arsura
Di bronzo micidial, che i globi fiocca;
Con guerrieri disegni
Si vinca, e si trionfi
55 Di Provincie, e di Regni,
E tra barbare stragi un cuor si gonfi:

VIII

Che al fin son vane prede;
Son di stolta avarizia indegni acquisti,
Ove il nido, e la sede
60 An le brame voraci, e i pensier tristi.
È fango ogni tesoro
A quel trionfo appresso,
A quel beato alloro,
Che miete il prode in debellar se stesso.

IX

65 Il Macedone ardito, [in margin: "Alessandro."]
Trionfator d'oriental falange,
Con applauso infinito
Corse superbo a incatenare il Gange;

Ma fu maggior vittoria
70 Sprezzar beltà lasciva;
Questa si degna Gloria
Viè più d'ogn'altra al grand' Eroe s'ascriva.

X

Nell'arringo di morte
Sotto bellico acciaro ascose il dorso
[in margin: "Marc'Antonio"] 75 Duce Romano, e forte,
Impose anch'egli a più d'un regno il morso:
Ma che valse fortezza
Contro sembiante impuro?
Se canopea bellezza [in margin: Cleopatra]
80 Rese poi di sua fama il sole oscuro.

XI

Dall'Iperboreo al Mauro
Coll'impero inoltrarsi, erger lo scetro,
Posare in seggio d'auro
Lasso! che prò, se la sua base è vetro?
85 Fregio stabile, e solo
Saran quelle corone,
Che discese dal polo
Virtù sublime in sulle fronti impone.

XII

Tu, che i detti più chiari
90 Del più saggio latino, Rosa, pingesti;
E industre, e senza pari
Splender frall'ombre finte il ver facesti;
Tu comprender ben puoi,
Che questi rozzi inchiostri
95 Appo i colori tuoi
Sembran larve, e Chimere, aborti, e mostri.

VII. 5 Ciro di Pers, "Lodasi Salvador Rosa, pittor famoso"

Published by M. Rak ed., *Ciro di Pers, Poesie*. Torino: Giulio Einuadi Editore, 1978, 89, no. 87.

I

Oggi il gran Rosa a ribellarsi invita
qualunque ingegno al vero è piú divoto
mentre il valor del falso egli fa noto
ne le sue tele e i di lui pregi addita.

II

Mirasi qui senza anima la vita,
senza voce il parlar, privo di moto
il corso e lo splendor di luce voto
mentre un'ombra mendace il vero imita,

III

ma, s'è possente a limitar l'immenso
e dal nulla crear quasi vicina,
ch'ombra ella sia mendace io già non penso,

IV

è viva è vera né a stupir m'inchina
perché non abbia e corso e voce e senso,
che non gli suole aver cosa divina.

VII. 6 Francesco Melosi, "Capitolo a Salvator Rosa"

Published by Limentani, "Nuovi studi e ricerche", *Italian Studies* VIII (1953), 47-49.

I

1 Perché sappiate ch'ancor io son vivo,
Salvatore mio car, Rosa mio bello,
Intorno al fuoco da stroncon vi scrivo,
Tra questi sassi la mia cruda stella
5 A naufragar di nuovo hammi condotto
E par ch'io n'habbia cotte le budella.
Che vivo siate voi, l'odo per tutto.
Sento che s'è veduta, e non ha molto,
Un'altra vostra Satira eccellente,
10 N'è l'ha per vostra alcun maligno, e stolto.

II

Oh trista qualità di trista gente
Che non vuol creder ne l'altrui cervello
Lo spirito e virtù che al suo non sente!
Cazzo, quel che voi fate col pennello,
15 Che fa trascolare il secol nostro,
Ond'io creator, più che pittor, v'appello,
Qual pazzo vorrà dir che non sia vostro?
Hor chi non sa quant'è maggior lavoro
Poetar coi color che con l'inchiostro?
20 Ma dicono così forse costoro

III

Però che de le Satire il soggetto,
Ch'è il vitio, non è vostro, è tutto loro.
Ed in ciò 'l vostro nome co l'effetto
S'accorda ben, poiché, dando qual rosa
25 Aspre ponture, havete odor perfetto.
Sentite che raggion ridicolosa
Portan del lor non credere ostinato
Che tali poesie sian vostra cosa.
Egli, dicon, fin hor non s'è spacciato
30 Mai per poeta; hor dunque, è principiante;

IV

Ma s'egli è tal, come ha sì ben poetato?
Né sanno ancor per quante lune e quante
Bestia d'essi minor nel ventre porti,
Prima di partorire, un elefante;
35 Né fatti son dal Venusino accorti
Quanto debba indugiarsi a darli fuora,
Perché i figli non sian mostri ed aborti.
Oh mi vien pur da ridere qual hora.
Per leggerlo da lui tosto m'apparto,
40 E mi par nato nel dargli una scorsa,

V

Non ch'in meno d'un'hora, in men d'un quarto.
Saggio chi tarda; un'opra corsa è corsa,
E cerca con la lingua ogni lettore
Farle il contrario ch'à suoi parti l'orsa.
45 Ma che fa in Roma il Padre Inquisitore,
Che non castiga questa razza ebrea,
Che vuol l'opre negar del Salvatore?
Hor voi non vi slacciate la giornea,
Né lasciate il cantar per questo caso;
50 Ha la rosa un odore che ricrea,
E però vuol ogn'un darvi del naso.

VII. 7 Michele Brugueres, *Le pompe della pittura e scoltura*, oda dedicata all'eminentiss. e riuerendiss. Sig. il signor cardinal Francesco degli Albici

Published in Rome by Paolo Moneta, 1669 (p. 7). Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome.

I
Tu ROSA il sai, che co i colori industre
Fai di scorno arrassir l'Invidia cieca,
E mentre sudi a empir col nome i lustri,
Taci gli Apelli suoi la troma Greca.

II
Mentre a l'opre, che fingi il senso crede,
Par che nube nevosa al Sol s'imbiondi.
Tu fai spirare i venti, a l'occhio vede
Gorgogliar l'acque, e susurrar le frondi.

III
E gia la sacra Gloria e la tua chioma.
Aggiunge allori infra gli altari, e i Tempj,
Quando a COSMO inchinate ha visto Roma
Strisciar le fiamme, e fulminar su gli empj.

VII. 8 Benedetto Menzini, "Satira III. Contro Giovanbattista Ricciardi, ch'ebbe la Cattedra di Morale nell'Università di Pisa"
BNCF Poligrafo Gargani MSS, sheet 161; *Satira del Menzini*, London, 1820; also published in E. Toci, *Rime Burlesche Edite e Inedite di G. B. Ricciardi*, Livorno, 1881, iii.

I
O dottoracci, che un'arpia vi scanni,
Infin che avete avanti il Comentario,
So che tirate il collo al barbagianni:

II
E noi preti osserviamo il calendario,
E diciam tuttodì messe ed ufizi,
Perchè rubbiate e decime e salario.

III
Io non prego che il diavol ve n'attizi,
Chè '1 tempo è lungo, e vi vorrei impiccati
Veder fra le colonne degli Ufizi;

IV
Ed il primo tra lor degli squartati
Vorrei il fiorentin Curculione,
Archimandrita degli sciagurati;

V
Ed il secondo quel moral Catone,
Buffone anch'egli ed inclito ciarliero,
Che dentro è un Epicuro e fuor Zenone.

VI
Oh Pisa, oh Pisa, e tu non hai nocchiero
Che dia a costor per Arno un dì la volta
E sì gli ciurmi in questo battistero?

VII. 9 (Valerio?) Inghirami, "Dell'Abbate Inghirami", a poem for Rosa.
BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 13r.

I
D' haverti o Rosa tra i prodigi suoi
Piange Natura, e maladice il fato
Poiche di Rosa e contr'al Fato e l' patto
Vivono eterni li colori tuoi

II
Piange ch'ella non sa quanto tu puoi,
Mentre tu puoi cio che non ha mai fatto,
E l' vede allor che di sue linee a un tratto
Ravvivi i morti, e sai crear che vuoi.

III
Piange che il chi vorrebbe al suo natale
Quali ricetti il sole ombre e gramaglie,

Luce e splendor dal tuo pennel fatale

IV
E se odiose ella se guerre e boscaglie
Piange che brami ogn'huom fatto immortale
Viver tra le sue selve e le battaglie.

VII. 10 Anonymous, Canzone for Rosa
BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 4v-8r.

I

1 La temeraria face
Che nel foco del sol non ben s'accese,
apprie del gran supplizio
Prima[?] i suoi pentimenti, e forsca splende;
5 e di tropp' alte imprese
cagion ardita, e collocato indizio
di vergognoso ardor se stessa accende:
e quel fumo, che tende
languior vera l'Etra, e non vi giunge
10 (sacrifizio aborrito) infamia aggiunge.

II

ROSA tanto mi mostra
il tuo illustre pennello il pregio altero,
che un glorioso lino
documenti dipinge e meraviglie
15 colorito mistero
par che in tenor terribile, e divino
su tele avverittrici or ci consiglie,
che non da noi si piglie
gia mai fama, o splendor, ch non sia nostro
20 in pena fuor di viscere, e di vostro.

III

Miro intanto rapito
le stese membra, e me ne purgo, e temo.
Tragica ignota forza
il mio stupore, il mio terror costringe,
25 e'l patimento estremo
pria, compatire, indi patir mi sforza
Veggi sasso che tien, ferro che stringe:
Veggi stil, che non finge;
Veggi in fibre sbranate, e semivive,
30 con riverente horror, Tragedie vive.

IV

Il prodigio famoso
lacerando animar formar facendo!
con vanto di Medea
ROSA dal tuo privar l'esser ne nasce;
35 Poi che, vero stupendo
un istesso pennel, struggendo crea.
More Prometheo, e il tuo valor rinasce;
nè può piu degne fasce
de le tue Tele haver ricche, e pregiate,
40 poi che li ha 'n Ciel l'eternita filate.

V

Ma tu per che diletto
prendi l'alme a mostrar d'aperto seno?
fosco genio, e crudele
sanguino a desio forse si diede?
45 Ah no?: chiaro, e severo
anzi lo spieghi in sù contrarie Tele,
or crudeltà di lealtà fa fede
mentre a pinto si vede
che in segno di schiettezza, e di candore
50 sia le figure tue mostrano il Core.

VI

Oh figure felici
figure illustri a pieno, e avventurose;
spettacoli di gloria
per l'invidia però mesti e mortali:
55 Tempestate di ROSE
Vanno le vostre esseguie: e la Memoria
stà monumenti ergendovi imortali.
Colori trionfali
Fan col tempo per voi vittrice guerra,
60 e v'innalzano al Cielo, e pur son Terra.

VII

Oh quanti ROSA oh quanti
(osservi per se stessi) à l'altrui grido
Rubano temeravi
splendor di fama, e se ne fanno illustri.
65 quanti nel mondo infido
su man luce ai gran nomi: e quindi chiavi
tentan mandar piccoli homi a i Lustri?
Vili[?] Promethei; industri
sol di mal opre: Hor il lor nome io passo;
70 provino come quel l'Aquila, e il sasso.

VIII

Avisero mà che dico!
novo Perillo il mio castigo assegno.
Anch'io statua di Carmi
con non mia luce ad'animar el giunto;
75 e quanto piu l'ingegno
da rapine aborrite or' vuol levarmi
tanto con le rapine io son congiunto
e qual Prometheo assunto
con lo splendor che da un pennello io fiero
80 alle morte mie Carte alma procuro.

VII. 11 Anonymous, "Al Salvator Rosa erudiss.mo Poeta e Pittore Napolitano"
BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 3v. The manuscript is somewhat illegible due to smudged ink and wormholes.

I
Rosa, la mano tuo regge dui strali
Il Pennello, e la penna: onde comparte
Alle Parche, all'obblio piaghe fatali,
E son dell'armi tue le Glorie sparte:

II
Se canti, i canti suoi son tutti sali
Che fanno incorrutibili le parte;
Se pingi, infondi all'ombre auri vitali
E correggi scatura a suo coll'aver:

III
Peggio gliene Giostri tuoi, miro i colori
Balzamar il tuo stome, e miro assorto
Il Tempo vorator in quei liquori:

IV
Alteri speri arrivar la Gloria all'orto
Doppo l'occupo suo: ma i tuoi sudori
Vanno fatto Immortal prima, che Morto.

VII. 12 Anonymous, "Per un Crocifisso, pittura del Sig. Salvator Rosa che rappresenta l'azione Inclinato Capite Emisit spiritum"
BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 4r-4v.

I
Sul legno Deicida esala il fiato
Chi dà l'anima al tutto: il Nume eterno
Trafitto ha'l capo da' dipinge Inverno,
Aperto ha'l petto, esuisce lato il lato.

II
Il lume della Gloria ecco velato
Da viesa delitti: ecco da chiedo altemo
Ha trafisso di mani al gran governo
Chi lo scelto vostien d'ogni creato:

III
L'uccise destra Ebrea: m'è si dipinto
Alvicco del Pittor, che benche esinto
Sospirto, sembra piu vero, che finto:

IV
Tal segno l'Insensibile sortio,
che parebbe se non fusse estinto
Ne braccio human puo dar la vita à un Dio.

VII. 13 (Valerio?) Inghirami, "Dal Gioco dal Lotto si cava instruzione per l'Amico Cortigiano"
BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2.

I
Ciò che di vago Arta ingegniosa affina
Ciò che nasce di rieco in grambo al secolo
Quanto pietra indorò l'Indo, e'l Pattolo
Quanto some figlio Conea Marina.

II
Tutto Fortuna a dispensar vicina
Mostra raccolto entro d'un letto solo
Indi grata arricchirne avido stucolo
Con vergati caratteri dottina.

III
Ma che! Non speri in quelle Carta attesta
D'haver chi non pagò parta veruna
Bench'il premio ivi sia dono di sorta.

IV
Amico il fato Uman sotto la cuna
Gira così; Vuoi trè fortuna in Corte?
Vuol dall'Oro comprata e per Fortuna.

VII. 14 Giovan Cosimo Villifranchi, Sonnet on the death of Ricciardi
BNCF Magl. CL. VII no. 871 – 'Poesie diverse', 271r, "Di morti del Sig.re Dott.re Giovan Battista Ricciardi. Sonetto"

I
Occhi à che fin vi distillati in pianto
Senza veder che lacrimati a torto?
Forse vi duol, per che colui e tanto
Seppe intender la vita oggi sia morto?

II
Perche i Cigni morir voglion col canto
Forse al vostro dolor manca il conforto?
Ma questi dal cantar riposta il vanto
Invece di morir d'esser risorto.

III
Dunque da i rivi tuoi più non diversa
Il lacrimoso umor, mesto Cuor mio,
La Parca il vizio, e non virtude atterra

IV
Ch'egli non già mai il corpo suo moriò,
Ne' gli fu nuovo il Cielo se tanto in terra
Intese il tempo, e vi conobbe Iddio.

VII. 15 Francesco Baldovini, "Lacrime dell'Arno nella partenza del Sig.[r] Volunnio Bandinelli"

ASF Mediceo del Principato 6424, no pagination (5 pages)

I
1 Dentro all horrido sen di rupe oscura
con luci afflite, e spente
piange l'Arno dolente
nel crdoglio comun la sua sventura
5 su' l'affannatio petto
piovean l'egȓe pupilli un Dio di duolo,
lunge dal crin neglecto
svelti l'Alghe giaceano in grembo al solo
e con tremanti volo
10 faceano al suon' degl'aspri suoi lamenti
E co lugubre impietositi i venti.

II
Con le lebi mormorio
languiano a i suoi martiri,
e in dolorosi giri
15 correan ebri di pianto i suoi cristalli
di gemiti infelici
risonavano intorno i mesti lidi
l'inhospiti pendici
interrotti rendean gl'ultimi gridi
20 con questi reuti stridi,
salando dal seno aure in focati
egli in tanto feria le stelle ingrati.

III
E qual nuovo furor Fati crudeli
ai danni miei v'accende?
25 misero e qual m'offende
improviso rigor d'irati Cieli?
quai dardi avvelenati
in me dall'arco suo vibra la sorte?
qual tra flutti spietati
30 e fiera cariddi ha le mie gioie absorbe?
qual piu erudo di morte
sdegno d'empio destino, in un momento
ogni dolcezza mia cangia in tormento?

IV
Invida del mio ben cieca fortuna,
35 perche da questa sede
rapir l'Erti, cui diede
su l'antiche sue rive Arbia la Cuna
per lui tra questi sponde
fermò bella Virtù l'aurati piume;
40 per lui di Cina all'onde
prepose i flutti miei di Belo il Nume
di preziose spume
vantinsi l'Ermo, e il Tago: il mio tesoro
fur dei labri facondi i fiumi d'Oro

V
45 Flora de pregi sui Teatro angusto
che gia con lieto ciglio
pender dal suo consiglio
mirò del Tosco Rege il Germe Augusto
oh quali al suo partire
50 sparse indarno dal sen' querele amare;
in si erudel martire
verso da i lumi ad dolorati un mare.
Se noto il suo penare

VI
Ma chi puo raffienar scitico stiale
che sciolga all'aure il volo?
gia scorsa era nel Polo
delle perditi sue l'hora fatale
60 di lacrime i torrenti
non estinguon del Ciel l'ire rubelle
ne per gl'altrui lamenti
influenze men ree pirvon le stelle
non cede al pianto imbelle

ai Tronchi istessi; e su i miei lidi intanto
55 nuova Egeria sembrò conversa in pianto.

VII

O del fiume latin rive Beate
voi sol felici appiono
hoggi nel vostro seno
70 l'avventuroso Eroe liete albergati
oh come al suo sembianti
offri ò Febro festoso onde tranquille,
come con pie vaganti
corsi i fiori a bagnar d'humide stille
75 con invide pupille
la tua sorte benigna io gia non miro
ma le miserie mie piango, e sospiro.

IX

Così dicea, quando gl'etherei Campi
90 smaltò raggio improvviso,
che messagier di riso
l'aria anicchi d'innargentati Lampi
poi con lieti fiagori
da sinistra tonar l'Etra s'udio
95 onde ne suoi dolori
le speranze avvivò l'algoso Dio,
e nel ceruleo Rio
ove Zeffiro apria placidi i vanni
verso pianti di gioia, e non d'affanni.

65 fato crudel; ne per l'altrui cordoglio
immutabil destin' tempra l'orgoglio.

VIII

Deh sorga homai dall Indiche Riviere
quel fortunato giorno
80 ch'alle sue chiome intorno
vedansi fiammeggiar Porpore altere
allor de i fati infidi
sommergendo in oblio l'ire spietati
lasciati i patrij Lidi
85 correro nuovo Alfeo strade celate
e alle soglie adorate
ov' ha del Lazio il Re scettro temuto
offriro de miei flutti humil tributo.

VII. 16 Orazio Persiani, "Esser molto difficile del farsi un Amico, Sonetto"
BNCF Magl. VII. 364, 126v-127r.

I

Tant'è possibil farsi un vero Amico
Quanto un brachier si cangi in una rosa,
E chi lo prova tien più facil cosa
Il far nascer de Granchi sù run fico.

II

Chi pesce par di fuor dentro, è lombrico
E penetrar non puossi alla nascosa
E tal muove parte lingua pietosa
Che ti fende la penna n' sul bellico.

III

Chi a consigli d'altrui tosto si cala,
È come quello a cui punzon sien dati,
Mentre tombola giu per una scala.

IV

Se chi non erede in dio và fra dannati
Chi ad altri crede è messo con la pala

V

Dentro alle stinche fra quei disperati
Ben seno avventurati.

VI

Certi Cornelij Taciti, e palesi
degl'Amici trovar fidi, e cortesi.
D'Orazio Persiani.

VII. 17 Pier Salvetti, "Al Sig. Carlo Dati, per la morte del Sig. Domenico Alessandro Squarcialupi suo Nipote. Che è meglio esser Medico che Poeta, Canzone del Sig. Pier Salvetti"

BNCF Magl. VII. 573 – VII. Pier Salvetti, Poes. Varie, 37r-v.

I

1 Nume Rè delle Stelle
Cui d'Alloro, e di luce
Coronato risplende il crine eterno
Te non vogl'io per Duce
5 O Arciero, o Cantatore, io son ribelle
Quand'anco i Draghi ancida e plachi Averno
Già che per colpo interno
Che scocchi in noi di sorte rea, faresta
Non giova, o forza d'Arco, o suon di Petra

II

10 Allor che d'improvviso
La Ninfa del Peneo
Nascose in verdi fronde, avori, ed ostri
Nimmi è qual il trofeo
Nel trafitto Pittore, a te deriso
15 Portò salute o feritor di Nostri?
Lo Stral ch'a gl'occhi nostri
Apparve omnipotente, al fin che vale?
Pur terreno è l'affanno, e fù immortale.

III

Forse sia che rammenti
20 Valor di Tracia Lira
Che la spenta beltà ritolse a morte
O come ben sospira
Orfeo laggiu: del Regno de' tormenti
Muove a Pietà l'inesorabil Corte

25 Apre Stige le Porte
Chiuse a' pasti mortali, e 'l volto amato
Rende pentito l'immutabil fato

IV

O di soavi corde
Grande stupor, mà vano
30 Piangon le furie Orfeo ritorna solo.
Vada e con dotta mano
Ritocchi l'aurea filo e l'alte e sorde
Querei inchini al suo pié, tragga al suo duolo
Arresti il corso, il volo
35 A' Fiumi, a' Venti, e di senso a gli Scogli
Che può se non dà pace a suoi cordogli

V

Voltate o miei pensieri
Dell'Egeo sù la sponda
Dov' Ipolito il Carro affretta il corso
40 Mirate uscir dall'onda
Belva squamosa, e i fervidi destrieri
Empier d'orror.

VII. 18 Anonymous, "Dal Conte Filippo S. Martino d'Agliè"

BiASA, Rome, Misc. Mss. B. 1. 2, 11r.

I

Spade, Penne, e Pennelli, o con qual Arti
Di Guerrire, di Poeta, e di Pittore.
Sangui, Inchiostro stillar veggio, e Colore
Su l'Armi, su le Tele, e su le Carti.

II

Pugna, scrive, dipinge à parte a parti
Con studio con ingegno, e con valore
(Oh vicende bellisime d'honore!)
Apelle, Apollo altosnamp.be e Marte.

III

Chi la Palma di lor sia che riparte
Marin, Figin, o Carlo, e gual secondo
Questi d'industrie, o pur quell'altro forte

IV

Non sò qual sia primiero, o qual secondo
So ben, che fan del pari ingiuria à Marte
Scorno all Invidia, e meraviglia al Mondo.

Bibliography

Abati, Antonio. *Poesie postume di Antonio Abati*. Venice [Venetia]: Appresso Angelo Bodio, 1676.

Accetto, Torquato. *Della dissimulazione onesta* (1641). Edited by Salvatore Silvano Nigro. Turin: Einaudi, 1997.

Acidini, Cristina et al., eds. *Arte e Storia in San Michele a San Salvi*. Exhibition catalogue. Florence, 1979.

Acton, Harold. *The Last Medici.* London: Macmillan, 1980.

Adams, Charles Darwin. *Demosthenes and his Influence*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927.

Adams, Rachel and David Savran, eds. *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

Ademollo, Alessandro. *I Teatri di Roma nel secolo Decimosettimo*. Rome: L. Pasqualucci, 1888; reprinted Rome: A. Borzi-Libraio, 1969.

Adler, Kathleen and Marcia Pointon, *The Body Imaged. The Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Adorno, Francesco, ed. *Accademie e Istituzioni Culturali a Firenze*. Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere "La Colombaria," Studi LXV. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1983.

Aeschines. *The Speeches of Aeschines*. Translated by C. D. Adams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

Ago, Renata. *Economia Barocca: Mercato e istituzioni nella Roma del Seicento*. Rome: Donzelli, 1998.

Agostino, Vittorio d'. *Studi sul Neostoicismo: Seneca, Plinio il Giovane, Epitteto, Marco Aurelio*. Turin: Presso l'autore, 1962.

Agoston, Laura Camille. "Giotto, de Man and the Allegorical Impulse in Michelangelo." In *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, edited by Cristelle Baskins and Lisa Rosenthal. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Agrippa, Cornelius. *De occulta philosophia libri tres*. Edited by V. Perrone Compagni. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Ajmar, Marta. "Talking Pots: Strategies for Producing Novelty and the Consumption of Painted Pottery in Renaissance Italy." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni, et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 55-64.

Alberti, Leon Battista. *On Painting*. Edited by John R. Spencer. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.

_______. *On Painting*. In Elizabeth Holt, *A Documentary History of Art*, vol. I. The Middle Ages and the Renaissance. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1957.

_______. *On Painting and Sculpture*. Edited and translated by C. Grayson. London: Phaidon, 1972.

_______. *On Painting*. Edited by Cecil Grayson. London: Penguin Classics, 2004.

Alciati, Andrea. *Emblemata cum commentariis*. [1621] New York: Garland Publishing, 1976.

Algarotti, Francesco. *Saggi*. Edited by Giovanni da Pozzo. Bari: Gius. Laterza e Figli, 1963.

Allacci, Lione. *Drammaturgia*. Venice: G.B. Pasquali, 1755. Reprint, Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1961.

Allodoli, Ettore, ed. *La Sfinge, Enimmi di Antonio Malatesti con aggiunta la Tina, Scrittori Italiani e Stranieri.* Lanciano (?): Carabba Editore, 1913.

Alpers, Svetlana. *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

_______. *Rembrandt's Enterprise*. *The Studio and the Market*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Alpatov, Mikhail. "Poussin Problems." *Art Bulletin* XVII (1935): 22-28.

Alterocca, Arnaldo. *La Vita e l'Opera Poetica e Pittorica di Lorenzo Lippi, con nuove indagini e con rime inedite*. Catania: Francesco Battiato ed., 1914.

Amussen, Susan. "'The part of a Christian man': The Cultural Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England." In *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe. Essays Presented to David Underdown*, edited by Susan Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995, 213-230.

Andreini, Guido. *La Vita e l'opera di Carlo Roberto Dati*. Milano-Genova a Roma-Napoli: Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1936.

Antoniano, Silvio. *Dell'educazione cristiana e politica de' figliuoli libri tre*. [1584] 2 vols. Milan: Antonio Pogliani, 1821.

Anzelewsky, Fedja. *Albrecht Dürer. Das malerische Werk*. Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1971.

Apollodorus. *The Library of Greek Mythology*. Translated by Sir James George Frazer. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's sons, 1921.

Arasse, Danielle. "Les miroirs de la peinture." In *L'Imitation. Alienation ou source de liberte?* Paris: La Documentation Française, 1985.

Arcangeli, Aldo. *Il castello di Strozzavolpe*. Poggibonsi: Nencini, 1960.

Arecchi, Alberto, ed. *Girolamo Cardano. Metoposcopia. Manuale per la lettura della fronte.* Milan: Mimesis, 2003.

Argan, Giulio Carlo. "La 'rettorica' e l'arte barocca." In *Retorica e barocco: Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Studi Umanistici*, edited by E. Castelli. Rome: Fratelli Bocca, 1955.

Ariosto, Ludovico. *Orlando Furioso*. Translated by Guido Waldman. Oxford World's Classics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Armenini, Giovanni Battista. *On the True Precepts of the Art of Painting*. [1586] Edited and translated by Edward J. Olszewski. New York: B. Franklin, 1977.

_______. *De' veri precetti della pittura*. Edited by Marina Gorreri. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1988.

Arnold, Edward Vernon. *Roman Stoicism; being lectures on the history of the Stoic philosophy with special reference to its development within the Roman Empire*. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.

Askew, Pamela. "A Melancholy Astronomer by Giovanni Serodine." *Art Bulletin* 47: 1 (1965): 121-128.

_______. "Fetti's 'Portrait of an Actor' Reconsidered." *Burlington Magazine* 120: 899 (1978): 59-65.

Aulus Gellius. *The Attic Nights*. Translated by John C. Rolfe. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Autrand, Francoise. "Offices et officiers royaux en France sous Charles VI," *Revue historique* 242 (1969): 300-306.

Bacon, Francis. *Essays and New Atlantis*. Edited by Gordon S. Haight. New York: Published for the Classics Club by W. J. Black, 1942.

Bailey, F. G., ed. *Gifts and Poison: The Politics of Reputation*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World.* Translated by Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Baldassari, Francesca. *La collezione Piero ed Elena Bigongiari, il Seicento fiorentino tra 'favola' e drama.* Pistoia: Cassa di Risparmio di Pistoia e Pescia, 2004.

Baldinucci, Filippo. *Dal Baroccio a Salvator Rosa*. Edited by Guido Battelli. Florence: Sansoni, 1961.

_______. *Vita del Cavaliere Gio. Lorenzo Bernino.* [1682] University Park and London: Pennsylvania University Press, 1966.

_______. *Notizie dei Professori del Disegno da Cimabue in qua.* Edited by Ferdinando Ranalli. 5 vols. Florence: V. Batelli, 1974.

_______. *Notizie dei professori del disegno, da Cimabue in qua*. Edited by Paola Barocchi. 7 vols. Florence: Edizioni S.P.E.S., 1975.

_______. *Vocabolario Toscano dell'Arte del Disegno.* [1681] Facsimile edition, Florence: Stampa Stab. Grafico Commerciale, 1985.

Barasch, Moshe. "The Mask in European Art." In *Art the Ape of Nature. Studies in Honor of H. W. Janson*, edited by Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler. New York: H. N. Abrams Inc.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981, 253-264.

Barbaro, Francesco. "On Wifely Duties." In *The Earthly Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Ronald G. Witt. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978.

Barker, Sheila. "Poussin, Plague, and Early Modern Medicine." *Art Bulletin* 86: 4 (2004): 659-689.

Barocchi, Paola and Renzo Ristori, eds. *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*. 5 vols. Florence: Sansoni, 1965.

Barochi, Paola, ed. *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento*. 3 vols. Milan: R. Ricciardi, 1973.

_______ and Miriam Fileti Mazza, eds. *Archivio del Collezionismo Mediceo. Il Cardinal Leopoldo*. Milan and Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi ed., 1998.

_______ and Giovanna Gaeta Bertelà, eds., *Collezionismo mediceo e storia artistica*. 3 vols. Florence: Studio per edizioni scelte, 2002-2007.

Barolsky, Paul. *Why Madonna Smiles and Other Tales by Vasari*. University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1991.

_______. *Giotto's Father and the Family of Vasari's Lives*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Barone, Juliana. "Seventeenth-century illustrations for the chapters on motion in Leonardo's *Trattato*." In *The Rise of the Image*, edited by Rodney Palmer and Thomas Frangenberg. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Barryte, Bernard. "History and Legend in T. J. Barker's 'The Studio of Salvator Rosa in the Mountains of the Abruzzi', 1865." *Art Bulletin* lxxi: 4 (1989): 660-673.

Bartsch, Adam von. *The Illustrated Bartsch*. Edited by Walter L. Strauss. New York: Abaris Books, 1978.

Barzman, Karen-edis. *The Florentine Academy and the Early Modern State*. *The discipline of disegno*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Baskins, Cristelle and Lisa Rosenthal, eds. *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Bates, J. A. V. "The Communicative Hand." In *The Body as a Medium of Expression*, ed. J. Benthall and T. Polhemus. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1975.

Batschmann, Oskar. *Nicolas Poussin. Dialectics of Painting*. London: Reaktion Books, 1990.

_______ and Pascal Grenier. *Hans Holbein.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Battaglia, Salvatore. *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*. Turin: Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1961-.

Battisti, Eugenio. "Il concetto d'imitazione nel cinquecento da Raffaello a Michelangelo." *Commentari* 7 (1956): 86-104.

_______. "Il concetto d'imitazione nel cinquecento dai Veneziani a Caravaggio." *Commentari* 7 (1956): 249-262.

Bauer, George C. *Bernini in Perspective*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1976.

Baxandall, Michael. *Painting and experience in fifteenth century Italy: a primer in the social history of pictorial style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Bayer, Andrea. “A Note on Ribera’s Drawing of Niccolò Simonelli.” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Journal* 30 (1995): 73-80.

_______ , ed. *Painters of Reality: the legacy of Leonardo and Caravaggio in Lombardy*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004.

Belfiore, Elizabeth. “Pleasure, Tragedy and Aristotelian Psychology.” *The Classical Quarterly* 35: 2 (1985): 349-361.

Bellamy, Elizabeth Jane. “Desires and Disavowals: Speculations on the Aftermath of Stephen Greenblatt's *Psychoanalysis and Renaissance Culture*,” *Clio* 34 (2005): 297-315.

Bellesi, Sandro. “Una vita inedita di Pier Dandini.” *Rivista d’arte* XLIII (1992): 89-188.

_______. “Tendenze e orientamenti naturalistici nella pittura fiorentina della prima metà del Seicento.” In *Luce e ombra nella pittura italiana tra Rinascimento e Barocco: da Tiziano a Bernini*, edited by Vittorio Sgarbi. Milan: Skira, 2005.

Bellori, Giovan Pietro. *Le Vite de’ Pittori, scultori ed architetti moderni* [1672]. Edited by Evelina Borea. Introduction by Giovanni Previtali. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1976.

_______. *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*. Translated by Alice Sedgwick Wohl. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Belting, Hans. *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Beltrami, Luca. *Documenti e memorie riguardanti la vita e le opere di Leonardo da Vinci*. Milan, 1919.

Benati, Daniele and Antonio Paolucci, eds. *Guido Cagnacci: Protagonista del Seicento tra Caravaggio e Reni*. Exhibition catalogue. Cinisello Balsamo, Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2008.

_______ and Antonio Paolucci eds. *Caravaggio. I ‘Bari’ della collezione Mahon*. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2008.

Benthall, Jonathan and Ted Polhemus, eds. *The Body as a Medium of Expression*. Essays based on a course of lectures given at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London. New York: Dutton, 1975.

Bentini, Jadranka ed. *Sovrane passioni: le raccolte d’arte della Ducale galleria estense*. Exhibition catalogue. Milan: F. Motta, 1998.

_______ , ed. *Sovrane passioni: studi sul collezionismo estense*. Milan: F. Motta, 1998.

Benvenuti, Edoardo. *Agostino Coltellini e l'Accademia degli Apatisti a Firenze nel secolo XVII*. Pistoia: Officina tipografica cooperativa, 1910.

Berger, Harry Jr. “Fictions of the Pose: Facing the Gaze of Early-Modern Portraiture.” *Representations* 46 (1994): 89-90.

_______. *Fictions of the pose: Rembrandt against the Italian Renaissance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Bernini and the Birth of Baroque Portrait Sculpture. Edited by Andrea Bacchi et al. Exhibition catalogue. J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles; National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, 2008.

Berthoff, Ann. “The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand.” In *The Making of Meaning*: *Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing Teachers*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1981, 61-67.

Bertini, Giuseppe. “Ottavio Farnese e Francesco de Marchi: una proposta di identificazione nel *Doppio Ritratto maschile* di Maso da San Friano.” *Aurea Parma* LXVIII (1994): 149-155.

Bertini, Silvano. “Sulle orme di Salvator Rosa nelle campagne volterrane.” *Volterra* 1 (1972): 11-14.

Biagioli, Mario. “Galileo’s System of Patronage.” *History of Science* xxviii (1990): 1-62.

Bialstocki, Jan. “The Renaissance Concept of Nature and Antiquity.” In *The Message of Images: Studies in the History of Art*. Vienna: IRSA Verlag, 1988.

Bianchi, Barbèra, ed. *La Vita di Benvenuto Cellini*. Florence: Successori Le Monnier, (1866) 1963.

Bianchi, Marina. “Consuming Novelty: Strategies for Producing Novelty in Consumption.” *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 28: 1 (1998): 3-18.

Bigazzi, P. *A Voi Marchese Luigi Torrigiani ... Pietro Bigazzi …, offre...* . Florence, 1867.

Bissell, Ward, et al eds. *Masters of Italian Baroque Painting. The Detroit Institute of Arts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.

Blau, Peter M. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: J. Wiley, 1964.

Bloom, Harold. *Genius: A Mosaic of One Hundred Exemplary Creative Minds.* New York: Warner Books, 2002.

Bloomfield, Morton W., ed. *Allegory, Myth and Symbol*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Blosser, Philip and Marshall Carl Bradley. *Friendship. Philosophic Reflections on a Perennial Concern*. Lanham, New York and Oxford: University Press of America, Inc., 1997.

Blume, Andrew. “Botticelli and the Cost and Value of Altarpieces in Late Fifteenth-Century Florence.” In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell’arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 151-161.

Blunt, Anthony. “Poussin’s Notes on Painting.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 1 (1937-8): 344-51.

_______. “Blake’s ‘Ancient of Days’: The Symbolism of the Compasses.” *JWCI* 2 (1938-39): 53-63.

_______ and Hereward Lester Cooke. *The Roman drawings of the XVII & XVIII centuries in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle*. London: Phaidon Press, 1960.

_______. *Nicolas Poussin*. The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts. 2 vols. New York, 1967.

Boas, George. *The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1950.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *De Casibus Illustrium Virorum.* A facsimile reproduction of the Paris edition of 1520. Introduction by Louis Brewer Hall. Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1962.

Bochiero, Luciano. *Experiment and natural philosophy in seventeenth-century Tuscany. The history of the Accademia del Cimento*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.

Boetzkes, Ottilie G. *Salvator Rosa: Seventeenth-Century Italian Painter, Poet and Patriot.* New York: Vantage Press, 1960.

Bok, Marten Jan. "Pricing the Unpriced: How Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painters determined the Selling Price of their Work." In *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, edited by Michael North and David Ormrod. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998, 104-8.

Bolgar, R. R. "The Teaching of Letter-writing in the sixteenth century." *History of Education* 12: 4 (1983): 245-253.

Bolten, Jaap. "A 'commercial copy' by Nicolaes Lauwers." *Delineavit et Sculpsit* 6 (1991).

Bologna, Ferdinando, ed. *Battistello Carracciolo e il primo naturalismo a Napoli*. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 1991.

Bolzoni, Lina. *The Gallery of Memory. Literary and Iconographic Models in the Age of the Printing Press*. Translated by Jeremy Parzen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Bomford, Kate. "The Visual Representation of Friendship amongst Humanists in the Southern Netherlands, c. 1560-c. 1630." PhD dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2000.

_______. "Peter Paul Rubens and the Value of Friendship." *NKJ* 54 (2003): 229-257.

_______. "Friendship and Immortality: Holbein's *Ambassadors* revisited." *Renaissance Studies* 18: 4 (2004): 544-581.

Bonfait, Oliver. "Le public du Guerchin: recherches sur le marché de l'art à Bologne au XVIIe siècle." *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine* XXXVIII (1991): 401-27.

_______. "La valeur de l'oeuvre peinte: l'economie du mecenat de Pompeo Aldrovandini." In *Le commerce de l'art de la Renaissance à nos jours*, edited by Laurence Bertrand Dorleac. Besancon: Editions La Manufacture, 1992, 95-99.

Boorsch, Suzanne and Nadine M. Orenstein. *The Print in the North. The Age of Albrecht Dürer and Lucas Van Leyden*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997.

Borea, Evelina and Carlo Gasparri. *L'Idea del Bello. Viaggio per Roma nel Seicento con Giovan Pietro Bellori.* Exhibition catalogue. 2 vols. Rome: De Luca, 2000.

Borelli, Gian Giotto and Lucio Festa. *Salvator Rosa: Lettere*. Naples: Società editrice il Mulino; Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici, 2003.

Boschloo, Anton W. A., ed. *Academies of Art between Renaissance and Romanticism*. 'S-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij, 1989.

Bottari, Giovanni Gaetano and Stefano Ticozzi. *Raccolta di lettere sulla pittura, scultura ed architettura scritte da' più celebri personaggi dei secoli XV, XVI, e XVII*. 8 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1976.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Boyer, Ferdinand. "Documents d'Archives Romaines et Florentines sur le Valentin, le Poussin e le Lorrain." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Francais* (1931): 233-238.

Bragaglia, Egisto and Teresa Grossi, eds. *Salvator Rosa. L'uomo, l'artista, l'antesignano.* Cornuda (Treviso): Antiga Edizioni, 2006.

Branham, Robert Bracht and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, eds. *The Cynics: the cynic movement in antiquity and its legacy.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Brann, Noel L. *The Debate over the Origin of Genius during the Italian Renaissance: the theories of supernatural frenzy and natural melancholy in accord and in conflict on the threshold of the scientific revolution.* Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002.

Bravo, Carlo del. "La 'fiorita gioventù' del Volteranno." *Artibus et Historiae* 1:1 (1980): 47-68.

Bray, Alan. "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England." In *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, edited by Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002, 340-50.

_______. *The Friend.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Bray, Bernard and Christoph Strosetzki, eds. *Art de la la lettre, art de la conversation à l'époque classique en France*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1995.

Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Bremmer, Jan and Herman Roodenburg, eds. *A Cultural History of Gesture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Brewer, John. "Positioning the Market: Art, Goods and Commodities in Early Modern Europe." In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della 'Trentateesima Settimana di Studi', 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, pp. 139-148.

Briganti, Giuliano. *Pietro da Cortona*, *o, Della Pittura barocca*. Florence: Sansoni, 1982.

_______ et al, eds. *I Bamboccianti: pittori della vita quotidiana a Roma nel Seicento.* Rome: U. Bozzi, 1983.

_______. “Osservazioni sulla carriera professionale e sullo stile di Pier Francesco Mola.” In *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*, edited by Manuela Kahn-Rossi. Exhibition catalogue. Milan: Electa, 1989, 21-27.

Brilliant, Richard. *Portraiture.* London: Reaktion Books, 2001.

Brittan, Simon. *Poetry, Symbol and Allegory*. *Interpreting Metaphorical Language from Plato to the Present*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003.

Brod, Harry, ed. *The Making of Masculinities. The New Men’s Studies*. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

Brown, Beverly Louise. “Replication and the Art of Veronese.” In *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, edited by Rosalind Krauss et al. National Gallery of Art, Washington. Studies in the History of Art, 20. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1989, 111-121.

_______ , ed. *The Genius of Rome, 1592-1623.* London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2001.

Brown, Christopher and Hans Vlieghe, et al. eds. *Van Dyck: 1599-1641*. New York: Rizzoli, 1999.

Brown, Jonathan. Review of *Poussin*, by Anthony Blunt. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 28: 1 (1969): 99.

_______. *Velazquez: Painter and Courtier*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

_______. *Jusepe De Ribera*. *Prints and Drawings*. Exhibition catalogue. Princeton: The Art Museum, Princeton University; Cambridge: The Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, 1973.

Bucci, Mario et al, eds. *Mostra del Cigoli e del suo ambiente*. Florence: Accademia degli Euteleti, Città di San Miniato. Cassa di Risparmio di S. Miniato, 1959.

Bullard, Melissa Meriam. “Marsilio Ficino and the Medici. The Inner Dimensions of Patronage.” In *Christianity and the Renaissance, Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento*, edited by Timothy Verdon and John Henderson. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990, 467-492.

_______. “Heroes and their Workshops: Medici patronage and the problem of shared agency.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994): 179-198.

Bullock, Walter L. “The Precept of Plagiarism in the Cinquecento.” *Modern Philology* 25: 3 (1928),: 293-312.

Bulwer, John. *Chirologia: or the Natural Language of the Hand, and Chironomia: or the Art of Manual Rhetoric.* [1644] Edited by James W. Cleary. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy.* [1860] London: Phaidon Press, 1960.

Burgess, Theodore C. “Epideictic Literature.” In *Studies in Classical Philology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902, III, 89-248.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful.* [1757] Edited by J.T. Boulton. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1958.

Burke, Peter. *The Renaissance Sense of the Past*. London: Edward Arnold, 1969.

_______. *The Italian Renaissance. Culture and Society in Italy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986.

_______. "The Presentation of the self in the Renaissance portrait." In *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy: Essays on Perception and Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

_______. "The Language of Gesture in Early Modern Italy." In *A Cultural History of Gesture*, edited by Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992, 71-83.

_______. *The Art of Conversation*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.

Burns, Elizabeth. *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and in Social Life*. London: Longman, 1972.

Burrows, David L. "Antonio Cesti on Music." *The Musical Quarterly* 51: 3 (1965): 518-529.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy.* Edited by Holbrook Jackson. New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001.

Bushman, Donald. "'A Conversation of Gestures': George Herbert Mead's Pragmatic Theory of Language." *Rhetoric Review* 16: 2 (1998): 253-267.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2006

Butters, Suzanne B. "Making Art Pay: The Meaning and Value of Art in Late Sixteenth-Century Rome and Florence." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 25-40.

Calbi, Maurizio. *Approximate Bodies. Gender and Power in Early Modern Drama and Anatomy.* New York and London: Routledge, 2005.

Calhoun, David Harris. "Friendship and Self-Love in Aristotle's Ethics." PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1989.

Calitti, Floriana, ed. *L'Arte della Conversazione. Nelle Corti del Rinascimento.* Introduction by Amedeo Quondam. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 2003.

Callistratus, *Philostratus the Younger/ the Elder, Imagines*; *Callistratus*, *Descriptiones*. Edited by A. Fairbanks. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1969.

Calvin, John. *Institutio Christianae Religionis*. Edited by August Tholuck. Edinburgh, 1874.

Campori, Giuseppe. *Gli Artisti Italiani e Stranieri negli Stati Estensi*. Rome: Multigrafica editrice, 1969.

Cantelli, Giuseppe. "Proposte per Giovanni Martinelli." *Paradigma* 2 (1978): 143-145.

Capitelli, Giovanna. "'Nota di guardaroba' del Principe Camillo Pamphilj," in *I capolavori della collezione Doria Pamphilj da Tiziano a Velazquez.* Exhibition catalogue. Fondazione arte e civiltà, Milan, Sept. 28-Dec. 8, 1996. Milan: Skira, 1996.

_______. "'Connoisseurship' al Lavoro: la carriera di Nicolò Simonelli (1611-1671)." *Quaderni Storici* 39: 116 (2004): 375-401.

Cappellano, Monsù. [Jean Chapelain] *Discorso di Monsù Cappellano … Nel quale dà il suo parere sopra l'Adone Poema del Cavalier Marino*. Venice: Giacomo Sarzina, 1625.

Caravaggio e L'Europa. Il movimento caravaggesco internazionale da Caravaggio a Mattia Preti. Exhibition catalogue. Milan: Skira, 2005.

Careri, Giovanni. *Bernini. Flights of Love, the Art of Devotion.* Translated by Linda Lappin. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1995.

Caroli, Flavio, ed. *L'Anima e il Volto*: *ritratto e fisiognomica da Leonardo a Bacon.* Milan: Electa, 1998.

_______. *Storia della Fisognomica. Arte e psicologia da Leonardo a Freud*. Milan: Electa, 2004.

Carrier, David. "Poussin's Self-Portraits." *Word and Image* 7: 2 (1991): 127-148.

_______. *Poussin's paintings: a study in art-historical methodology*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

Caro, Annibale. *Delle Lettere familiari*. Bassano: a spese Remondini di Venezia, 1782.

Carter, Paul. "A Roman Comedy." *Art and Artists* 12: 9 (1978): 37-39.

Cassani, Silvia, ed. *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli*. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 1984.

Cast, David. *The Calumny of Apelles. A Study in the Humanist Tradition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Castelli, Silvia ed., *Manoscritti teatrale della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*, Catalogo ragionato. Florence: Polistampa, 1998.

Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Translated by George Bull. Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1967.

Cattaneo, Irene. *Salvator Rosa.* Milan: Casa Editrice 'Alpes', 1929.

Cavallaro, Dani. *Critical and Cultural Theory.* London: Athlone Press, 2001.

Cavazzini, Patrizia. *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.

Cecchini, Isabella. "'Fatte varie, et diverse esperienze per essitar esse Pitture'. Prezzo e valori di stima. Breve analisi di un campione seicentesco a Venezia." In *Tra Committenza e Collezionismo. Studi sul mercato dell'arte nell'Italia settentrionale durante l'età moderna*, edited by Enrico Maria Dal Pozzolo and Leonida Tedoldi. Vicenza: Terra Ferma, 2003, 123-136.

_______. "Troublesome Business: Dealing in Venice, 1600-1750." In *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006, 125-134.

Cella, Cristiana. *La mano, il guanto*. Milan: Idealibri, 1989.

Ceppi, Claudia Beltramo and Nicoletta Confuorto, eds. *Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento. Il Potere e lo Spazio*. Milan: Electa, 1980.

Cesareo, Giovanni Alfredo. *Poesie e Lettere edite e inedite di Salvator Rosa*. 2 vols. Naples: Tipografia della Regia Università, 1892.

_______. "Bricchiche Rosiane." *Giornale Storico della letteratura italiana* 22 (1893): 185-199.

Chambers, David S. *Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1970.

_______ and Francois Quiviger, eds. *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century.* London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995.

_______. "The Earlier 'Academies' in Italy." In *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, edited by David S. Chambers and Francois Quiviger. London: : The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995.

Chambers, L. P. "Moral Freedom and Artistic Creativity." *International Journal of Ethics* 42: 2 (1932): 163-70.

Chantelou, Paul Fréart de. *Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini's Visit to France. (Journal du voyage en France du cavalier Bernin.)* Edited by Anthony Blunt. Translated by Margery Corbett. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Chapman, H. Perry. *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits: A study in seventeenth-century identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Chapman, John W. "Toward a General Theory of Human Nature and Dynamics." In *Human Nature in Politics* (*Nomos XVII*), edited by J. Roland Pennock and John W. Chapman. New York: New York University Press, 1977.

Chastel, André. "Masque, Mascarade, Mascaron." In *Fables, Formes, Figures*, I. Idées et Recherches. Paris: Flammarion, 1978.

_______. "Le Principe de l'imitation à la Renaissance." In *Fables, Formes, Figures*, II. Idees et Recherches, Paris: Flammarion, 1978.

_______. "Gesture in Painting. Problems in Semiology." In *The Language of Gesture in the Renaissance*. Selected proceedings of the conference held in Toronto, November 1983. Edited by Konrad Eisenbichler and Philip Sohm. Renaissance and Reformation, new series, 10, no. 1, 1986.

Cheal, David. *The Gift Economy*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988.

Cheney, Liana De Girolami, ed. *The Symbolism of Vanitas in the Arts, Literature, and Music. Comparative and Historical Studies*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

Chiarini, Marco, ed. *Lodovico Cigoli, 1559-1613. Tra Manierismo e Barocco. Dipinti*. Florence: Galleria Palatina di Palazzo Pitti, 1992.

_______ and Karl Noehles. “Pietro da Cortona a Palazzo Pitti: un episodio ritrovato.” *Bolletino d’Arte* 52: 4 (1967): 233-39.

_______ ed. *Artisti alla corte granducale*. Palazzo Pitti, Appartamenti monumentali, maggio-luglio 1969. Florence: Centro Di, 1969.

_______ and Serena Padovani, eds. *La Galleria Palatina e gli Appartamenti Reali di Palazzo Pitti: catalogo dei dipinti.* Florence: Centro Di, 2003.

_______.“Gli anni fiorentini di Salvator Rosa.” In *Salvator Rosa, Tra Mito e Magia*. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 2008, 22-27.

Chiarini de Anna, G. “Leopoldo de’ Medici e la sua raccolta di disegni nel ‘Carteggio d'Artisti’ nell’Archivio di Stato di Firenze.” *Paragone* 26 (1975): 38-64.

Chodorow, Nancy Julia. “Toward a Relational Individualism: The Mediation of Self through Psychoanalysis.” In *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, 197-207.

Christ, Alice T. “The Masculine Ideal of ‘the Race That Wears the Toga’.” *Art Journal* 56: 2 (“How Men Look: On the Masculine Ideal and the Body Beautiful”) (1997): 24-30.

Christensen, Carl C. “Durer’s ‘Four Apostles’ and the Dedication as a Form of Renaissance Art Patronage.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 20: 3 (1967): 325-334.

Christiansen, Keith. “Some Observations on the Relationship between Caravaggio’s Two Treatments of the ‘Lute-Player’.” *Burlington Magazine* 132: 1042 (1990): 21-19

_______ and Denis Mahon. “Caravaggio’s Second Versions.” *Burlington Magazine* 134: 1073 (1992): 502-504

_______. “Tiepolo, Theater, and the Notion of Theatricality.” *Art Bulletin* 81: 4 (1999): 665-692.

Ciardi, Roberto. “‘A Knot of Words and Things’: Some Clues for Interpreting the *Imprese* of Academies and Academicians.” In *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, edited by David S. Chambers and Francois Quiviger. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995, 37-54.

_______. *Case di Artisti in Toscana*. Florence: Banca Toscana, 1998.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Amicitia*. Translated by J. F. Stout and W. F. Masom. London: W. B. Clive, University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1895.

_______. *De Amicitia*. Translated by Andrew P. Peabody.   Portland, Maine: The Mosher Press, 1913.

_______. *De Oratore*. Translated by E. W. Sutton. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

_______. *Tusculanae Disputationes*. Translated by J. E. King. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard Univerity Press, 1971.

_______. *De Officiis*. Translated by Walter Miller. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Cinelli Calvoli, Giovanni. *La Toscana letterata, ovvero storia degli scrittori fiorentini*. Ms Magliabecchiano IX, codice 67. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence.

Cipolla, Carlo M. "The Decline in Italy: the case of a fully matured economy." *The Economic History Review* 5, (1952): 178-87.

_______. *Fighting the Plague in 17th c. Italy*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.

Cirlot, J. E. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. Translated by Jack Sage. New York: Philosophical Library, 1962.

Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli. Exhibition catalogue. Soprintendenza per i Beni Artistici e Storici di Napoli. Museo di Capodimonte; Museo Pignatelli. Electa: Napoli, 1984.

Clair, Jean, ed. *Mélancolie. Génie et folie en Occident.* Exhibition catalogue. Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, Paris (10 octobre 2005-16 janvier 2006); Neue Nationalgalerie, Berlin (17 février-7 mai 2006). Paris: Galimard, 2006.

Clark, John R. and Anna Lydia Motto. "Seneca on friendship." *Atene e Roma*, 38 (1993): 91-98.

Claudian [Claudius Claudianus]. *In Rufinum*. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann, 1932.

Clericuzio, Antonio and Silvia de Renzi. "Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy in the Early Accademia dei Lincei." In *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, edited by David S. Chambers and Francois Quiviger. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995, 175-194.

Clifford, Gay. *The Transformations of Allegory.* London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1974.

Clifford, James. "On Ethnographic Self-Fashioning: Conrad and Malinowski." In *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, 140-62.

Cochrane, Eric W. *Tradition and Enlightenment in the Tuscan Academies, 1690-1800*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Cocke, Richard. *Pier Francesco Mola*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Coffin, David R. "Pirro Ligorio on the Nobility of the Arts." *JWCI* 27 (1964): 191-210.

Cohen, Elizabeth. "Honor and Gender in the Streets of Early Modern Rome." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* xxii: 4 (1992): 597-625.

Cohen, Sarah R. "Body as 'Character' in Early Eighteenth-Century French Art and Performance." *The Art Bulletin* 78: 3 (1996): 454-466.

Cohen, Michèle. *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century.* London and NY: Routledge, 1996.

Colantuono, Anthony. "The Tender Infant: *Invenzione* and *Figura* in the Art of Poussin." PhD dissertation, John Hopkins University, 1986.

_______. “The Cup and the Shield: Lorenzo Lippi, Torquato Tasso and Seventeenth-Century Pictorial Stylistics.” In *L’Arme e gli amori. Ariosto, Tasso and Guarini in Late Renaissance Florence*. Acts of an International Conference. Florence, Villa I Tatti, June 27-29, 2001. (Vol. II, Dynasty, Court and Imagery). Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2004.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Biographia literaria*. Edited by J. Shawcrosse. 2 vols. London and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Condivi, Ascanio. *The Life of Michelangelo*. Edited by Hellmut Wohl. Translated by Alice Sedgwick Wohl. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.

Conisbee, Philip. “Salvator Rosa and Claude-Joseph Vernet.” *Burlington Magazine* 15: 849 (1973): 789-794.

Connell, R. W. “The History of Masculinity.” In *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, edited by Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002, 245-261.

Connors, Joseph. “Virtuoso Architecture in Cassiano’s Rome.” In *Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Paper Museum*. 2 vols. Milan, 1992, 2 (Quaderni Puteani 3), 23-40.

_______. Review of *Le vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti..., Rome, 1642 by Giovanni Baglione*, by Jacob Hess. *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57: 4 (1998): 469-71.

Consagra, Francesca. “The Marketing of Pietro Testa’s ‘Poetic Inventions’.” In *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650: Prints and Drawings*, edited by Elizabeth Cropper. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1988, lxxxix-xcv.

Conte, Floriana. “In margine all’epistolario di Salvator Rosa.” *Aprosiana* 14 (2006 (2007)): 189-197.

_______. “Fortuna di Salvator Rosa nella letteratura del tempo.” Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Conti, Alessandro. “L’evoluzione dell’artista.” *Storia dell’arte italiana* 2 (1979): 117-263.

Conti, G. “La Compagnia della Scala.” In *L’Illustratore Fiorentino*, 1915.

Conway, William Martin, ed. *Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889.

Cooper, John M. “Aristotle on Friendship.” *Essays on Aristotle’s Ethics*. Edited by Amelie Oksenberg Rorty. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1980.

Cooper, Tarnya. “‘Frail flesh, as in a glass’: the portrait as an immortal presence in early modern England and Wales.” In *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art*, edited by Mary Rogers. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Cope, Jackson I. “Bernini and Roman *Commedie Ridicolose*.” *PMLA* 102: 2 (1987): 177-186.

Corbett, Edward P. J. “The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist.” *College Composition and Communication* 20 (1969): 288-296.

_______. “The Theory and Practice of Imitation in Classical Rhetoric.” *College Composition and Communication* 22: 3 (1971): 243-250.

Cordingly, David. “Claude Lorrain and the Southern Seaport Tradition.” *Apollo* 103: 169 (1976): 208-213.

Corsiglia, Christina, ed. *Rubens and His Age: Treasures from the Hermitage Museum, Russia*. Exhibition catalogue. Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario, 2001.

Coryate, Thomas. *Coryats Crudities, Hastily gobled up in Five Moneths Travells in France, Savoy, Italy*. [1611] Edited and translated by F. Taviani and M. Schino, in *Il Segreto della Commedia dell’Arte*. Florence: La Casa Usher, 1982.

Costamagna, Philippe. *Pontormo*. Milan: Electa, 1994.

Costello, Jane. “The Twelve Pictures Ordered by Velazquez and the Trial of Valguarnera.” *JWCI* 13 (1950): 237-284.

Cotticelli, Francesco, et al. *The Commedia dell’Arte in Naples: A Bilingual Edition of the 176 Casamarciano Scenarios*. vol. I. Lanham, Maryland and London: The Scarecrow Press, 2001.

Couchman, Jane and Ann Crabb. *Women’s Letters Across Europe, 1400-1700: Form and Persuasion*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005.

Cox, Virginia. *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary dialogue in its social and political contexts, Castiglione to Galileo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Cox-Rearick, Janet. *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art: Pontormo, Leo X, and the Two Cosimos.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Cretella, Luigi. *L’Ideale di Salvator Rosa e le ‘Satire’*. Trani: V. Vecchi, Tipografo-Editore, 1899.

Cristina di Svezia. Le collezioni reali. Exhibition catalogue. Rome: Fondazione Memmo; Milan: Electa, 2003.

Croce, Benedetto. *I Teatri di Napoli nei secoli XV-XVII*. Naples: Pierro, 1891.

_______. “Recenzione dell'opera del Cesareo 'Poesie e lettere’, ecc.” *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* xxi (1893): 127-150.

_______. *Pulcinella e il personaggio del napoletano in commedia*. Rome: Loescher, 1899.

_______. *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del seicento*. Bari: Laterza, 1911.

_______. “Due illustrazioni al ‘Viaje del Parnaso’ del Cervantes.” In *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del Seicento*. Bari, 1911.

Cropper, Elizabeth. “Bound Theory and Blind Practice: Pietro Testa’s Notes on Painting and the *Liceo della Pittura*.” *JWCI* 34 (1971): 262-296.

_______. *The Ideal of Painting. Pietro Testa’s Düsseldorf Notebook*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

_______ and Charles Dempsey. "The State of Research in Italian Painting of the Seventeenth Century." *Art Bulletin* 69 (1987): 494-509.

_______ , ed. *Pietro Testa, 1612-1650: Prints and Drawings*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art; University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

_______. "The Petrifying Art: Marino's Poetry and Caravaggio." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 26 (1991): 193-212.
_______. "Painting and Possession: Poussin's Portrait for Chantelou and the Essais of Montaigne." In *Der Kunstler uber sich in seinem Werk*. Herausgegeben von Matthias Winner. Internationales Symposium der Biblioteca Hertziana, Rome 1989. VCH Acta humanoria, 1992.

_______. "Printmaking in the Seicento." *Print Quarterly* 11: 2 (1994): 182-3.

_______. "The place of beauty in the High Renaissance and its displacement in the history of art." In *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance*, edited by Alvin Vos. Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 132, 1995, 159-205.

_______ and Charles Dempsey. *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

______."Michelangelo Cerquozzi's Self-Portrait: The Real Studio and the Suffering Model." In *Ars naturam adiuvans: Festschrift fur Matthias Winner*, edited by Victoria von Flemming and Sebastian Schütze. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern, 1996, 401-12.

_______. *Pontormo. Portrait of a Halberdier*. Los Angeles: Getty Museum, 1997.

_______. *The Domenichino Affair. Novelty, Imitation and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.

Crosby, Donald A. *Novelty*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005.

Cummings, Frederick, ed. *Art in Italy 1600-1700*. Detroit: Detroit Institute of Arts, 1965.

Cunnally, John. "Ancient Coins as Gifts and Tokens of Friendship during the Renaissance." *Journal of the History of Collections* 6: 2 (1994): 129-143.

D'Afflitto, Chiara. "Precisazioni sulla fase giovanile di Lorenzo Lippi." *Paragone* 353 (1979): 61-76.

_______. "La 'conversione' di Lorenzo Lippi." *Paradigma* 4 (1984): 111-138.

______. *Lorenzo Lippi*. Florence: Edifir, 2002.

______ and Danilo Romei, eds. *I teatri del Paradiso : la personalità, l'opera, il mecenatismo di Giulio Rospigliosi (Papa Clemente IX)*. Pistoia: Maschietto & Musolino; Siena: Protagon editori toscani, 2000.

Dalton, George, ed. *Tribal and Peasant Economies: Readings in Economic Anthropology*. Garden City, New York: Published for the American Museum of Natural History, Natural History Press, 1967.

Danesi Squarzina, Silvia, ed. *Caravaggio e I Giustiniani. Toccar con mano una collezione del seicento*. Milan: Electa, 2001.

Daprà, Brigitte. "I ritratti di Salvator Rosa." In *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 2008, 58-65.

Darby, Delphine Fitz. "Ribera and the Wise Men." *Art Bulletin* 44: 4 (1962): 279-307.

Dati, Carlo. *Prose fiorentine raccolte dallo Smarrito, accademico della Crusca ...* . Florence: Nella nuova stamperia all'insegna della stella, 1661-.

Dati, Carlo. *Lettere di Carlo Roberto Dati*. Florence: Stamperia Magheri, 1825.

Davis, Bruce. "Pier Francesco Mola's Autobiographical Caricatures: A Postscript." *Master Drawings* 29: 1 (1991): 48-51, 85-86.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. "Beyond the Market: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33 (1983): 69-88.

_______. "Boundaries and the Sense of Self in Sixteenth-century France." In *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, 53-63.

_______. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.

Delbeke, Maarten, Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow, eds. *Bernini's Biographies*. *Critical Essays*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Le Pli. Leibniz et le Baroque*. Paris: Editions du Minuit, 1988.

Delfino, Antonio. "Documenti inediti per alcuni pittori del '600." In *Ricerche sul '600 napoletano*. Milan: L & T, 1985.

Della Casa, Giovanni. *Trattato degli uffici comuni tra gli amici superiori e inferiori*. In *Prose di G. Della Casa e altri trattatisti cinquecenteschi del Comportamento* [1571]. Edited by Arnaldo di Bendetto. Turin: Utet, 1970.

Della Porta, Giovan Battista. *Della Fisonomia dell'uomo*. [1610 edition] Edited by Mario Cicognani. Milan: Longanesi & C., 1971.

_______. *De Ea Naturalis Physiognomoniae Parte Quae Ad Manum Lineas Spectat Libri duo.* Edited by Oreste Trabucco. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2003.

Delumeau, Jean. *Rome au XVIe siècle*. Paris: Hachette, 1975.

_______. *Vita economica e sociale di Roma nel Cinquecento*. Florence, 1979.

Dempsey, Charles. "Castiglione in Philadelphia." *Burlington Magazine* CXIV (1972): 117-120.

_______. Review of *Pietro da Cortona at the Pitti Palace: A Study of the Planetary Rooms* and related projects by Malcolm Campbell. *Art Bulletin* 61: 1 (1979): 141-44.

_______. "Some Observations on the Education of Artists in Florence and Bologna during the later Sixteenth Century." *Art Bulletin* 62: 4 (1980): 552-569.

_______. *Inventing the Renaissance Putto*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Dentler, Clara Louise. "Salvator Rosa and his Academy." *Florence* XIV: 3 (1953): 39-41.

Desan, Philippe. "Préfaces, prologues et avis au lecteur: stratégies préfacielles à la Renaissance." In *What is Literature? France 1100-1600*, edited by F. Cornilliat, D. Kelly, U. Langer. Lexington, KY: French Forum, 1993.

Descartes, René. *A Discourse on Method*. [1637] Translated by John Veitch. London: J.M. Dent, 1960.

Desmet, Christy. "The Persistence of Character." *Shakespeare Studies* 34 (2006): 46-55.

Diana, Antoninus. *Resolutiones morales*. Mons: Franciscus Waudraeus, 1635.

The Dictionary of Art. Edited by Jane Turner. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Didi-Huberman, George. "L'imitation comme mythe a la Renaissance." In *Künstlerischer Austausch/ Artistic Exchange.* Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin 15-20 Juli 1992. Band II. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993.

Dieckmann, Herbert. "Diderot's conception of Genius." *Journal of the History of Ideas* II (1941): 151-182.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. Edited by C. D. Younge. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853.

Il Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-.

Doglio, Maria Luisa. *L'Arte delle Lettere: idea e pratica della scrittura epistolare tra Quattro e Seicento*. Bologna: Il mulino, 2000.

Dominici, Bernardo de. *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti napoletani.* [1742] Bologna: Forni, 1971.

Donaldson, S. K. "One Kind of Speech Act: How Do We Know When We're Conversing?" *Semiotica* 28, (1979): 259-99.

Dooley, Brendan, ed. *Italy in the Baroque. Selected Readings*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1995.

Dorjahn, Alfred P. "A Further Study on Demosthenes' Ability to Speak Extemporaneously." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 69-76.

Doy, Gen. *Materializing Art History.* Oxford and New York: Berg, 1998.

_______. *Picturing the Self: Changing Views of the Self in Visual Culture.* London: I. B. Tauris, 2005.

Duby, Georges and Jean-Luc Daval, eds. *Sculpture. From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Köln: Taschen, 2002.

Duchartre, Pierre Louis. *The Italian Comedy. The improvisation, scenarios, lives, attributes, portraits and masks of the illustrious characters of the commedia dell'arte.* Translated by Randolph T. Weaver. New York: John Day, 1929.

Dumont, Louis. *Homo Hierarchicus*. Translated by M. Sainsbury. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

_______. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. [1893] New York: Free Press, 1964.

Ebert-Schifferer, Sybille. "Il teatro filosofico della vanità. Le iconografie di Salvator Rosa." In *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia*. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 2008, 66-82.

Edgerton, Samuel Y. Jr. "Galileo, Florentine 'Disegno' and the 'Strange Spottednesse' of the Moon." *Art Journal* XLIV: 3 (1984): 225-32.

Eggebrecht, Hans Heinrich, ed. *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie*. Im Auftrag der Kommission für Musikwissenschaft der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz hrsg. von Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht. Wiesbaden; F. Steiner, 1972-.

Eisenbichler, Konrad. *The Boys of the Archangel Raphael. A Youth Confraternity in Florence, 1411-1785*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Eisenstadt, S. N. and Louis Roniger. "Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22: 1 (1980): 42-77.

_______. *Patrons, Clients and Friends. Interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communication and Cultural Transformation in Early Modern Europe*. 2 vols. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Elias, Norbert. *The Court Society*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. New York: Pantheon Books, 1983.

_______. *The Civilizing Process. The History of Manners*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Emison, Patricia A. *Creating the "divine" artist : from Dante to Michelangelo*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Enciclopedia dello Spettacolo. Rome: Casa editrice La Maschere, 1954-.

Enterline, Lynn. *The Tears of Narcissus. Melancholia and Masculinity in Early Modern Writing*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Epifani, Mario. "Giovan Battista Pace e il Disegno: Un Petit Maitre tra Pier Francesco Mola, Salvator Rosa e Pietro da Cortona." *Proporzioni* 5 (2004): 125-146.

Epictetus. *The Discourses.* As reported by Arrian, *The Manual and Fragments*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966-67.

Epstein, Isidore, ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: Soncino Press, 1935.

Esau, Erika. “Tiepolo and Punchinello: Venice, Magic and Commedia Dell’arte.” *Australian Journal of Art* IX (1991): 41-58.

Esch, Arnold and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, eds. *Arte, committenza ed economia a Roma nelle corti del Rinascimento (1420- 1530).* Turin: Einaudi, 1995.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Collected Works of Erasmus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974-1984.

Erenstein, Robert L. “Satire and the Commedia dell’arte.” In *Western Popular Theatre* (proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Manchester University Department of Drama), edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards. London: Methuen, 1977, 29-47.

Esequie del divino Michelangelo Buonarotti celebrate in Firenze dall'Accademia de Pittori, Scultori, & Architetti. Nella Chiesa di S. Lorenzo il di luglio MDLXIIII. Florence: Giunta, 1564. Translated by Rudolf Wittkower as *The Divine Michelangelo: The Florentine Academy’s Homage on his death in 1564*. London: Phaidon, 1964.

Evans, Elizabeth C. “A Stoic Aspect of Senecan Drama: Portraiture.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* LXXXI (1950): 169-184.

Evelyn, Mary. *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*. Edited by William Bray. London: Henry Colburn, 1857.

Evers, Bernd and Christof Thoenes. *Architectural Theory*: *From the Renaissance to the Present*. Cologne: Taschen, 2003.

Ewald, Gerhard. “Hitherto Unknown Works by Cecco Bravo.” *Burlington Magazine* 102: 689 (1960): 343-352.

Fabbri, Nancy Rash. “Salvator Rosa’s Engraving for Carlo de’ Rossi and his Satire, *Invidia*.” *JWCI* 33 (1970): 328-30.

Fabroni, Angelo. *Historia Academicae Pisanae*. Pisa: Mugnaino, 1795.

Fagiolo dell'Arco, Maurizio. *La festa barocca*. Rome: De Luca, 1997.

Faldi, Italo. “Paolo Guidotti e gli affreschi della ‘Sala del Cavaliere’ nel Palazzo di Bassano di Sutri.” *Bollettino d’Arte* (1957): 278-95.

Falk, Eugene H. “Molière the Indignant Satirist: ‘Le Bourgeois gentilhomme’.” *The Tulane Drama Review* 5: 1 (1960): 73-88.

Falvo, Joseph D. *The Economy of Human Relations. Castiglione’s ‘Libro del Cortegiano’*. New York: Peter Lang, 1992.

Fantoni, Marcello et al, eds. *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell’arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII.* Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003.

Farago, Claire. *Leonardo da Vinci’s Paragone: A Critical Interpretation with a New Edition of the Text in the Codex Urbinas*. Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Faranda, Franco. *Ludovico Cardi, detto il Cigoli*. Florence: Cassa di Risparmio di San Miniato; Rome: De Luca, 1986.

Farina, Viviana. "Precisazioni sulla giovinezza napoletana di Salvator Rosa." Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Fasto romano: dipinti, sculture, arredi dai Palazzi di Roma. Coordinamento scientifico del Catalogo a cura di Alvar González-Palacios. Rome: Leonardo-De Luca, 1991.

Fava, Antonio. *The Comic Mask in the Commedia dell'arte*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007.

Feher, Michael et al, eds. *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*. 2 vols. New York: Zone, 1989.

Ferrari, Oreste and Giuesppe Scavizzi, eds. *Luca Giordano. L'opera completa.* Naples: Electa, 1992.

Ferroni, Giulio. "L'ossessione del raddopiamento nella *commedia dell'arte*." In *The Science of Buffoonery*: *Theory and History of the Commedia dell'arte*, edited by Domenico Pietropaolo. Toronto: University of Toronto Italian Studies 3; Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989.

Festa, Lucio. "I lunghi amichevoli rapporti fra Salvator Rosa e i Maffei (Un grande pittore napoletano e una famiglia volterrana)." *Volterra* (1963), 5 pages.

_______. "Uno scolopio mancato ed uno vero: Salvator Rosa e il fratello." *Napoli Nobilissima* II (1963): 69-76.

_______. "Aforismi, massime e sentenze di Salvator Rosa." In *Curiosità Letterarie Napoletane, trascelte, raccolte e presentate a A. Altamura*. (Seconda Serie). Biblioteca Napoletana, 2. Libreria Scientifica Editrice, Napoli, 1971, 71-75.

_______. "Una redazione inedita del 'Tireno' di Salvator Rosa." *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* 97 (1979): 185-216**.**

_______. "Aspetti della vita e dell'arte di Salvator Rosa da Documenti inediti." *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* 21 (1982): 101-123.

_______. "Salvator Rosa filosofo." *Criterio,* Naples, 1985.

_______. "Le lettere di Salvator Rosa ai Maffei di Volterra." *Rassegna volterrana* 61-62 (1985-86 (1987)): 371-372, 381.

_______. "Per una biografia di Salvatore Rosa. La Galleria di Palazzo Maffei." *Rassegna Volterrana* 61-2 (1987): 373-89.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Opera omnia*. 2 vols. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1962.

_______. *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love.* Translated by Jayne Sears. Dallas: Spring Publications, Inc., 1985.

Figurine d'Acquaforte. Mostra di incisioni di Salvator Rosa. Exhibition catalogue. Benevento, Museo del Sannio, 9 dic. 2000 – 7 gen. 2001.

Filarete [Antonio Averlino]. *Filarete's Treatise on Architecture: Being the Treatise by Antonio di Piero Averlino, Known as Filarete.* [c. 1460 - c. 1464] Translated by John R. Spencer. Facsimile ed. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Filipczak, Zirka Zaremba. *Picturing Art in Antwerp, 1550-1700.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Filosofico umore e maravigliosa speditezza: pittura napoletana del Seicento dalle collezioni medicee. Exhibition catalogue. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, 2007-2008. Florence: Giunti, 2007.

Finaldi, Gabriele and Michael Kitson, eds. *Discovering the Italian Baroque. The Denis Mahon Collection*. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: National Gallery Publications, 1997. = *Alla scoperta del barocco italiano. La collezione Denis Mahon.* Bologna: Marsilio, 1998.

Findlen, Paula. "Controlling the Experiment: Rhetoric, Court Patronage and the Experimental Method of Francesco Redi." *History of Science* xxxi (1993): 35-64.

Firth, Raymond. "Symbolism in Giving and Getting." In *Symbols Public and Private*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973, 368-402.

Flemming, Victoria von. "Dissimulazione: Lorenzo Lippi, Salvator Rosa und die Krise der Repräsentation." In *Diletto e Maraviglia. Ausdruck und Wirkung in der Kunst der Renaissance bis zum Barock*, edited by C. Göttler et al. Emsdetten, 1998, 74-101.

Fletcher, Angus John Stewart. *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Fletcher, Jennifer. "'Fatto al Specchio': Venetian Renaissance Attitudes in Self-Portraiture." In *Imaging the Self in Renaissance Italy*. Fenway Court, 1990-1991. Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 1992, 45-60.

Fontani, Francesco. *Elogio di Carlo Roberto Dati*. Florence, 1794.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and, The Discourse on Language*. Translated by Alan M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Dorset Press, 1972.

_______. *Discipline and Punish: Tthe Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan M. Sheridan. London: A. Lane, 1977.

_______. *The History of Sexuality*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1980.

_______. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* Edited by Colin Gordon. London: Harvester, 1980.

Fraisse, Jean Claude. *Philia: La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique*. Paris: Libraire Philosophique J. Vrin, 1974.

Franco, Niccolò. *Dialogi piacevoli*. [1542] Edited by Franco Pignatti. Manziana (Rome): Vecchiarelli, 2003.

Frangi, Francesco and Alessandro Morandotti, eds. *Maestri del '600 e del '700 Lombardo nella Collezione Koelliker.* Milan: Mazzotta, 2006.

Fraschetti, Stanislao. *Il Bernini*. *La sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo*. Milan: Hoepli, 1900.

Frederickson, Burton B. and Federico Zeri. *Census of Pre-Nineteenth-Century Paintings in North American Public Collections.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

_______. "A Pair of pendant pictures by Claude Lorraine and Salvator Rosa from the Chigi Collection." *Burlington Magainze* cxxxiii (1991): 543-6.

Freedberg, David. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

_______. "Imitation and its Discontents." In *Kunstlerischer Austausch/ Artistic Exchange.* Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin 15-20 Juli 1992. Band II. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993.

Freedman, Luba. "The Concept of Portraiture in Art Theory of the Cinquecento." *Zeitschrift für Äesthetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 32 (1987): 63-82.

Freeman Bauer, Linda. "Oil Sketches, Unfinished Paintings and the Inventories of Artists' Estates." In *Light on the Eternal City. Observations and Discoveries in the Art and Architecture of Rome*, edited by Hellmut Hager and Susan Scott Munshower. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987, 93-107.

Freitas, Roger. "Singing and Playing: The Italian Cantata and the Rage for Wit." *Music & Letters* 82: 4 (2001): 509-542.

Fried, Michael. *Absorption and Theatricality*. *Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

_______. "Thoughts on Caravaggio." *Critical Inquiry* 24: 1 (1997): 13-56.

Friedlaender, Walter. *Caravaggio Studies*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1955.

Fumaroli, Marc. *L'Age de l'Eloquence: Rhétorique et 'res literaria' de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980.

_______. "Le Corps Éloquent: Une Somme *D'Actio et Pronuntiatio Rhetorica* au XVIIe siecle, les *Vacationes Autumnales* du P. Louis de Cressolles (1620)." *XVIIe siècle* 132 (1981): 237-264.

_______. "Muta eloquentia: La representation de l'eloquence dans l'oeuvre de Nicolas Poussin." *Bulletin de la Societe de l'Histoire de l'Art Francaise* (1982): 29-48.

_______. "The Republic of Letters." *Diogenes* 143 (1988): 129-52.

_______. *L'inspiration du poete de Poussin*. Dossiers du Department de Peinture, 36. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Louvre, 1989.

_______. "De l'Age de l'éloquence à l'Age de la conversation, la conversion de la rhétorique humaniste dans la France du XVIIe siècle." In *Art de la la lettre, art de la conversation à l'époque classique en France*, edited by Bernard Bray and Christoph Strosetzki. Paris: Klincksieck, 1995.

_______. “Academia, Arcadia, Parnassus: trois lieux allégoriques de l'éloge du loisir lettré.” In *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, edited by David S. Chambers and Francois Quiviger. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995, 15-35.

Fumerton, Patricia. *Cultural Aesthetics. Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Gagliardi, Paola. *Un legame per vivere*. *Sul concetto di amicitia nelle lettere di Seneca*. Galatina: Congedo Editore, 1991.

Galasso, Giuesppe, ed. *Mentalità comportamenti e istituzioni tra Rinascimento e decadenza 1550-1700*. Vita civile degli Italiani. Società, Economia, Cultura Materiale. Milan: Electa, 1988.

Gamba, Bartolommeo, ed. *Scelta di Prose di Carlo Ruberto Dati*. Accedemico della Crusca. Venice: Tipografia di Alvisopoli, 1826.

_______. *La Vita di Salvatore Rosa scritta da Filippo Baldinucci fiorentino con voci aggiunte*. Venice, 1830.

Gardner, Victoria C. “Homines non nascuntur, sed figuntur: Benvenuto Cellini's Vita and Self-Presentation of the Renaissance Artist.” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28: 2 (1997): 447-465.

Garrard, Mary D. *Artemisia Gentileschi. The Image of the Female Hero in Italian Baroque Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

_______. “Here’s Looking at Me: Sofonisba Anguissola and the Problem of the Woman Artist.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 47: 3 (1994): 556-622.

_______. *Artemisia Gentileschi around 1622. The Shaping and Reshaping of Artistic Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Garzoni, Tommaso. *La piazza universale* [1595]. Edited and translated by John Addington Symonds. London, 1890.

Gaudenzio, Claretta. “Relazioni d’insigni artisti e virtuosi in Roma col Duca Carlo Emanuele II di Savoia, studiate sul carteggio diplomatic.” In *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria*, vol. VIII, 1885.

Gauthier, René-Antoine. *Magnanimité: L’idéal de la grandeur dans la philosophie païenne et dans la théologie chrétienne*. Paris: Vrin, 1951.

Gaye, Giovanni. *Carteggio inedito d’artisti dei secoli XIV, XV, XVI. Pubblicato ed illustrato con documenti pure inediti*. Florence: Molini, 1839-40.

Gazda, Elaine K. “Beyond Copying: Artistic Originality and Tradition.” In *The Ancient Art of Emulation. Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity*, edited by Elaine K. Gazda. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press (for the American Academy in Rome), 2002.

Gebert, Clara. *An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications & Prefaces*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933.

Gelder, H. E. van. “Marginalia bij Rembrandt I. De Pendant van Maurits Huygens.” *Oud Holland* LX (1943): 33-34.

Gelder, J. G. van. “The Rembrandt Exhibition at Edinburgh.” *Burlington Magazine* 92: 572 (1950): 327-329.

Gent, Lucy and Nigel Llewellyn, eds. *Renaissance Bodies. The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1660.* London: Reaktion Books, 1990.

Gérin-Jean, Pierre. “Recherches sur la signification economique des prix des oeuvres d'art: la facon dont se formaient ceux des peintures et les hierarchies qui en resultant.” In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della ‘Trentateesima Settimana di Studi’, 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, 729-749.

_______. “Prices of Works of Art and Hierarchy of Artistic Value on the Italian Market (1400-1700).” In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell’arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 181-194.

Gibson, Craig A. *Interpreting a Classic. Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2002.

Gilbert, Creighton. “Grapes, Curtains, Human Beings: The Theory of Missed Mimesis.” In *Kunstlerischer Austausch/ Artistic Exchange.* Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin 15-20 Juli 1992. Band II. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993

Gilligan, Carol. “Remapping the Moral Domain: New Images of the Self in Relationship.” In *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, 237-52.

Ginzburg, Silvia, ed. *Docere, delectare, movere: affetti, devozione e retorica nel linguaggio artistico del primo barocco romano*. Conference acts, Biblioteca Hertziana. Rome: Edizioni de Luca, 1996.

Glück, Gustav. “Self-Portraits by Van Dyck and Jordaens Self-Portraits by Van Dyck and Jordaens.” *Burlington Magazine* 65: 380 (1934): 195-201.

Godbout, Jacques T. *L’Esprit du don*. Montreal: Boréal, 1992.

_______. *Le don, la dette e l'identité. Homo donator versus homoeconomicus.* Montreal: Éditions La Découverte/ Éditions du Boreal, 2000.

Godelier, Maurice. *The Enigma of the Gift.* Translated by Nora Scott. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Goffen, Rona. *Renaissance Rivals*. *Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre, 1959.

_______. *Interaction Ritual*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Goguel, Catherine Monbeig. “Francesco Furini dans le prisme du dessin.” In *Un’altra bellezza. Francesco Furini*, edited by Mina Gregori and Rodolfo Maffeis. Exhibition catalogue. Florence, Palazzo Pitti, Museo degli Argenti, December 22 2007-April 27 2008. Florence: Mandragora, 2007.

Goldberg, Edward L. *After Vasari*: *History, Art, and Patronage in Late Medici Florence.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Golden, Leon. "Catharsis." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 93 (1962): 51-60.

_______. "The Purgation Theory of Catharsis." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 31: 4 (1973): 473- 479.

_______. "Plato's Concept of Mimesis." *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 15: 2 (1975): 118-131.

Goldman, Jean. "Aspects of Seicento Patronage: Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Amateur Tradition." PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1978.

Goldsmith, Elizabeth C. *'Exclusive Conversations': The Art of Interaction in Seventeenth-Century France*, Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. *The Letters of Demosthenes*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Goldthwaite, Richard. "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture." *American Historical Review* LXXVII (1972): 977-1012.

_______. "The Empire of Things: Consumer Demand in Renaissance Italy." In *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, edited by F. W. Kent and P. Simons. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 154-175.

_______. "Economic Parameters of the Italian Art Market (15th to 17th Centuries)," in *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 423-444.

Golzio, Vincenzo. *Documenti artistici sul Seicento nell'Archivio Chigi*. Rome: Fratelli Palombi, 1939

Gombrich, Ernst H. "Renaissance and Golden Age." *JWCI* 24: 3/4 (1961): 306-309.

_______. "Ritualized Gesture and Expression in Art." In *The Image and the Eye: further studies in the psychology of pictorial representation*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1982.

_______. "Botticelli's mythologies: A study in the Neo-Platonic symbolism of his circle." In *Symbolic Images: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

González-Palacios, Alvar, ed. *Fasto Romano: dipinti, sculture, arredi dai Palazzi di Roma.* Rome: Leonardo-De Luca, 1991.

Gosman, Martin. "Princely Culture: Friendship or Patronage." In *Princes and Princely Culture 1450-1650*. Vol. I. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003, 1-29.

Gotlieb, Marc. "The Painter's Secret. Invention and Rivalry from Vasari to Balzac." *Art Bulletin* 84: 3 (2002): 469-490.

Göttler, Christine, et al, eds. *Diletto e Maraviglia: Ausdruck und Wirkung in der Kunst von der Renaissance bis zum Barock*. Emsdetten: Edition Imorde, 1998.

Gozzano, Natalia. *La Quadreria di Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna. Prestigio nobiliare e collezionismo nella Roma barocca.* Rome: Bulzoni editore, 2004.

_______. "Salvator Rosa, i Colonna e la Commedia dell'arte: il mondo del teatro dipinto e recitato nella Roma del Seicento." Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Il Grande dizionario Garzanti della lingua italiana. Milan: Garzanti, 1987.

Grassi, Luigi. "Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Fréart de Chantelou, Salvator Rosa e Nicolò Simonelli: Due Accademie e una Caricatura." In *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Federico Zeri*. Vol. 2. Milan: Electa, 1986, 630-639.

Greco, Aulo. *La memoria delle lettere*. Rome: Bonacci, 1985.

Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy. Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

_______ "Fiction and Friction." In *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, 30-52.

Gregori, Mina. "Nuovi accertamenti in Toscana sulla pittura 'caricata' e 'giocosa'." *Arte antica e moderna* 13-16 (1961): 400-416.

_______ , ed. *Storia delle arti in Toscana: Il Seicento*. Florence: Edifir, 2001.

_______. "I decenni centrali del secolo. 'Maxima et minima': Volterrano, Stefano della Bella e oltre." In *Storia delle arti in Toscana: Il Seicento*, edited by Mina Gregori. Florence: Edifir, 2001, 155-164.

_______, ed. *Pittura Fiorentina XVII secolo*, *Collezione Koelliker*. Turin: Camedda & C., 2005.

_______ and Rodolfo Maffeis, eds. *Un'altra bellezza: Francesco Furini.* Florence: Mandragora, 2007.

Griffiths, Antony. "On Some Albums of Etchings by Salvator Rosa." *Print Quarterly* 9: 3 (1992): 250-260.

Grimm, Reinhold. "From Callot to Butor. E.T.A. Hoffmann and the Tradition of the Capriccio." *Modern Language Notes* 93: 3 (1978): 399-415.

Grössinger, Christa. *Humour and Folly in Secular and Profane Prints of Northern Europe, 1430-1540.* London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2002.

Grossman, Marshall. "Augustine, Spenser, Milton and the Christian Ego." *New Orleans Review* 11 (1984): 9-17.

_______. *The Story of All Things. Writing the Self in English Narrative Poetry*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Jacques Lacan. A Feminist Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Guazzo, Stefano. *La Civile Conversazione*. Edited by Amedeo Quondam. Ferrara: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1993.

Guery, Alain. "Le Roi Dépensier: Le don, la contrainte, et l'origine du système financier de la monarchie française d'Ancien Régime." *Annales (Economies, Societes, Civilisations)* 39: 6 (1984): 1241-1269.

Guerzoni, Guido. "Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor: The Classic Origins of Italian Renaissance Lifestyles." In *Economic Engagements with Art*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Craufurd D. W. Goodwin. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1999, 332-378.

Gundersheimer, Walter L. "Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach." In *Patronage in the Renaissance*, edited by Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Gurvitch, George. "The sociology of the theatre." In *Sociology of Literature and Drama: Selected Readings*, edited by E. Burns and T. Burns. Harmondsworth, Middx.: Penguin, 1973, 71-81.

Guyot Cameron, A. Review of *Pulcinella & C.: le théâtre napolitain*, by Henry Lyonnet. *Modern Language Notes* 17: 4 (1902): 111-118.

Haan, Estelle. *From Academia to Amicitia: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998

Hadas, Moses. *The Stoic Philosophy of Seneca. Essays and Letters of Seneca*. New York: The Norton Library, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1958.

Haggerty, George E. *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Hale, John R. "The soldier in Germanic graphic art of the Renaissance." In *Art and History: Images and their Meanings*, edited by Robert Rotberg and Theodore Rabb. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Hall, James. *Illustrated Dictionary of Symbols in Eastern and Western Art*. New York: Icon Editions, 1996.

Hall, Marcia. "Michelangelo's Last Judgment: Resurrection of the Body and Predestination." *Art Bulletin* 58: 1 (1976): 85-92.

Halliwell, Stephen. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Hallpike, C. R. "Social Hair." *Man* 4: 2 (1969): 256-264.

Halperin, David M. "How to do the History of Male Homosexuality." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 6 (2000): 87-123.

Hammond, D. and A. Jablow, "Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid: The Myth of Male Friendship." In *The Making of Masculinities. The New Men's Studies*, edited by Harry Brod. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987, 241-58.

Hammond, Frederick. *Music and Spectacle in Baroque Rome*. *Barberini patronage under Urban VIII*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Hankins, James. “The Myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence.” *Renaissance Quarterly* XLIV: 3 (1991): 429-75.

Hardison, O. B. *The Enduring Monument*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1962.

Haskell, Francis. Review of *Salvator Rosa*, by Luigi Salerno. *Burlington Magazine* CVII (1965): 263.

_______. *Patrons and Painters: Art and Society in Baroque Italy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

_______. “Art Exhibitions in XVII century Rome.” *Studi secenteschi* 1 (1960): 107-121.

Hatfield, “The High End: Michelangelo’s Income.” In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell’arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 195-201

Hecht, Peter. “The Paragone Debate: Ten Illustrations and a Comment.” *Simiolus* 14: 2 (1984): 125-136.

Heikamp, Detlef, ed. *Scritti d'arte di Federico Zuccaro*. Florence: Olschki, 1961.

Heinz, Günther. “Realismus und Rhetorik im Werk des Bartolomeo Passarotti.” *Jahrbuch Kunsthistorisches Sammlung in Wien* 68 (1972): 153-69.

Heitsch, Dorothea. “Approaching Death by Writing: Montaigne’s Essays and the Literature of Consolation.” *Literature and Medicine* 19: 1 (2000): 96-106.

Held, Julius S. *Dürers Wirkung auf die niederldndische Kunst seiner Zeit*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1931.

_______. “The Early Appreciation of Drawings.” In *Studies in Western Art.* Acts of the 20th Intl. Congress of the History of Art. 3 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Heller, Thomas C. et al eds. *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986.

Henke, Robert. *Performance and Literature in the Commedia dell’Arte*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Henry, Patrick. “Recognition of the Other and Avoidance of the Double. The Self and the Other in the *Essais* of Montaigne.” *Stanford French Review* (1982): 175-187.

Herding, Klaus. *Pierre Puget*. Berlin: Mann, 1970.

Herman, Arthur L., Jr. “The Language of Fidelity in Early Modern France.” *The Journal of Modern History* 67: 1 (1995): 1-24.

Herrick, Marvin T. *Italian Comedy in the Renaissance*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960.

Herrmann-Fiore, Kristina. “Due artisti allo Specchio: un doppio ritratto del Museo di Wurzberg attributo a Giovanni Battista Paggi.” *Storia dell’arte* 47 (1983): 29-39.

Heusinger, Christina von. “A Group of Trial Proofs and Early States of Salvator Rosa’s *Figurine*.” *Print Quarterly* 1:2 (1984): 115-19.

Hewitt, Joseph William. “The Gratitude of Horace to Maecenas.” *The Classical Journal* 36: 8 (1941): 464-472.

Hibbard, Howard. *Caravaggio*. Boulder, Colorado: Icon Editions; Westview Press, 1983.

Highet, Gilbert. *Juvenal the Satirist. A Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Hill, John Walter. “Antonio Veracini in Context: New Perspectives from Documents, Analysis and Style.” *Early Music* 18: 4 (1990): 545-562.

Hills, Helen. “The baroque: beads in a rosary or folds of time.” *Fabrications* (December 2007): 1-20.

Hills, Paul. “Tintoretto’s Marketing.” In*Venedig und Oberdeutschland in der Renaissance: Beziehungen zwischen Kunst und Wirtschaft*, edited by Bernd Roeck et al. Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1993.

Hirschfeld, Heather. “Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship.” *PMLA* 116: 3 (2001): 609-622.

Hitchcock, Tim and Michèle Cohen, eds. *English Masculinities 1660-1800.* London and New York: Longman, 1999.

Holmes, William C. *Opera Observed. Views of a Florentine Impresario in the Early Eighteenth Century.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Hoff, Francois, Louis Fouarge and Astrid Mull, et al eds. *La Lettre Dans Tous ses Etats.* Strasbourg: Clément & Gyss, 2000.

Hoffmann, E. T. A. “Salvator Rosa.” In *Tales of Hoffmann*, translated by Christopher Lazare. New York and London: Grove Press, 1946, 348-427.

Holberton, Paul. “To Loosen the Tongue of Mute Poetry: Giorgione’s Self-Portrait as ‘David’ as a Paragone Demonstration.” In *Poetry on Art. Renaissance to Romanticism*, edited by Thomas Frangenberg. Donington: Shaun Tyas/Paul Watkins, 2003.

Hollanda, Francisco de. *Three Dialogues on Painting.* In *Michael Angelo Buonarroti, with translations of the life of the master by his scholar Ascanio Condivi, and three dialogues from the Portuguese by Francisco D’Ollanda*, translated by Charles Holroyd. London: Duckworth, 1911.

Hollstein, F. W. H., ed. *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts c. 1450-1700.* Vol. III, Fouceel-Gole. Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1949.

Hoogewerff, G. J. *Bescheiden in Italië omtrent Nederlandsche kunstenaars en geleerden*. 3 vols. ’S-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij, 1911-17.

Hope, Charles. “Artists, Patrons, and Advisers in the Italian Renaissance.” In *Patronage in the Renaissance*, edited by Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981, 293-343.

Horace. *Sermones: The Satires of Horace*. Edited by Arthur Palmer. London: Macmillan, 1964.

_______. *Odes and Carmen Saeculare. With an English version in the original metres*. Introduction and notes by Guy Lee. Leeds: Francis Cairns; The University of Leeds, 1998.

Houdt, Toon van. "The Economics of Art in Early Modern times: Some Humanist and Scholastic Approaches." In *Economic Engagements with Art*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Craufurd D. W. Goodwin. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1999, 303-331.

_______ , Jan Papy, Gilbert Tournay, Constant Matheeussen, eds. *Self-Presentation and Social Identification of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

Humfrey, Peter, et al. *Giovanni Battista Moroni. Renaissance Portraitist*. Exhibition catalogue. Fort Worth: Kimbell Art Museum, 2000.

Hurley, Susan and Nick Chater. *Perspectives on Imitation: From Neuroscience to Social Science.* Vol. 2. Imitation, Human Development, and Culture. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 2005.

Hyde, Lewis. *The Gift. Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*. New York: Random House, 1983.

Inwood, Brad, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Jacobs, Frederika H. "Woman's Capacity to Create: The Unusual Case of Sofonisba Anguissola." *Renaissance Quarterly* 47: 1 (1994): 74-101.

_______. *Defining the Renaissance Virtuosa: Women Artists and the Language of Art History and Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Jaffé, David ed. *Titian*. Exhibition catalogue. London: National Gallery, 2003.

Janson, H. W. "The Putto with the Death's Head." *Art Bulletin* 19 (1937): 423-449.

_______. "The Birth of 'Artistic License': The Dissatisfied Patron in the Early Renaissance." In *Patronage in the Renaissance*, edited by Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981, 344-346.

Jardine, Lisa. "Towards Reading Albion's Classicism: An Exchange of Gifts between Northern Classical Scholars." In *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660*, edited by Lucy Gent. Studies in British Art, 2. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995, 19-28.

Jensen, H. James. *The Muses' Concord: Literature, Music and the Visual Arts in the Baroque Age*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1976.

John-Steiner, Vera. *Creative Collaboration*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Jones, Pamela M. *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana: Art Patronage and Reform in Seventeenth-Century Milan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Jouanny, Charles. *Correspondance de Nicolas Poussin.* Paris: F. de Nobele, 1968.

Kahn, Arthur D. "'Every Art Possessed by Man Comes from Prometheus': The Greek Tragedians and Science and Technology." *Technology and Culture* 11: 2 (1970): 133-162.

Kahn-Rossi, Manuela, ed. *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*. Exhibition catalogue. Milan: Electa, 1989.

_______. "Pier Francesco Mola e la caricature." In *idem* ed., *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*. Exhibition catalogue. Milan: Electa, 1989, 121-133.

Kallendorf, C. W., ed. *Humanist Educational Treatises.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Kamen, Henry. *The Iron Century: Social Change 1550-1660*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

Kanz, Roland. *Dichter und Denker im Porträt. Spurengänge zur deutschen Porträtkultur des 18. Jahruhunderts*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1993.

Karpinski, Caroline. "The Print in Thrall to its Original: A Historiographic Perspective." In *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, edited by Rosalind Krauss et al. National Gallery of Art, Washington. Studies in the History of Art, 20. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1989, 101-110.

Khatchadourian, Haig. "Artistic Freedom and Social Control." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 12: 1 (Special Issue: Policy and Aesthetic Education) (1978): 23-32.

Katritzky, M. A. *The Art of Commedia: A Study in the Commedia dell'arte 1560-1620, with Special Reference to the Visual Records.* Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006.

Keane, Patrick J. *Coleridge's Submerged Politics*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1994.

Keller, Harald. "Entstehung und Blützeit des Freundschaftsbildes." In *Essays Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, edited by Douglas Fraser et al. London: Phaidon, 1979, 161-173.

Kemp, Martin. "'Ogni dipintore dipinge sé': A neo-Platonic echo in Leonardo's art theory?" In *Cultural Aspects of the Renaissance: Essays in Honour of P. O. Kristeller*, edited by Cecil H. Clough. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.

_______. "From 'Mimesis' to 'Fantasia': The Quattrocento Vocabulary of Creation, Inspiration and Genius in the Visual Arts." *Viator* 8 (1977): 347-398.

_______. "Equal Excellences: Lomazzo and the Explanation of Individual Style in the Visual Arts." *Renaissance Studies* I (1987-88): 1-26.

_______ , ed. *Leonardo on painting: an anthology of writings*. Selected and translated by Martin Kemp and Margaret Walker. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

_______. "The 'Super-artist' as Genius." In *Genius*: *The History of an Idea*, edited by Penelope Murray. Oxford and New York: B. Blackwell, 1989.

_______. *The Science of Art: Optical Themes in Western Art from Brunelleschi to Seurat*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990.

_______. *Leonardo da Vinci*. *The marvelous works of nature and man*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kempers, Bram. *Painting, Power and Patronage. The Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1987.

Kendon, Adam. "Gesture." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 109 (1997): 109-128.

_______. *Gesture*: *Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kennedy, George. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

_______. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Kennedy, Ruth Wedgwood. "Novelty and Tradition in Titian's Art." The Katharine Asher Engel Lectures. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, 1963.

Kent, Dale. "The Dynamic of Power in Cosimo de'Medici's Florence." In *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, edited by F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 63-77.

_______. "Illegitimate and Legitimating Passions in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Political Discourses." *Cultural and Social History* 2 (2005): 49-62.

Kent, F. W. and Patricia Simons, eds. *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

_______. "Ties of Neighbourhood and Patronage in Quattrocento Florence." In *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, edited by F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 79-98.

_______ and Patricia Simons, "Renaissance Patronage: An Introductory Essay." In *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, edited by F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 1-21.

Kettering, Sharon. *Patrons, Brokers and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

_______. "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France." *French History* 2: 2 (1988): 131-151.

_______. *Patronage in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century France*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

Kimball, Roger. "Lessons from Juvenal." *New Criterion* 21:8 (2003).

King, Lester S. "The Transformation of Galenism." In *Medicine in 17th Century England*, edited by Allen G. Debus. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974, 7-31.

Kiralyfalvi, Bela. "Lukács's Views on Artistic Freedom." *Leonardo* 16: 2 (1983): 124-6.

Kirchner, T. "'De l'usage des passions'. Die Emotionen bei Künstler, Kunstwerk und Betrachter." In *Pathos-Affekt-Gefühl. Die Emotionen in den Künsten*, edited by K. Herding and B. Stumphans. Berlin and New York, 2004, 357-377

Kitson, Michael, ed. *Salvator Rosa*. Exhibition catalogue. Hayward Gallery, London, October 17 – December 23 1973. London: London Arts Council, 1973.

Klein, Robert. *La forme et l'intelligible: écrits sur la Renaissance et l'art moderne*. Articles at essais réunis et présentés par André Chastel. Paris: Gallimard, 1970.

Klibansky, Raymond, Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl. *Saturn and Melancholy. Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Kneller, Jane. "Imaginative Freedom and the German Enlightenment." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51: 2 (1990): 217-32.

Koca, Kathryn. "Adriaen van Ostade, 'Beggar in a Large Coat'." In *Outside the Shadow of Rembrandt, Selected 17th Century Prints from the Famulener and Wilson Collections*, edited by Gregory Gilbert. Exhibition, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois, 2001.

Koerner, Joseph Leo. *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Koestenbaum, Wayne. *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration.* New York and London: Routledge, 1989.

Komter, Aafke E. *Social Solidarity and the Gift*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kooijmans, Luuc. *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 1997.

Koslow, Susan. "Frans Hals's Fisherboys: exemplars of idleness." *Art Bulletin* 57 (1975): 418-32.

Krauss, Werner. *Graciáns Lebenslehre*. Frankfurt, 1947.

Kren, Thomas. "*Chi non vuol Baccho*: Roeland van Laer's Burlesque Painting about Dutch Artists in Rome." *Simiolus* 11: 2 (1980): 63-80.

Krieger, Murray. "Poetic Presence and Illusion: Renaissance Theory and the Duplicity of Metaphor." *Critical Inquiry* 5: 4 (1979): 597-619.

Kris, Ernst and Otto Kurz. *Legend, Myth and Magic in the Image of the Artist: a Historical Experiment*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Kristeva, Julia. *Black Sun. Depression and Melancholia*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1989.

Kristof, Jane. "Michelangelo as Nicodemus: The Florence Pieta." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 20: 2 (1989): 163-182

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Andrea Mantegna*. Translated by S. Arthur Strong. London: Longmans Green, 1901.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "'Creativity' and 'Tradition'." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44: 1 (1983): 105-113.

Krohn, Deborah. "Taking Stock: Evaluation of Works of Art in Renaissance Italy." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 203-9

Kubersky-Piredda, Susanne. "Immagini devozionali nel Rinascimento fiorentino: produzione, commercio, prezzi." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 115-125.

Kuo, Hsiu-Li. "The Solitary Notations." PhD dissertation. University of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia, 2004.

Labrot, Gerard. "Un marche dynamique. La peinture de serie à Naples. 1606-1775." In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della 'Trentateesima Settimana di Studi', 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, 261-279.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage." In *Ecrits: A Selection*, edited and translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1977.

Lai, Chung-Hsiung. "Limits and Beyond: Greenblatt, New Historicism and a Feminist Genealogy." *Intergrams* 7.1-7.2 (2006): 1-29.

Landolfi, Domenica. "Su un teatrino mediceo e sull'Accademia degli Incostanti a Firenze nel primo Seicento." *Teatro e Storia* VI: 1 (1991): 57-88.

Langdon, Helen. "Salvator Rosa and Claude." *Burlington Magazine* 115: 849 (1973): 779-785.

_______. "Salvator Rosa in Florence 1640-1649." *Apollo* 100: 151 (1974): 190-197.

_______. "Salvator Rosa: His Ideas and Development as an Artist." PhD dissertation, University of London, 1975.

_______. "Two Book Illustrations by Salvator Rosa." *Burlington Magazine* 118: 883 (1976): 698-99.

_______. *Caravaggio. A Life*. London: Chatton & Windus, 1998.

_______. "A Theatre of Marvels: the Poetics of Salvator Rosa." *Kunsthistorisk Tidskrift* 73: 3 (2004): 179-192.

_______. "Claude and the Roman Landscape, 1630–1690." *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* 73: 3 (2004): 130-132.

_______. "Salvator Rosa, gli ultimi anni (1660-1673)." In *Salvator Rosa. Tra Mito e Magia.* Exhibition catalogue. Naples, Museo di Capodimonte, 18 April – 29 June 2008. Naples: Electa, 2008, 47-57.

Lange, Konrad von and Franz Louis Fuhse. *Dürer's schriftlicher Nachlass*. Halle, 1893.

Lankheit, Klaus. *Das Freundschaftsbild der Romantik.* Heidelberger Kunstgeschichtliche Abhandlungen, N. F., I, ed. by Walter Paatz. Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag Carl Winter, 1952.

Lacquer, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Lavin, Irving. *Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts*. 2 vols. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1980.

_______. "Bernini and Antiquity – The Baroque Paradox: A Poetical View." In *Antikenrezeption im Hochbarock*, edited by Herbert Beck and Sabine Schulze. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1989, 9-36.

Lawson, Susan. *Rubens*. London: Chaucer Press, 2006.

Lazzeri, Alessandro. "Agostino Coltellini e l'Accademia degli Apatisti di Firenze." In *Università, Accademie e Società in Italia e in Germania dal Cinquecento al Settecento*, edited by Laetitia Boehm and Ezio Raimondi. Bologna: Società Editrice il Mulino, 1981, 237-244.

_______. *Intellettuali e consenso nella Toscana del Seicento: L'Accademia degli Apatisti*. Milan: A. Giuffre, 1983.

Lea, Kathleen M. *Italian Popular Comedy: A Study in the Commedia dell'arte, 1560-1620, with special reference to the English stage*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.

Leach, James. "Modes of creativity." In *Transactions and Creations: Property Debates and the Stimulus of Melanesia*, edited by Eric Hirsch and Marilyn Strathern. Oxford: Berghahn, 2004, 151-175.

Le Brun, Charles. *Traité des Passions. = L'expression des passions & autres conferences. Correspondance*. Edited by Julien Philipe. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1994.

LeCoat, Gerard. *The Rhetoric of the Arts, 1550-1650*. Bern and Frankfurt: Herbert Lang, 1975.

Lecoq, Anne-Marie. "Nature et rhétorique: de l'action oratoire à l'éloquence muette (J. Bulwer)." *XVIIe siècle* 132 (1981): 265-277.

_______. "Une peinture 'incorrecte' de Lorenzo Lippi." *Revue de l'Art* 130 (2000): 9-16.

Lee, Rensselaer W. "*Ut Pictura Poesis*: The Humanistic Theory of Painting." *Art Bulletin* 22: 4 (1940): 197-269.

_______. *Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting,* New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.

Leeflang, Huigen and Ger Luijten, eds. *Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617). Drawings, Prints and Paintings*. Exhibition catalogue. Zwolle: Waanders, 2003.

Le Fevre, Karen Burke. *Invention as a Social Act*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

Legassé, Paul, ed. *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. Sixth Edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Lehmann, Gustav Adolf. *Demosthenes. Ein Leben für die Freiheit. Biographie*. Munich: Beck, 2004.

Lehmann, Jurgen M. *Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Kassel. Italienische, franzosiche und spanische Gemalde des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*. Fridingen: Graf Klenau, Verlags GmbH, 1980.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoon: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962.

Leuschner, Eckhard. "The Pythagorean Inscription on Rosa's London 'Self-Portrait'." *JWCI* 57 (1994): 278-283.

_______. "Censorship and the Market. Antonio Tempesta's 'New' Subjects in the Context of Roman Printmaking, c. 1600." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 65-71.

Levey, Michael. *The Painter Depicted: Painters as a Subject in Painting.* London: Thames & Hudson, 1981.

Levine, David A. and Ekkehard Mai, eds. *I Bamboccianti: niederländische Malerrebellen im Rom des Barock.* Exhibition catalogue. Milan: Electa, 1991.

Levy, Alison. *Re-Membering Masculinity in Early Modern Florence. Widowed Bodies, Mourning and Portraiture*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006.

Levy, Evonne. "Ideal and Reality of the Learned Artist: The Schooling of Italian and Netherlandish Artists." In *Children of Mercury: The Education of Artists in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* In Conjunction with an Exhibition. Providence: Brown University, 1984, 20-27.

_______. "Architecture and Religion in 17th century Rome." *Studiolo* 2 (2003): 219-53.

_______. *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004.

_______. "Chapter 2 of Domenico Bernini's *Vita* of his Father: Mimesis." In *Bernini's Biographies. Critical Essays*, edited by Maarten Delbeke et al. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006, 159-180.

Limentani, Uberto. *Poesie e lettere inedite di Salvator Rosa*. Biblioteca Dell' Archivum Romanicum. Fondata di Giulio Bertoni. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1950.

_______. "Salvator Rosa – Nuovi Studi e Ricerche." *Italian Studies* 8 (1953): 29-58.

_______. "La Satira dell'Invidia di Salvator Rosa e una polemica letteraria del Seicento." *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 134 (1957): 570-585.

_______. *La Satira nel Seicento*. Milan-Naples: Ricciardi, 1961.

_______. "Per la biografia di Cosimo Brunetti." *Studi secenteschi* XIX (1978): 109-27.

Lincoln, Evelyn. *The Invention of the Italian Renaissance Printmaker.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Linscott, Robert, ed. *The Complete Poems and Selected Letters of Michelangelo*. Translated by Creighton Gilbert. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Lippi, Lorenzo. *Il Malmantile Racquistato di Perlone Zipoli, colle note di Puccio Lamoni e d'altri.* Florence: Nella stamperia di Michele Nestenus e Francesco Moücke, 1731.

_______. *Il Malmantile Racquistato*. London: Masi, 1779.

_______. *Il Malmantile Racquistato di Perlone Zipoli*, with notes and selections by Luigi Portirelii. Milan: Dalla Societa Tipografica de' Classici Italiani, 1807.

_______. *Il Manmantile Racquistato*. Edited by Enrico Bianchi. Florence: Selam, 1937.

Lipsius, Justus. *Iusti Lipsi Politicorum, sive, Civilis doctrinae libri sex.: qui ad principatum maximè spectant*. Lugduni Batavorum [Leiden]: Ex officina Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphelengium, 1589.

_______. *Monita et exempla politica libri duo, qui virtutes et vitia Principum spectant*. Antwerp: Joannes Moretus, (1605) 1606.

_______. *Justi Lipsi V.C. Opera omnia. postremum ab ipso aucta et recensita ; nunc primum copioso rerum indice illustrata.* Vesaliae: Apud Andream ab Hoogenhuysen et Societatem, 1675.

Livesay, John. *Stefano Guazzo and the English Renaissance*. Durham: University of North Carolina, 1961.

Livingston, Paisley. *Models of Desire. Rene Girard and the Psychology of Mimesis.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Livingstone, David N. and Richard T. Harrison. "Meaning Through Metaphor: Analogy as Epistemology." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 71: 1 (1981): 95-107.

Loh, Maria. "Strategies of Repetition from Titian to Padovanino: Producing and Reproducing Venetian Style in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Painting." PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 2003.

_______. "Originals, Reproductions, and a 'Particular Taste' for Pastiche in the 17th-century Republic of Painting." In *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006, 237-262.

_______. *Titian remade: repetition and the transformation of early modern Italian art*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007.

Lollini, Massimo. "Vico, Salvator Rosa e le maschere del barocco." *Forum Italicum* 29: 2 (1995): 245-65.

Lomazzo, Giovanni Paolo. *Trattato dell' arte della pittura, scoltura, et architettura*. Milan: Per P.G. Pontio a instantia di P. Tini, 1585.

Long, Kathleen P. *High Anxiety: Masculinity in Crisis in Early Modern France.* Kirksville, Mo.: Truman State University Press, 2002.

Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Edited by Thomas R. R. Stebbing. Oxford: T & G Shrimpton, 1867.

Longo, Nicola. *Letteratura e lettere indagine nell'epistolografia Cinquecentesca*. Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1999.

Lopez, Maritere. "Writing a letter, writing the self: Courtesans of the Italian Renaissance and their epistolary writings (Camilla Pisana, Tullia d'Aragona, Veronica Franco)." PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 2003.

López, Rosalva Loreto. "The Devil, Women, and the Body in Seventeenth-Century Puebla Convents." *The Americas* 59: 2 (The Devil in Latin America) (2002): 181-199.

Lorizzo, Loredana. "Documenti inediti sul mercato dell'arte: I testamenti e l'inventario della bottega del Genovese Pellegrino Peri 'rivenditore di quadri' a Roma nella seconda metà del Seicento." In *Decorazione e collezionismo a Roma nel Seicento: Vicende di artisti, committenti, mercanti*, edited by Francesco Cappellati. Rome: Gangemi, 2003.

_______. "Il mercato dell'arte a Roma nel XVII secolo: 'Pittori bottegari' e 'rivenditori di quadri' nei documenti dell'archivio storico dell'Accademia di San Luca." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/*

Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 325-336.

_______. "People and Practices in the Paintings Trade of Seventeenth-Century Rome." In *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006, 343-362.

Luca Giordano: 1634-1705. Edited by Nicola Spinosa. Electa: Naples, 2001.

Luck, George, ed. *Arcana Mundi: Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Lukács, György. *Magyar irodalom, Magyar kúltúra*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 1968.

Lukehart, Peter M., ed. *The Artist's Workshop*. CASVA Symposium Papers XII, National Gallery of Art, Washington. University Press of New England: Hanover and London, 1993.

Lumbroso, Giovanni. "Notizie sulla vita di Cassiano dal Pozzo ... con alcuni suoi ricordi e una centura di lettere." *Miscellanea di Storia Italiana* 15 (1876): 129-388.

Lynch, James B. Jr. "Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo's Self-Portrait in the Brera." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 64 (1964): 189-197.

_______. "Lomazzo and the Accademia della Valle di Bregno." *Art Bulletin* 48 (1966): 210-11.

Lynch, Sandra. *Philosophy and Friendship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

Lyons, John D. "Self-Knowledge and the Advantages of Concealment: Pierre Nicole's On Self-Knowledge'." In *Culture and Authority in the Baroque*, edited by Massimo Ciavolella and Patrick Coleman. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005, 193-207.

Lytle, Guy Fitch, "Friendship and Patronage in Renaissance Europe." In *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, edited by F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 47-59.

Maccherini, Michele. "Caravaggio nel carteggio familiare di Giulio Mancini." *Prospettiva* 86 (1997): 71-92.

Maché, Ulrich. "Author and Patron: On the Function of Dedications in Seventeenth-century German Literature." In *Literary Culture in the Holy Roman Empire, 1555-1720*, edited by James A. Parente Jr., Richard E. Schade, and George C. Schoolfield. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

MacCurdy Edward, ed. *The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci*. Connecticut: Konecky & Konecky, 2003.

MacKay, Agnes Ethel. *An Anatomy of Solitude. Towards a New Interpretation of the Sources of Creative Inspiration.* Glasgow: William MacLellan, 1978.

Maclean, Ian. *The Renaissance Notion of Woman*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Macpherson, Crawford Brough. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Madrignani, Carlo Alberto. “La poetica di Francesco Redi nella Firenze letteraria di fine Seicento.” *Belfagor* 15: 4 (1960): 402-14.

Maffei, R. S. “Ville e castelli volterrani.” *Rassegna volterrana* II (1925): 52-3.

Maffeo, Pasquale. *Salvator Rosa com’era.* Naples: Fausto Fiorentino Editrice, S. p. A., 1975.

Maginnis, H. B. J. Review of *Giotto and the Language of Gesture*, by Moshe Barasch. *Burlington Magazine* 130: 1026 (1988): 702.

Magurn, Ruth Saunders. *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Mahon, Denis. *Italian Art and Britain. A souvenir of the exhibition*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1960.

_______. “A plea for Poussin as a painter.” In *Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag; eine Festgabe seiner europäischen Schüler, Freunde und Verehrer*, edited by Georg Kauffman and Willibald Sauerländer. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1965.

_______. *Studies in Seicento Art and Theory*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1971.

_______. “Fresh Light on Caravaggio’s Earliest Period: His ‘Cardsharps’ Recovered.” *Burlington Magazine* 130: 1018 (1988): 11-25.

Mahoney, Michael. “Salvator Rosa Provenance Studies: Prince Livio Odescalchi and Queen Christina.” *Master Drawings* 3 (1965): 383-389.

_______. *The Drawings of Salvator Rosa*. 2 vols. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1977.

Maiorino, Giancarlo. *The Portrait of Eccentricity. Arcimboldo and the Mannerist Grotesque*. Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Malvasia, Carlo Cesare. *Felsina Pittrice. Vite de Pittori Bolognese*. Bologna, 1678. Reprint, Bologna: G. Zanotti, 1841.

_______. *The Life of Guido Reni*. Translated by Catherine and Robert Enggass. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980.

Mamone, Sara. “Tra tela e scena. Vita d’accademia e vita di corte nel primo Seicento fiorentino.” *Biblioteca teatrale* 37-38 (1996): 213-228.

_______. “Il sistema dei teatri e le accademie a Firenze sotto la protezione di Giovan Carlo, Mattias e Leopoldo principi impresario.” In *Teatro e spettacolo nella Firenze dei Medici*, edited by Elvira Garbero Zorzi and Mario Sperenzi. Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2001, 83-113.

Man, Paul de. “The Epistemology of Metaphor.” *Critical Inquiry* 5: 1 (1978): 13-30.

Mancini, Giulio. *Considerazioni sulla pittura*. Edited by Adriana Marucchi, with comments by Luigi Salerno. Imprint. 2 vols. Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1956.

Maniura, Robert and Rupert Shepherd, *Presence. The Inherence of the Prototype within Images and Other Objects*. Aldershot, Hants.; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.

Mann, Heinz H. "Die Plastizitat des Mondes - Zu Galileo Galilei und Lodovico Cigoli." *Kunsthistorisches Jahrbuch Graz* XXIII (1987): 55-59.

Manwaring, Elizabeth W. *Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England. A study chiefly of the inflaence of Claude Lorrain and Salvator Rosa on English Taste, 1700-1800*. London: F. Cass, (1925) 1965.

Marcenaro, C., ed. *Luca Cambiaso e la sua fortuna*. Exhibition catalogue. Genova, Palazzo dell'Accademia, 1956.

Marchesi, G. B. "I 'Ragguagli di Pannasso' e la critica letteraria nel secolo XVII." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* XXVII (1896): 78-93.

Marchi, Neil de and Hans J. Van Miegroet. "Pricing Invention: 'Originals', 'Copies', and their Relative Value in 17th century Netherlandish Art Markets." In *Economics of the Arts*, edtied by Victor A. Ginsburgh and Pierre-Michel Menger. Amsterdam and New York: Elsevier, 1996, 27-70.

_______ and Hans J. Van Miegroet and Matthew E. Raiff. "Dealer-Dealer Pricing in the mid-Seventeenth-Century Antwerp to Paris Art Trade." In *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, edited by Michael North and David Ormrod. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998, 113-130.

_______ and Hans J. van Miegroet. *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 28: 1 (1998), special issue "Markets and Novelty".

_______ and Craufurd D. W. Goodwin, eds. *Economic Engagements with Art*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1999.

_______ and Hans J. Van Miegroet, eds., *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Mariani, Lucilla. "Un album di appunti di Salvator Rosa." *Accademia e Biblioteche d'Italia* XVII: 6 (1943): 335-347.

Mariani, Ilaria Miarella. "Lettere di Augusto Rosa a Giovan Battista Ricciardi (1673-1686)." *Studi secenteschi* XLIV (2003): 281-313.

Marin, Louis. *Masque et portrait. Sur l'operateur 'masque' dans quelques textes du XVIIeme siècle francais*. Urbino, 1993.

_______. *To Destroy Painting*. Translated by Mette Hjort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

_______. *Sublime Poussin*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Mariti, Luciano. "Esercizio d'Attore nel Seicento: Giovanni Briccio & C." In *Scritti in onore di Giovanni Macchia*. Vol. II. Milan: Mondadori, 1983, 633-52.

_______. *La Commedia ridicolosa: comici di professione, dilettanti, editoria teatrale nel Seicento: storia e testi*. Rome: Bulzoni, 1979.

Marlan, Stanton. *The Black Sun. The Alchemy and Art of Darkness*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2005.

Marotti, Ferruccio and Giovanna Romei, eds. *La Commedia dell'arte e la società barocca. La Professione del Teatro*. Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1991.

Marrone, Gaetana, et al. *Encyclopedia of Italian Literary Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Marshall, Christopher R. "Markets, Money and Artistic Manoeuvres: Bernardo Cavallino and the Grand Manner." In *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, edited by David R. Marshall. The Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne. Florence: Centro Di, 2004, 41-48.

_______. "*Appagare il pubblico*: The Marketing Strategies of Luca Giordano, 1678-1684." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 245-52.

_______. "Dispelling Negative Perceptions: Dealers Promoting Artists in Seventeenth-Century Naples." In *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006, 363-382.

Martial. *Epigrams*. Translated by Walter C. A. Ker. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1919-20.

Martin, John Jeffries. *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Martin, John Jeffries. "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe." *The American Historical Review* 102: 5 (1997): 1309-1342.

Martini, Angelo. *Manuale di metrologia*. Turin: Loescher, 1883.

Martinori, Edoardo. *La moneta. Vocabolario generale.* Rome: L'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, 1915.

Martucci, Giovanni. "Salvator Rosa nel personaggio di 'Formica'." *Nuova Antologia* 5 (1885): 641-658.

Mascalchi, Silvia. "Anticipazioni sul mecenatismo di Giovan Carlo de' Medici e suoi contribute alle collezioni degli Uffizi." In *Gli Uffizi. Quattro secolo di una galleria. Fonti e documenti*. Florence, 1982, 41-82.

_______. "Giovan Carlo de' Medici. An Outstanding but Neglected Collector in Seventeenth Century Florence." Translated by Anthony M. Sutton. *Apollo* CXX (1984): 268-272.

Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Matt, Luigi. *Teoria e prassi dell'epistolografia Italiana tra Cinquecento e primo Seicento. Ricerche linguistiche e retoriche, con particolare riguardo alle lettere di Giambattista Marino*. Rome: Bonacci, 2005.

Matteoli, Anna. "Documenti su Cecco Bravo." *Rivista d'Arte* XLII (1990): 95-146.

Matthew, Louisa C. "Focus on the artist and the middleman: materials, workshop production and marketing during an age of transition." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 13-16.

_______. "Painters Marketing Paintings in 15th- and 16th-century Florence and Venice." In *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006, 307-327.

Matthews-Grieco, Sara F. "The buyers' end of the market: demand, taste and consumption in Renaissance and Counter-Reformation Italy." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 17-23.

Mattioli, Antonio. *Vocabolario romagnolo-italiano*. Imola: Galeati, 1879.

Mattyasovszky-Lates, Adrienne von. "Stoics and Libertines: Philosophical Themes in the Art of Caravaggio, Poussin and their Contemporaries." PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1988 (1991).

Mauss, Marcel. "Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques." Originally published in *L'Année Sociologique*, second series, 1923-1924.

_______. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by W. D. Halls. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.

Mayer, David and Kenneth Richards, eds. *Western Popular Theatre*. Proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Manchester University Department of Drama. London: Methuen, 1977.

Maylender, Michele. *Storie delle Accademie d'Italia*. 5 vols. Bologna: Arnaldo Farni, 1930 (reprint).

Mayor, A. Hyatt and Leonard Baskin. "The Etchings of Jacques Callot." *The Massachusetts Review* 3: 1 (1961): 121-132.

Mazza, Miriam Fileti, ed. *Archivio del Collezionismo Mediceo. Il Cardinal Leopoldo*. Ricerca diretta da Paola Barocchi. Milan and Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi ed., 1998.

Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony. "Castiglione's Courtier: The Self as a Work of Art." In *Renaissance and revolution: the remaking of European thought*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1966.

McClure, George W. *Sorrow and Consolation in Italian Humanism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

McConnell, Terrance. *Gratitude*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.

McDowell, John H. "Some Pictorial Aspects of Early Mountebank Stages." *Studies in Philology* 37 (1940): 84-96.

_______. "Some Pictorial Aspects of Early 'Commedia dell'arte' Acting." *Studies in Philology* 39: 1 (1942): 37-64.

McGrath, Elizabeth. "From Parnassus to Careggi: A Seventeenth-Century Celebration of Plato and Renaissance Florence." In *Sight and Insight: Essays on Art and Culture in Honour of E. H. Gombrich at 85*, edited by John Onians. London: Phaidon Press, 1994, 191-220.

McKeon, Richard. “Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity.” *Modern Philology* 34: 1 (1936): 1-35.

McLean, Paul D. “A Frame Analysis of Favor Seeking in the Renaissance: Agency, Networks, and Political Culture.” In *The American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1 (1998): 51-91.

McWhorter, Ladelle. “Rites of Passing: Foucault, power and same-sex commitment ceremonies.” In *Thinking Through Rituals: Philosophical Perspectives*, edited by Kevin Schilbrack. London: Routledge, 2004.

Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self and Society.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, (1934) 1962.

Mead, G. R. S. *Thrice-Greatest Hermes: studies in Hellenistic theosophy and gnosis, being a translation of the extant sermons and fragments of the Trismegistic literature, with prolegomena, commentaries, and notes*. London: Theosophical Publ., Society, 1906.

Meder, Ioseph. *Die Hanzeichnung, ihre Technik und Entwicklung*. Vienna: Kunstverlag Anton Schroll & Co., 1923.

Meidow, E. *Das Motiv, den Kopfaufdie Hand zu stuetzen*. Greifswald, 1945.

Meloni Trkulja, Silvia. “Nuove Notizie su Luca Giordano (e sul Volterrano).” *Paragone* 315 (1976): 78-82.

Menghini, Mario. *La vita e le opere di Giambattista Marino: studio biografico-critico.* Rome: Manzoni, 1888.

Méré, Antoine Gombaud (Chevalier de). *Oeuvres complètes du chevalier de Méré.* Paris: F. Roches, 1930.

Meroni, Ubaldo. *Lettere e altri documenti intorno alla Storia della Pittura. Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione, detto il Grechetto, Salvator Rosa, Gian Lorenzo Bernini*. Fonti per la storia della pittura e della scultura antica, VIII. Monzambano: Edizioni per le fonti di storia della pittura, 1978.

_______. “Un disegno sconosciuto di Salvator Rosa ed un raro autografo di Giovanni Battista Ricciardi.” *Prospettiva Firenze* 15 (1978): 68-70.

_______. “Salvator Rosa: autoritratti e ritratti di amici.” *Prospettiva Firenze* 25 (1981): 65-70.

Meyer, Arline. “Re-dressing Classical Statuary: The Eighteenth-Century ‘Hand-in-Waistcoat’ Portrait.” *Art Bulletin* 77: 1 (1995): 45-63.

Michelassi, Nicola. “Il Teatro del Cocomero di Firenze: uno stanzone per tre accademie (1651-1665).” *Studi Secenteschi* XL (1999): 149-186.

_______. “Schede secentesche XXI- Memorie dal sottopalco: Giovan Carlo de’ Medici e il primo teatro della pergola.” *Studi Secenteschi* XLIII (2002): 347-355.

Miedema, Hessel. *Kunst historisch*. Leiden: Primavera, 1995.

Millen, R. F. and R. E. Wolf. *Heroic Deeds and Mystic Figures: A New Reading of Rubens’ Life of Maria De’ Medici.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Miller, Peter N. "Friendship and Conversation in Seventeenth-Century Venice." *The Journal of Modern History* 73: 1 (2001): 1-31.

Miller, Stephen. *Conversation. A History of a Declining Art*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006.

Miller, Dwight C. "A Preparatory Study for Salvator Rosa's 'L'Umana Fragilita." Notice. *Burlington Magazine* 119: 889 (1977): 272.

Minerva, Nadia, ed. *La Luna allo specchio*. *Rappresentazioni, simbologie e metafore seleniche nella letteratura e nell'immaginario*. Bologna: Patron Editore, 1990.

Missimi, M. *Memorie per servire alla storia della Romana Accademia di San Luca*. Rome, 1823.

Missirini, Melchior. *Memorie per servire alla storia della Romana Accademia di S. Luca fino alla morte di Antonio Canova.* Rome: Nella Stamperia de Romanis, 1823.

Mix, Erving R. *Marcus Atilius Regulus. Exemplum Historicum*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton & Co., 1970.

Modesti, Adelina. "Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 367-388.

Moffa, Francesco. "Le Frascherie di Antonio Abati e le Satire di Salvator Rosa." *Rassegna Pugliese* (Trani-Bari) XVIII (1901).

_______ , ed. *Elisabetta Sirani: una virtuosa del Seicento Bolognese*. Bologna: Compositori, 2004.

Moffitt, John. *Inspiration. Bacchus and the Cultural History of a Creation Myth*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

Molho, Anthony. "Cosimo de'Medici: *Pater Patriae* or *Padrino*?" *Stanford Italian Review* I: i (1979): 5-33.

Molinari, Isabella. "Il teatro di Salvator Rosa." *Biblioteca Teatrale* 49/51 (1999): 195-248.

Monaldi, Gino. *I Teatri di Roma negli ultimo tre secoli*. Naples: Ricciardi, 1928.

Monbeig-Goguel, Catherine and Walter Vitzthum eds. *Le dessin à Naples du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle*: XXXIXe exposition du Cabinet des Dessins. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 1967.

Monk, Samuel Holt. "A Grace Beyond the Reach of Art." *Journal of the History of Ideas* V (1944): 131-50.

Montagu, Jennifer. "Antonio and Gioseppe Giorgetti: Sculptors to Cardinal Francesco Barberini." *Art Bulletin* 52: 3 (1970): 278-298.

_______. "Bernini Sculptures not by Bernini." In *Gianlorenzo Bernini. New Aspects of his Art and Thought*, edited by Irving Lavin. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1985, 25-43.

_______. *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

_______. "Edward Altham as a Hermit." In *England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J. B. Trapp*, edited by E. Chaney and P. Mack. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1990, 271-282.

_______. *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's 'Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière'*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Montaigne, Michel de. *On Friendship*. Translated by M. A. Screech. New York: Penguin Books, 1991.

_______. *The Essays*. Edited by W. Carew Hazlitt, translated by C. Cotton. Chicago: William Benton; Encyclopaedia Brittanica, Inc., (1952) 1988.

_______. *Essays*. Translated by J. M. Cohen. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, (1958) 1993.

Montalto, Lina. "Gli affreschi del Palazzo Pamphili in Valmontone." *Commentari* VI (1955): 267-302.

Montanari, Tomaso. "'Dar todo a uno es obra del diablo': Gian Lorenzo Bernini artista di corte?" In *Velazquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano. Le corti del Barocco*, edited by Fernando Checa Cremades. Milan: Skira, 2004, 89-98.

_______. *Bernini Pittore*.   Cinisello Balsamo, Milan: Silvana, 2007.

Montias, John Michael. *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

_______. "Art Dealers in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands." *Similiolus* 17 (1989): 244-56.

_______. *Le marché de l'art aux Pays Bas, XVe-XVIIe siècles*. Paris: Flammarion, 1996.

_______. *Art at Auction in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2002.

_______. "Art Dealers in Holland." In *Economics of Art and Culture*, edited by V. A. Ginsburgh. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2004, 75-96.

Morabito, Raffaele. *Lettere e letteratura. Studi sull'epistolografia volgare in Italia*. Turin: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2001.

Morales, Helen. "The Torturer's Apprentice: Parrhasius and the limits of art." In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, edited by Jas Elsner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 182-209.

Morel, Philippe. "La figure de la magicienne de l'Orlando Furioso à l'art fiorentin entre Cinquecento et Seicento." In *L'arme e gli armori. Ariosto, Tasso and Guarini in Late Renaissance Painting*, edited by in M. Rossi and F. Gioffredi Superbi. Florence: Olschki, 2001, 297-326.

Morford, Mark. *Stoics and Neostoics. Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Morgan, Luke. "Guercino's 'Et in Arcadia Ego' and Eighteenth-Century Landscape Design." In *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, edited by David R. Marshall. The Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne. Florence: Centro Di, 2004, 191-196.

Morgan, Lady Sydney. *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa*. 2 vols. London: Colburn, 1824.

Moscovici, Claudia. *Romanticism and Postromanticism.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007.

Mostra dei Tesori Segreti delle Case Fiorentine. Comitato Femminile della C. R. I. e dal Circolo Borghese e della Stampa a Beneficio della Croce Rossa Italiana di Firenze. Florence: Circolo Borghese e della Stampa, 1960.

Mousnier, Roland E. *Les institutions de la France sous la monarchie absolue, 1598-1789*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974.

_______."Les Fidélités et les clientèles en France aux XVIe, XVIIe, et XVIIIe siècles." *Histoire sociale* 15 (1982): 35-6, 45-6.

Muller, Jeffrey. *Rubens: The Artist as Collector*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

_______. "Measures of Authenticity: The Detection of Copies in the Early Literature on Connoisseurship." In *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, edited by Rosalind Krauss et al. National Gallery of Art, Washington. Studies in the History of Art, 20. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1989, 141-147.

Murata, Margaret. "Dr. Burney Bought a Music Book." *The Journal of Musicology* 17: 1 (1999): 76-111.

Muro, Noemi di. "Il teatro di Giovanni Battista Ricciardi (1623-1686). Il linguaggio comico del Trespolo." *Biblioteca teatrale* 49/51 (1999): 145-193.

Musolff, Meghan Jane Kalasky. "Sofonisba Anguissola's Double Portrait." MA Thesis, Michigan State University, 2003.

Musolff, Hans-Ulrich. *Erziehung und Bildung in der Renaissance: von Vergerio bis Montaigne*. Cologne, 1997.

Nagel, Alexander. "Gifts for Michelangelo and Vittoria Colonna." *Art Bulletin* LXXIX: 4 (1997): 647-668.

_______. "Art as Gift. Liberal Art and Religious Reform in the Renaissance." In *Negotiating the Gift. Pre-Modern Figurations of Exchange*, edited by Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner and Bernard Jussen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003, 319-360.

Negrón, Zarinés. "Francisco Pacheco: Economist for the Art World." In *Economic Engagements with Art*, edited by Neil De Marchi and Craufurd D. W. Goodwin. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1999, 33-40.

Nesi, Antonella. "Un'aggiunta al catalogo di Giovanni Martinelli." *Paragone* 457 (1988): 62-65.

Nesselrath, Arnold. "Raphael's Gift to Dürer." *Master Drawings* 31:4 (1993): 376-389.

Nichols, Tom. *Tintoretto: Tradition and Identity*. London: Reaktion Books, 1999.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *Masks, Mimes and Miracles: Studies in the Popular Theatre.* New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963.

_______. *The World of Harlequin. A Criticial Study of the Commedia dell'Arte*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Nicolò, Anna. *Il Carteggio di Cassiano dal Pozzo*. Quaderni del Rinascimento, II. Florence: L. S. Olschki, 1991.

North, Michael ed., *Economic History and the Arts*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1996.

_______ and David Ormrod, eds. *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

_______. "The Long Way of Professionalization in the Early Modern German Art Trade." In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della 'Trentateesima Settimana di Studi', 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, 459-471.

Notarp, Gerlinde Lutke. "Jacques de Gheyn II's 'Man Resting in a Field': An Essay on the Iconography of Melancholy." *Simiolus* 24: 4 (1996): 311- 319.

O'Donnell, Katherine and Michael O'Rourke. *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, 2003.

Oertel, Robert. "Die Vergänglichkeit der Künst. Ein Vanitas-Stilleben von Salvator Rosa." *Müncher Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst* XIV (1963): 105-120.

Oestreich, Gerhard. *Neostoicism and the early modern state*. Edited by B. Oestreich and H. G. Koenigsberger. Translated by David McLintock. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Olson, Todd. *Poussin and France. Painting, Humanism, and the Politics of Style*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002.

O'Malley, Michelle. "Commissioning Bodies, Fee Negotiations and Price Structures for Altarpieces in 15th and Early 16th Century Italy." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 163-180.

Orgel, Stephen. "The Renaissance Artist as Plagiarist." *English Literary History* 48: 3 (1981): 476-495.

Ortiz, Antonio Dominguez et al. *Velazquez.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1989.

Ostovich, Helen. *Ben Jonson, Every Man Out of His Humour*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Ostrow, Steven. "Cigoli's Immacolata and Galileo's Moon: Astronomy and the Virgin in Early Seicento Rome." *Art Bulletin* 78: 2 (1996): 218-235.

Ottonelli, G. D. *Della Christiana Moderatione del Theatro*. Florence: Stamperia di L. Franceschini & A. Logi, 1646.

Ovid. *Metamporphoses*. Edited and translated by Sir Samuel Garth and John Dryden, et al. London: J. and R. Tonson, 1736.

Ozzola, Leandro. *Vita e Opere di Salvator Rosa: Pittore, Poeta, Incisore*. Con Poesie e Documenti Inediti. Strassburg: J. H. Ed. Heitz (Heitz & Mündel), 1908.

_______. "Salvator Rosa auf dem Lande." *Cicerone* I: 22 (1909): 691-693.

Pächt, Otto. "Zur Entste hung des 'Hieronymous im Gehäus'." *Pantheon* XXI (1963): 131-142.

Pagel, Walter. *Paracelsus: An Introduction to Philosophical Medicine in the Era of the Renaissance.* Basel: New York: Karger, 1982.

Pagliarulo, Giovanni. "Appunti fiorentini e alcune ipotesi intorno al soffitto della Madonna dei Galletti a Pisa." *Antichità viva* 30: 4/5 (1991): 33-43.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Albrecht Dürer*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943.

_______. *Early Netherlandish Painting: its Origins and Character*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

_______. *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

_______. *A Mythological Painting by Poussin in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm.* Stockholm: Nationalmusei Skriftserie, 1960.

_______. *Tomb Sculpture. Four Lectures on its changing aspects from ancient Egypt to Bernini*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1964.

_______. *Idea. A Concept in Art Theory*. Translated by Joseph J. S. Peake. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968.

Parry, Graham. "The Court of Charles I." In *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.

Parshall, Peter. "Prints as Objects of Consumption in Early Modern Europe." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 28:1 (1998): 19-36.

Pascoli, Leoni. *Vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti moderni, con indice analitico* (1730-1736). Rome: Società multigrafica editrice Somu, 1965.

Pasquinelli, Barbara. *Il gesto e l'espressione.* Milan: Electa, 2005.

Passeri, Giambattista. *Die Künstlerbiographien*. Nach den Handschriften des Autors hrsg. und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Jacob Hess. Leipzig, H. Keller, 1934.

_______. *Die Kunstlerbiographien von Giovanni Battista Passeri*. Edited by J. Hess. Worms am Rhein, 1995.

_______. *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti che hanno lavorato in Roma*. Arnaldo Forni Editore, 2002. Facsimile of 1st ed., Presso Natale Barbiellini Mercante di Libri a Pasquino, Rome, 1772.

Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed. Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Patch, H. R. *The Tradition of Boethius. A Study of his Impotence in Medieval Culture.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1935.

Patterson, Frank A., ed. *The Works of John Milton.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1931-40.

Patty, James S. *Salvator Rosa in French Literature: From the Bizarre to the Sublime*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 2005.

Patz, Kristine. "Sub Rosa. Verschwiegene Beredsamkeit im Londoner Selbstporträt von Salvator Rosa." Manuskriptabschluss 1996. Erscheinungsort, Berlin: Reimer Verlag, 1997.

Payne, Alina. *The Architectural Treatise in the Renaissance. Architectural Invention, Ornament, and Literary Culture*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Paxson, James J. *The Poetics of Personification*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Pearce, Howard D. "A Phenomenological Approach to the *Theatrum Mundi* Metaphor." *PMLA* 95: 1 (1980): 42-57.

Pearson, Lionel. *The Art of Demosthenes*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

Pelles, Geraldine. "The Image of the Artist." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 21: 2 (1962): 119-137.

Penguin Dictionary of Symbols. Edited by Jean Chevalier and Alain Gheerbrandt. Translated by John Buchanan-Brown. London: Penguin, 1996.

Pepper, Stephen. "Guido Reni's Practice of Repeating Compositions." *Artibus et Historiae* 20: 39 (1999): 27-54.

Peregrini, Matteo. *Della pratica comune a principi e servitori loro libri cinque.* Viterbo, 1634.

_______. *Delle Acutezze, che altrimenti spiriti, vivezze, e concetti volgarmente si appellano*. Genova: Gio. Maria Farroni, Nicolò Pesagni, & Pier Francesco Barbieri, 1639.

Perelli, Marcello, Egisto Bragaglia and Teresa Grossi. *Salvator Rosa: L'uomo, l'artista, l'antesignano. 32 tavole di schizzi e studi inediti*. Treviso: Antiga Edizioni, 2006.

Pérez Sánchez, Alfonso E. and Nicola Spinosa. *L'opera completa del Ribera*. Milan: Rizzoli, 1978.

Perini, Giovanna. "Carlo Cesare Malvasia's Florentine Letters: Insight into Conflicting Trends in Seventeenth-Century Italian Art Historiography." *Art Bulletin* 70:2 (1988): 273-299.

Perlove, Shelley Karen. *Bernini and the Idealization of Death*: *The Blessed Ludovica Albertoni*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.

Perrucci, Andrea. *Dell'arte rappresentativa premeditata, ed all'improviso* (1699). Edited and translated by Francesco Cotticelli, Anne Goodrich Heck, and Thomas F. Heck. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2007.

Perry, Ellen. *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Pers, Ciro di. *Poesie*. Edited by Michele Rak. Turin: Giulio Einuadi Editore, 1978.

Pescetti, Luigi. "Lettere inedite di Baldassare Franceschini, pittore volterrano (1611-1689)." *Rassegna volterrana* VIII: 13 (1934): 27-46.

Petrucci, Francesca. “La ‘ragione trionfante’ alla corte medicea: il Gran Principe Ferdinando e Giuseppe Maria Crespi.” *Artibus et Historiae* 3: 5 (1982): 109-123.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Lettere di Francesco Petrarca delle cose familiari libri ventiquattro* … [*Epistolae familiares*]. Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1863-1867.

_______. *The life of solitude* [*Vita solitaria*]. Translated by Jacob Zeitlin. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1924.

_______. *Rime, trionfi, e poesie latine*. Edited by Ferdinando Neri et al. Milan: R. Ricciardi, 1951.

Petrucci, Francesco, ed. *Mola e il suo tempo. Pittura di figura dalla Collezione Koelliker*. Exhibition catalogue. Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia. Milan: Skira, 2005.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. *Academies of Art, Past and Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Piccini, Giulio. *Lettera Famliare di Antonio Malatesti a Lorenzo Lippi, fiore d'Amenità Letterarie*. Florence: Antonio Cecchi, 1867.

Piccolomini, Alessandro. *De la institutione di tutta la vita de l'homo nato nobile e in città libera*. Venice: Giovanni Maria Bonelli, 1552.

Pieters, Jürgen and Lise Gosseye. “The Paradox of Paragone: Painters and Poets in Constantijn Huygens’ *Ooghen-Troost.*” *Neophilologus* 92: 2 (2008): 177-192.

Pietropaolo, Domenico, ed. *The Science of Buffoonery*: *Theory and History of the Commedia dell’arte.* Toronto: University of Toronto Italian Studies 3; Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989.

Pigler, Andrew. “The Importance of Iconographical Exactitude.” *Art Bulletin* 21: 3 (1939): 228-237.

Pigler, Anton. *Barockthemen*, *eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956.

Pigman, G. W. III. “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 33: 1 (1980): 1-32.

Pignatti, Terisio. *Giorgione*. London: Phaidon, 1971.

Pilliod, Elizabeth. “Representation, Misrepresentation, and Non-Representation: Vasari and his Competitors.” In *Vasari's Florence. Artists and Literati at the Medicean Court*, edited by Philip Jacks. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 30-52.

_______. *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori*. *A Genealogy of Florentine Art*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001.

Pinchera, Valeria. “Arte e consumo della nobilità fiorentina nel Sei e Settecento.” In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della ‘Trentateesima Settimana di Studi,’ 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, 635-48.

Pio, Nicola. *Le vite di pittori, scultori et architetti* (Cod. ms. Capponi 257). Edited by Catherine and Robert Enggass. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1977.

Piperno, Franco. "Opera Production to 1780." In *Opera Production and its Resources*, edited by Lorenzo Bianconi and Giorgio Pestelli, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Pizzo, Marco. "'Far Galleria': Collezionismo e mercato artistico tra Venezia e Roma nelle lettere di Quintiliano Rezzonico a Livio Odescalchi (1676-1709)." *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova* 89 (2000): 43-84.

Pizzorusso, Claudio. "Amicizia di Bacco. Variazioni su un tema del Caravaggio." *Artista* (1998): 8-17.

Pliny. *Natural History*. Edited by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Pliny. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Translated by K. Jex-Blake. Chicago: Argonaut, 1968.

Plutarch. *Essays* [*Moralia*]. Translated by Robin Waterfield. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944.

Poliziano, Angelo. *Il Manuale di Epitetto*. Edited by Giuseppe Rensi. Milan: Casa editrice L.F. Cogliati del dott. G. Martinelli, 1926.

Polleross, Friedrich. "Between Typology and Psychology: The Role of the Identification Portrait in Updating Old Testament Representations." *Artibus et Historiae* 12: 24 (1991): 75-117.

Portal, Andrew. *The Orations of Aeschines against Ctesiphon and Demosthenes de Corona*. Oxford: Munday & Slatter, 1814.

Porter, Roy, ed. *Rewriting the Self. Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Poseq, A . W. G. "Caravaggio's Self-Portrait as the Beheaded Goliath." *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* 59 (1990): 169-82.

Posner, Donald. "Jacques Callot and the Dances Called *Sfessania*." *Art Bulletin* 59: 2 (1977): 203-216.

Price, Linda L. and Eric J. Arnould. "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider-Client Relationships in Context." *Journal of Marketing* 63: 4 (1999): 38-56.

Prinz, Wolfgang. "The Four Philosophers of Rubens and the Pseudo-Seneca in Seventeenth Century Painting." *Art Bulletin* 40:3 (1973): 410-428.

Prota-Giurleo, Ulisse. "La Musica a Napoli nel Seicento. (Dal Gesualdo allo Scarlatti)." *Samnium* II: 2 (1929): 30-49.

_______. *La famiglia e la giovinezza di Salvator Rosa. (con LII documenti inediti).* Naples: A Spese de l'autore, Largo S. Domenico, 12. Benevento: Tipi Istituto Maschile Vittorio Em. III, Chiostro S. Sofia, 1929, VII.

_______. *I teatri di Napoli nel '600. La commedia e le maschere*. Naples: F. Fiorentino, 1962.

Pseudo-Dionysius the Aeropagite. *The Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchies*. Translated by Rev. John Parker. London, 1894.

Publius Syrus [Publilii Syri]. *Sententiae*. Edited by R. A. H. Bickford-Smith. London: Cambridge University Press, 1895.

Puglisi, Catherine. *Francesco Albani*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie* [1589]. Edited by Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.

Puttfarken, Thomas. "Golden Age and Justice in Sixteenth-Century Florentine Political Thought and Imagery: Observations on Three Pictures by Jacopo Zucchi." *JWCI* 43 (1980): 130-149.

Puppi, Lionello. "Copie, falsi, pastiches. Riflessioni preliminari intorno al mercato dell'arte come economia del gusto." In *Tra Committenza e Collezionismo. Studi sul mercato dell'arte nell'Italia settentrionale durante l'età moderna*, edited by Enrico Maria Dal Pozzolo and Leonida Tedoldi. Vicenza: Terra Ferma, 2003.

Quinn, Michael L. "Celebrity and the Semiotics of Acting." *New Theatre Quarterly* VI: 22 (1990): 154-161.

Quint, David. *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Quintilian. *Institutionis oratoriae.* [*The Institutio oratoria*] Translated by H. E. Butler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966-1969.

Quondam, Amedeo. *La Funzione delle Accademie nella Cultura Odierna*. Atti del convegno. Spoleto, 10 dicembre 1977. Spoleto: Panetto e Petrelli, 1979.

_______ , ed. *Le 'carte messaggiere'. Retorica e modelli di comunicazione espistolare: per un indice dei libri di lettere del Cinquecento*. Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1981.

_______. *Il naso di Laura: lingua e poesia lirica nella tradizione del classicismo.* Ferrara: ISR; Modena: F. C. Panini, 1991.

Radcliffe-Umstead, Douglas. "The Erudite comic tradition of the *Commedia dell'arte*." In *The Science of Buffoonery. Theory and History of the Commedia dell'arte*, edited by Domenico Pietropaolo. Toronto: University of Toronto Italian Studies 3; Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989.

Rak, Michele. *La maschera della fortuna. Letture del Basile 'toscano'*. Naples: Liguori Editore, 1975.

_______. "Cade il mondo. Icone, magia, saperi e devozione nelle satire di Salvator Rosa." In *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia.* Exhibition catalogue. Naples, Museo di Capodimonte, 18 April – 29 June 2008. Naples: Electa, 2008, 88-96.

Ramsden, E. H. *"Come Take this Lute": A Quest for Identities in Italian Renaissance Portraiture*. Salisbury, England: Element Books, 1983.

Randolph, Mary Claire. "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: Its Possible Relationships and Implications." *Studies in Philology* 38 (1941): 154-6.

Ranum, Orest. "Courtesy, Absolutism, and the Rise of the French State, 1630-1660." *Journal of Modern History* 52 (1980): 426-51.

Rapin, R. *A Comparison Between the Eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero*. Translation, Anon. Oxford, 1672.

Rebecchini, Guido. "Il mercato del dono. Forme dello scambio artistico a Mantova tra Cinque e Seicento." In *Tra Committenza e Collezionismo. Studi sul mercato dell'arte nell'Italia settentrionale durante l'età moderna*, edited by Enrico Maria Dal Pozzolo and Leonida Tedoldi. Vicenza: Terra Ferma, 2003, 113-122.

Rebhorn, Wayne A. *Courtly Performances*: *Masking and Festivity in Castiglione's Book of the Courtier*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1978.

Reckford, Kenneth J. "Horace and Maecenas." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XC (1959): 195-208.

Redi, Francesco. *Opere*. Milan: Società Tip. de' Classici Italiani, 1809-11.

Regel, Walter and Hartmut Köhler. …*Hoch gerühmt, fast vergessen, neu gesehen: der italienische Maler und Poet Salvator Rosa.* Studien zur Neubewertung. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2007.

Reinhard, Wolfgang. "*Amici e creature*. Politische Mikrogeschichte der romischen Kurie im 17. Jahrhundert." *Quellen und Forschungen, Aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut in Rom 76 (1996): 308-334.

Reinhardt, Volker. "The Roman Art Market in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." In *Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800*, edited by Michael North and David Ormrod. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998, 82-91.

Reresby, Sir John. *The Memoirs and Travels of Sir John Reresby*. London: Edward Jeffery, 1813.

Reynolds, Sir Joshua. *Discourses on Art*. Ed. Robert R. Wark. San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1959.

Reznicek, Emil Karel Josef. *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*. Mit einem beschreibenden Katalog. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1961.

Ricci, Corrado. "Salvator Rosa a Pisa e nel Casentino." *Rassegna d'arte antica e moderna* xxi (1921): 68.

Richards, Kenneth and Laura Richards. *The Commedia dell'Arte*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell for The Shakespeare Head Press, 1990.

Richter, Gisela M. A. *Greek Portraits: A Study of Their Development.* Collection Latomas, xx, Brussels, 1955.

_______. *The Portraits of the Greeks*. London: Phaidon Press, 1965.

Richter, Jean Paul. *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Riggs, Christina. "Facing the Dead: Recent Research on the Funerary Art of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt." *American Journal of Archaeology* 106: 1 (2002): 85-101.

Rinaldis, Aldo de. *Lettere Inedite di Salvator Rosa a G. B. Ricciardi*. Rome: Fratelli Palombi Editori, 1939.

Ripa, Cesare. *Iconologia* [1593]. Edited by Piero Buscaroli, preface by Mario Praz. Milan: TEA, 1992.

_______. *Baroque and Rococo Pictorial Imagery. The 1758-60 Hertel Edition of Ripa's 'Iconologia' with 200 Engraved Illustrations*. Edited by Edward A. Maser. New York: Dover Publications, 1971.

Roberts, K. B. and J. D. W. Tomlinson. *The Fabric of the Body. European Traditions of Anatomical Illustration.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Robertson, Martin. *A History of Greek Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Robin, Francoise. "Le rencontre du prince et de l'artiste: mise au point et etat de connaissances (France XIVe - Xve siecles)." In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della 'Trentateesima Settimana di Studi', 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, 593-602.

Rocke, Michael. *Forbidden Friendhips. Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Rogers, Mary, ed. *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Romano, Denis. "The Art Market in Italy (15th-17th Centuries). Concluding Remarks." In *The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries/ Il Mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*, edited by Marcello Fantoni et al. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003, 445-448.

Romei, Danilo ed. *Salvator Rosa. Satire*. Commento di Jacopo Manna. Milan: Mursia, 1995.

Roodenburg, Herman. *The Eloquence of the Body. Perspectives on Gesture in the Dutch Republic*. Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2004.

Rooses, Max. *Catalogue du Musée Plantin Moretus.* Anvers: J.-E. Buschmann, 1881.

Roover, Raymond de. "The Concept of the Just Price: Theory and Economic Policy." *Journal of Economic History* xviii (1958): 418-34.

Rosa, Salvator. *Il Teatro della Politica: Sentenziosi afforismi della prudenza*. Edited by Giorgio Baroni. Scelta di Curiosita Letterarie, Inedite o Rare dal Secolo XIII al XIX. Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1991.

Rosand, David. *Drawing Acts: Studies in Graphic Expression and Representation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Rosen, Edward. "Carlo Dati on the Invention of Eyeglasses." *Isis* 44: 1/2 (1953): 4-10.

Rosenberg, Pierre. "Poussin Drawings from British Collections." *Burlington Magazine* 133: 1056 (1991): 210-13.

_______, et al. *French Dutch and Flemish Caravaggesque Paintings*. Collezione Koelliker. Part II. Milan: Collezione Koelliker, 2007.

Rosenthal, Lisa. "Venus's Milk and the Temptations of Allegory in Otto Van Veen's 'Allegory of Temptation'." In *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, edited by Cristelle Baskins and Lisa Rosenthal. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Roskill, Mark. "Van Dyck at the English Court: The Relations of Portraiture and Allegory." *Critical Inquiry* 14: 1 (1987): 173-199.

Rossi, Sergio, ed. *Scienza e miracoli nell'arte del '600. Alle origini della medicina moderna*. Milan: Electa, 1998.

Rothbard, Murray N. *Economic Thought before Adam Smith: An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought.* 2 vols. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar, 1995.

Rothschild, Deborah Menaker. "Lorenzo Bartolini's Demidoff Table." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 17 (1982): 75-86.

Rowland, Ingrid D. *The Ecstatic Journey: Athanasius Kircher in Baroque Rome*. Introduction by F. Sherwood Rowland. Chicago: Dept. of Special Collections, University of Chicago Library, 2000.

Roworth, Wendy Wassyng. *Pictor Succensor*: *A Study of Salvator Rosa As Satirist, Cynic and Painter.* New York: Garland, 1978.

_______. "A Date for Salvator Rosa's Satire on Painting and the Bamboccianti in Rome." *Art Bulletin* 63: 4 (1981): 611-617.

_______. "Baroque Portraiture in Italy." *Burlington Magazine* 127: 987 (1985): 376, 406-7.

_______. "The Consolations of Friendship. Salvator Rosa's Self-Portrait for Giovanni Battista Ricciardi." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 23 (1988): 103-124.

_______. "Salvator Rosa's Self-Portraits: Some Problems of Identity and Meaning." *The Seventeenth Century* IV (1989): 117-48.

_______. "The Evolution of History Painting: Masaniello's Revolt and Other Disasters in Seventeenth-Century Naples." *Art Bulletin* lxxv: 2 (1993): 219-234.

_______. "*Pittura*, *Invidia*, and the artist's fortunes." Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Rubin, Patrica Lee. *Giorgio Vasari. Art and History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Rubin, Julius H. *Religious Melancholy and Protestant Experience in America*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Ruelens, Charles Louis and Max Rooses. *Correspondance de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses oeuvres*. Antwerp, 1898.

Ruffo, Vincenzo. "Galleria Ruffo nel Secolo XVII in Messina. Con Lettere di Pittori ed altri Documenti inedite." *Bollettino d'Arte*, 1916.

Rupprich, Hans, ed. *Albrecht Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*. 3 vols. Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956-69.

Russell, Susan. “Salvator Rosa and Herman van Swanevelt.” Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Ruvoldt, Maria. “Michelangelo’s Dream.” *Art Bulletin* 85: 1 (2003): 86-113.

Rzepińska, Maria. “The Divine Wisdom of Michelangelo in The Creation of Adam.” *Artibus et Historiae* 15: 29 (1994): 181-187.

Saccone, Eduardo. “Grazia, Sprezzatura, and Affettazione in Castiglione’s Book of the Courtier.” *Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies* 5 (1979): 34-54.

Safarik, Edward A. and Cinzia Pujia. *Collezione dei dipinti Colonna, Inventari 1611-1795*. Edited by Anna Cera Sones. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 1996.

Sahlins, Marshall. “On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange.” In *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, edited by M. P. Banton. London: Tavistock, 1965, 139-236.

Salerno, Luigi. *Salvator Rosa.* Milan: Edizioni per il club del libro, 1963.

_______. “Il dissenso nella pittura. Intorno a Filippo Napoletano, Caroselli, Salvator Rosa e altri.” *Storia dell’Arte* 5 (1970): 34-65.

_______. “Salvator Rosa at the Hayward Gallery.” Review of the exhibition *Salvator Rosa* at the Hayward Gallery, London. *Burlington Magazine* 115: 849 (1973): 827-831.

_______. “Salvator Rosa. Postille alla mostra di Londra.” *Arte Illustrata* VI (1973): 408-14.

_______. *L’Opera completa di Salvator Rosa*. Milan: Rizzoli, 1975.

_______. “Immobilismo politico e academia.” *Storia dell’Arte italiana* 6: 1 (1981): 449-522.

Salomon, Xavier. Review of the exhibition *Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia* at the Capodimonte, Naples, 2008. *Burlington Magazine* CL (2008): 493-495.

Salvator Rosa: Wild Landscapes. Selected by Dr. Susan Jenkins. Exhibition catalogue. Compton Verney 25 March – 5 June 2005; Wallace Collection, London 23 June – 18 September 2005. Compton Verney House Trust, 2005.

Salvator Rosa: Tra Mito e Magia. Exhibition catalogue. Naples, Museo di Capodimonte, 18 April – 29 June 2008. Naples: Electa, 2008.

Salvini, Salvino. *Fasti consolari dell’Accademia Fiorentina*. Florence: Nella stamperia di S.A.R.; per Gio. Gaetano Tartini, e Santi Franchi, 1717.

Sandrart, Joachim von. *Teutsche Academie der Edlen Bau-, und Mahlerey-Künste* [1675]. Edited by A. R. Peltzer. Munich, 1925.

Sarasohn, Lisa T. “Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and the Patronage of the New Science in the Seventeenth Century.” *Isis* 84: 1 (1993): 70-90.

Saslow, James M. *The Poetry of Michelangelo*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.

Saunders, Jason Lewis. *Justus Lipsius: The Philosophy of Renaissance Stoicism.* New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1955.

Scalabroni, Luisa. *Vanitas: fisionomia di un tema pittorico*. Alessandria (Italy): Edizioni dell'Oro, 1999.

Scaramuccia, Luigi. *Le finezze dei pennelli italiani …* [1674] Edited by Guido Giubbini. Milan: Edizioni Labor, 1965.

Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch culture in the Golden Age*. New York: Knopf; Random House, 1987.

Schaper, Eva. "Aristotle's Catharsis and Aesthetic Pleasure." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 18: 71 (1968): 131-143.

Schiesari, Juliana. *The Gendering of Melancholia. Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Shiff, Richard. "Representation, Copying, and the Technique of Originality." *New Literary History* 15: 2 (1984): 333-363.

Shifflett, Andrew. *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton. War and Peace Reconciled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Schino, Jun di. *I fasti del banchetto barocco*. Rome: Diomeda Centro studi e ricerche, 2005.

Schleier, Erich, ed. *Giovanni Lanfranco. Un pittore barocco tra Parma, Roma e Napoli*. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 2001.

Schlimme, Hermann. "Between Architecture, science and technology: the Accademia della Vachia in Florence, 1661-1662." In *Practice and Science in Early Modern Italian Building. Towards an Epistemic History of Architecture*, edited by Hermann Schlimme. Milan: Electa, 2006.

Schlitzer, Franco. "A Letter from Cesti to Salvator Rosa." Translated by Frank Walker.*The Monthly Musical Record* (1954): 150-152.

Schmidt, Carl B. "Antonio Cesti's 'Il pomo d'oro': A Reexamination of a Famous Hapsburg Court Spectacle." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29: 3 (1976): 381-412.

Schmidt, H. W. "Drawings by Salvator Rosa in the Leipzig Stadtbibliothek." *Old Master Drawings* VI: 24 (1932): 60-63.

Schmidt, Steffen W. et al, eds. *Friends, Followers and Factions. A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Schnackenburg, Bernard. *Gemaldegalerie Alte Meister Gesamtkatalog*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Gegründet, 1785, reprinted 1996.

Schneewind, J. B. "The Use of Autonomy in Ethical Theory." In *Reconstructing Individualism. Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, 64-75.

Schrift, Alan D., ed. *The Logic of the Gift. Toward an Ethic of Generosity*. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Schütze, Sebastian. “Aristide de Thebes, Raphael et Poussin. La Representation des Affetti dans les grands tableaux d’histoire de Poussin des annees 1620-1630.” In *Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665): Actes du colloque organisé au Musée du Louvre*, edited by A. Merot. Paris: Documentation Francaise, 1996, 571-601.

Schwartz, Gary. “The Structure of Patronage Networks in Rome, the Hague and Amsterdam in the 17th century.” In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della ‘Trentateesima Settimana di Studi’, 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002, 567-574.

Schwarz, Hans Peter. “Non visse da pittore, ma da prencipe.” PhD dissertation, University of Marburg, 1982.

Schyberg, Frederik. “The Art of Acting.” *The Tulane Drama Review* 5: 4 (1961): 63-5.

Scott, Jonathan. *Salvator Rosa: His Life and Times*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Sebaste, Beppe. *Lettere & Filosofia, Poetica dell’Epistolarità*. Florence: Alinea, 1998.

Sebesta, Judith Lynn and Larissa Bonfante, eds. *The World of Roman Costume*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Segre, Michael. *In the Wake of Galileo.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Il Seicento fiorentino: arte a Firenze da Ferdinando I a Cosimo III. 3 vols. Exhibition at Palazzo Strozzi, Florence, 21 Dec. 1986 – May 4 1987. Florence: Cantini, 1986.

Sellars, John. *Stoicism*. Chesham: Acumen, 2006.

Seneca. *De Amicitia*. In *L. Annaei Senecae Opera Quae Supersunt*, edited by F. Haase. Leipzig. 1897.

_______. *Of Benefits*. In *Moral Essays*. 3 vols. Trans. John W. Basore. The Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann, 1928-1935.

_______. *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales.* [*Moral Epistles*] Translated by Richard M. Gummere. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917-25.

Serie degli uomini piu illustri in pittura, scultura, e architettura con i loro elogi e ritratti incise in rame. 13 vols. Florence: stamperia di S.A.R. per Gaetano Cambiagi, 1769-76.

Serlio, Sebasitiano. *Libro Extraordinario*. Venice, 1619.

_______. *Tutte l’opere d’architettura, et prospetiva*. Book 4. Venice, 1619. Reproduced by Ridgewood, New Jersey: Gregg Press, 1964.

Serra, L. *Domenichino Zampiero, ditto il Domenichino*. Rome, 1909.

Settis, Salvatore. *Giorgione's Tempest: Interpreting the Hidden Subject*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Sgarbi, Vittorio ed. *Luce e ombra nella pittura italiana tra Rinascimento e Barocco: da Tiziano a Bernini*. Milan: Skira, 2005.

Sheard, Wendy Stedman and John T. Paoletti, eds. *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.

Shearman, John. *Mannerism.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967.

_______. *Only Connect… Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

_______. "Castiglione's Portrait of Raphael." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institute in Florenz* XXXVIII (1994): 69-97.

Schlosser, Julius von. *Quellenbuch zur Kunstgeschichte des abendlandischen Mittelalters.* Vienna: C. Graeser, 1896.

Sider, Sandra. "New Resources for Emblem Studies." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54: 4, part 2 (2001): 1574-1580.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *Defense of Poesy* [1595]. Edited by Albert S. Cook. Boston: Ginn, 1890.

Silius Italicus. *Punica*. Translated by J. D. Duff. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1934.

Silver, Larry. *Peasant Scenes and Landscapes: The Rise of Pictorial Genres in the Antwerp Art Market*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Simons, Patricia. "Portraiture, Portrayal, and Idealization: Ambiguous Individualism in Representations of Renaissance Women," in Alison Brown ed., *Language and Images of Renaissance Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

_______. "Homosociality and erotics in Italian Renaissance Portraiture." In *Portraiture. Facing the Subject*, edited by Joanna Woodall. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997, 29-51.

Simson, Otto von. Review of *Das Freundschaftsbild der Romantik*, by Klaus Lankheit. *Art Bulletin* 36 (1954): 161-163.

Siraisi, Nancy. *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine*: *an introduction to knowledge and practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Skrine, Peter N. *The Baroque: Literature and Culture in Seventeenth-Century Europe*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1978.

Slive, Seymour. *Dutch Painting, 1600-1800.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Smith, Charles Saumarez. *The National Portrait Gallery*. London, 2004.

Snyder, Jon R. "Sincerity in Seventeenth-Century Italy." *Rinascimento* 43 (2003): 265-286.

Sohm, Philip. *Pittoresco: Marco Boschini, his Critics, and their Critiques of Painterly Brushwork in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

_______. "Maniera and the absent hand. Avoiding the etymology of style." *RES* 36 (1999): 101-124.

_______. "Baroque Piles and Other Decompositions." In *Warburg Institute Colloquia, 6. Pictorial Composition from Medieval to Modern Art*, edited by Paul Taylor and Francois Quiviger. London and Turin, 2000, 58-90.

_______. *Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

_______ and Richard Spear. *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Italian Seventeenth-Century Painters*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Solinas, Francesco. "Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657): il ritratto di Jan van den Hoecke e l'Orazione di Carlo Dati." *Bollettino d'Arte* 92 (1995): 141-164.

Sopher, Marcus S. and Claudia Lazzaro-Bruno. *Seventeenth Century Italian Prints*. Stanford: Stanford Art Gallery; Stanford University, California, 1978.

Sophocles. *Works*. Trans. Francis Storr. London: Heinemann, 1929.

Sörbom, Göran. *Mimesis and Art. Studies in the Origin and Early Development of an Aesthetic Vocabulary*. Bonniers: Svenska Bokforlaget, 1966.

Southorn, Janet. *Power and Display in the Seventeenth Century. The Arts and their Patrons in Modena and Ferrara*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Sozzi, Lionello. "Il *crotesque*: bruttezza e bizzarria." In *Disarmonia, Bruttezza, e Bizzarria nel Rinascimento*, edited by Luisa Secchi Tarugi. Atti del VII Convegno internazionale. Chianciano-Pienza 17-20 luglio 1995. Florence: Franco Cesati editore, 1998, 9-17.

Spear, Richard. "Notes on Renaissance and Baroque Originals and Originality," in Rosalind Krauss et al, *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*. National Gallery of Art, Washington. Studies in the History of Art, 20. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1989, pp. 97-99.

_______. "What is an Original?" In *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, edited by David R. Marshall. The Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne. Florence: Centro Di, 2004, 15-31.

_______. "Guercino's 'Prix-Fixe': Observations on Studio Practises and Art-Marketing in Emilia." *Burlington Magazine* 136 (1994): 592-602.

_______. *The "Divine" Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997.

_______. "Di sua mano." In *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volumes*. Vol. 1, The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity (2002), 79-98.

_______. "Scrambling for Scudi: Notes on Painter's Earnings in Early Baroque Rome." *Art Bulletin* 85 (2003): 310-20.

Spencer, John R. "*Ut Rhetorica Pictura*: A Study in Quattrocento Theory of Painting." *JWCI* 20: 1/2 (1957): 26-44.

Spezzaferro, Luigi. "La cultura del cardinal Del Monte e il primo tempo del Caravaggio." *Storia dell'arte* 9/10 (1971): 57-92

_______. "Pier Francesco Mola e il mercato artistico romano: atteggiamenti e valutazioni." In *Pier Francesco Mola, 1612-1666*, edited by Manuela Kahn-Rossi. Exhibition catalogue. Milan: Electa, 1989, 40-59.

_______. "Le collezioni di 'alcuni gentiluomini particolari' e il mercato: appunti su Lelio Guidoccioni e Francesco Angeloni." In *Poussin et Rome. Actes du colloque de l'Academie de France à Rome*, 16-18 novembre 1994, edited by Olivier Bonfait et al. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1996.

_______. "Per il collezionismo dei Bamboccianti a Roma nel Seicento: qualche appunto a qualche riflessione." In *Da Caravaggio a Ceruti. La scena di genere e l'immagine dei 'pitocchi' nella pittura italiana*, edited by Francesco Porzio. Milan: Skira, 1998.

_______. "Problemi del collezionismo a Roma nel XVII secolo." In *Geografia del Collezionismo. Italia e Francia tra il XVI e il XVIII secolo*, edited by Oliver Bonfait et al. Ecole Francaise de Rome, 2001, 1-23.

_______. "Caravaggio accettato. Dal rifiuto al mercato." In *Caravaggio nel IV centenario della Cappella Contarelli*, edited by Caterina Volpi. Atti del convegno. Rome: CAM, 2002.

_______. "Le contraddizioni del pittore. Note sulle trasformazioni del lavoro artistico nella prima meta del '600." *Quaderni Storici* 16: XXXIX (2004): 329-351.

Spicer, Joaneath. "The Renaissance Elbow." In *A Cultural History of Gesture, From Antiquity to the Present Day*, edited by Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991, 84-128.

Spike, John T. "Saleroom Note: An Early Drawing by Salvator Rosa, Datable to 1639." *Burlington Magazine* 124: 950 (1982): 322.

_______. *Baroque Portraiture in Italy: Works from North American Collections.* Exhibition catalogue. Hartford, Connecticut: Wadsworth Atheneum; Sarasota, Florida: John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, 1985.

_______. *Mattia Preti. Catalogue raisonné of the paintings*. Florence: Centro Di, 1999.

Spinelli, Riccardo. "Indagini sulle decorazioni secentesche del Casino Guadagni 'di San Clemente' a Firenze'." *Quaderni di Palazzo Te* 4 (1996): 36-65.

Spinosa, Nicola, ed. *Ribera. L'opera completa.* Naples: Electa, 2003.

Sricchia, Fiorella. "Giovanni Martinelli," *Paragone*, 39 (1953), pp. 29-34.

_______. "Lorenzo Lippi nello svolgimento della pittura fiorentina della prima metà del Seicento." *Proporzioni* IV (1963): 242-270.

Stechow, Wolfgang. "A Note on 'The Poet' by Ribera." *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* XIV: 2 (1957): 67-72.

Stephanson, Raymond. "'Epicœne Friendship': Understanding Male Friendship in the Early 18th Century, with Some Speculations about Pope." *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 38 (1997): 151-170.

Stolzenburg, Andreas, ed. *Salvator Rosa. Genie der Zeichnung. Studien und Skizzen aus Leipzig und Haarlem*. Exhibition catalogue. Museum der bildenden Künste Leipzig, and Teylers Museum Haarlem. Wienand Verlag, 1999.

_______. "Anmerkungen zu einem neuen Oeuvre-Katalog der Zeichnungen Salvator Rosas." Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Strathern, Marilyn. *The Gender of the Gift. Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1990.

Strauss, Walter L., ed. *Hendrick Goltzius, 1558-1617. The Complete Engravings and Woodcuts*. New York: Abaris Books, 1977.

Strinati, Claudio. "La Roma papale del tardo Seicento: regola e trasgressione." In *Velazquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano. Le corti del Barocco*, edited by Fernando Checa Cremades. Milan: Skira, 2004, 57-64.

Strong, Roy. "A portrait by Queen Elizabeth's Serjeant Painter." In *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography*, II: Elizabethan, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995, 169-175.

Struhal, Eva. "La Semplice imitazione del naturale". Lorenzo Lippi's Poetics of Naturalism in Seventeenth-Century Florence." PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 2007.

_______. "Friendly Disagreements: Salvator Rosa and Lorenzo Lippi." Lecture at the conference *Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) e il suo tempo*. Biblioteca Hertziana and the Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, January 12-13 2009.

Suida Manning, Bertina and William Suida. *Luca Cambiaso: La vita e le opere*. Milan: Ceschina, 1958.

Summers, David. *Michelangelo and the Language of Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

_______. "Form and Gender." *New Literary History* 24: 2 (1993): 243-271.

Summerscale, Anne. *Malvasia's Life of the Carracci.* University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.

Sunderland, John. "John Hamilton Mortimer and Salvator Rosa." *Burlington Magazine* 112: 809 (1970): 520-531.

_______. "The Legend and Influence of Salvator Rosa in England in the eighteenth century." *Burlington Magazine* 115: 849 (1973): 785-9.

Sutherland Harris, Ann and Carla Lord. "Pietro Testa and Parnassus." *Burlington Magazine* CXII (1970): 15-20.

Swain, Simon, ed. *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul. Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Swan, Claudia. *Art, Science and Witchcraft in Early Modern Holland. Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Sykes, Karen. *Arguing with Anthropology. An Introduction to critical theories of the gift*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Tangri, Daniel. "Demosthenes in the Renaissance: A Case Study on the Origins and Development of Scholarship on Athenian Oratory." *Viator* 37 (2006): 546-582.

Tantillo Mignosi, Almamaria. "I Chigi ad Ariccia nel '600," in *L'arte per i papi e per i principi nella campagna romana grande pittura del '600 e del '700.* Museo Nazionale del Palazzo di Venezia, Rome, 8 marzo-13 maggio 1990. Rome: Casa Editrice Quasar, 1990, vol. 2, 69-114.

Tapié, Alain, ed. *Les Vanités dans la peinture au XVIIe siècle. Méditations sur la richesse le dénuement et la rédemption*. Ville de Caen: Albin Michel; Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1990.

Tarugi, Luisa Secchi. "Le bizzarrie pittoriche di Piero di Cosimo." In *Disarmonia, Bruttezza, e Bizzarria nel Rinascimento*, edited by Luisa Secchi Tarugi. Atti del VII Convegno internazionale. Chianciano-Pienza 17-20 luglio 1995. Florence: Franco Cesati editore, 1998, 319-40.

Tasso, Torquato. *Lettere*. Edited by C. Guasti. Florence: Le Monnier, 1853.

Taviani, Ferindando and Mirella Schino. *Il segreto della commedia dell'arte*. Florence: La Casa Usher, 1982.

Tempesti, Anna Forlani. "Un disegno giovanile di Salvator Rosa." In *Studi di storia dell'arte in onore di Mina Gregori*, edited by Elisa Acanfora et al. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 1994.

Tenenti, Alberto, ed. *Humana Fragilitas. I temi della morte in Europa tra Duecento e Settecento*. Clusone (Bergamo): Ferrari Editrice, 2000.

Tervarent, Guy De. *Attributs et Symboles dans l'Art Profane, 1450-1600.* Lausanne; Geneve: Dros, 1958.

Testaverde, Anna Maria. *I canovacci della commedia dell'arte*. Turin: G. Einaudi, 2007.

Thiel, P. J. J. van. "La Collection de Portraits réunie par Peiresc à propos d'un portrait de Jean Barclay conservé à Amsterdam." *Gazette des Beaux Arts* 65 (1965): 341-354.

Thompson, Wendy. "'Pigmei Pizzicano Giganti'. The Encounter between Netherlandish and Italian Artists in Seventeenth century Rome." PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1997.

Thuillier, Jacques. *Nicolas Poussin.* Paris: Fayard, 1988.

Tikkanen, J. J. *Die Beinstellungen in der Kunstgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der künstlerischen Motive*. Helsingfors, 1912.

Titi, Filippo. *Studio di Pittura, Scoltura et Architettura nelle Chiese di Roma*. Rome, 1674 (1686, 1708, 1721).

______. *Descrizione delle Pitture, Sculture, ed Architetture esposte al pubblico in Roma*. Rome, 1763.

Titian: prince of painters. Munich: Prestel, 1990.

Tiziano e il Ritratto di Corte da Raffaello ai Carracci. Exhibition catalogue. Naples: Electa, 2006.

Toci, Ettore. *Rime Burlesche Edite e Inedite di G. B. Ricciardi*. Livorno, 1881.

Tomory, Peter. *Salvator Rosa. His Etchings and Engravings after His Works.* Exhibition catalogue. Sarasota, Fla.: John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, 1971

_______. "Salvator Rosa: 'La Menzogna'." *Paragone* 31: 367 (1980): 60-66.

_______. "Battles, war and soldiers: Salvator Rosa as moralist." *Storia dell'arte* 69 (1990): 256-67.

Toppi, Nicolò. *Biblioteca napoletana, et apparato a gli hvomini illvstri in lettere di Napoli e del regno, delle famiglie, terre, citta e religioni, che sono nello stesso regno, dalle loro origini, per tutto l'anno 1678*. *Opera ... divisa in dve parti. Nelle quali vengono molte famiglie forastiere lodate, e varij autori illustrati, & emendati.* Naples: A. Bulifon, 1678.

Torricelli, Evangelista. *Carteggio Famliare*. In *1647-1651: Discepoli di Galileo, Tomo XXII*. Vol. 2. Ms Gal. 132, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence.

_______. *Opere*. Edited by Gino Lauria and Giuseppe Vassura. Faenza: Stabilimento Tipo-Litografico G. Montanari, 1919.

Tortoletti, Bartolomeo. *Academiae germinae, etc*. Rome, 1646.

Tostmann, Oliver. "Battaglien. Studien zur Schalchtenmalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts in Italien." PhD dissertation, Frei Universität, Berlin, 2007.

Tournon, André and G.-A. Perouse. *Or, Monnaie, Échange dans la Culture de La Renaissance.* Actes du 9e Colloque International de l'Association Renaissance, Humanisme, Réforme, Lyon 1991. Publication de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 1994.

Trapier, Elizabeth du Gué. *Ribera*. New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1952.

Trexler, Richard. *Public Life in Renaissance Florence.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.

_______. *Persons in Groups. Social Behavior as Identity Formation in Medieval and Renaissance Europe*. Papers of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies. Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1985.

_______. *Dependence in Context in Renaissance Florence*. Binghamton, New York: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1994.

Tribby, Jay. "Cooking (with) Clio and Cleo: Eloquence and Experiment in 17th-century Florence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 52: 3 (1991): 417-439.

Turner, Nicholas. "L'Autoportrait dessine de Poussin au British Museum." In *Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665): Actes du colloque organisé au Musée du Louvre*, edited by Alain Merot. Paris: Documentation Francaise, 1996, vol. 1, 81-97.

Ueding, Gert, ed. *Historisches Woerterbuch der Rhetorik*. 7 vols. Tuebingen: M. Niemeyer, 1991.

Unglaub, Jonathan. "Poussin's 'Esther before Ahasuerus': Beauty, Majesty, Bondage." *Art Bulletin* 85:1 (2003): 114-136.

_______. "Poussin's Reflection." *Art Bulletin* 86: 3 (2004): 505-528.

_______. *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting. Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Valeriano. *Les Hieroglyphiques de Ian-Pierre Valerian* [1615]. Edited by G. P. V. Bolzani. Translated by I. de Montlyard. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1976.

Van Mander, Karel. *Den grondt der edel vry schilder-const* [1604]. Edited by H. Miedema. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1973.

_______. *Het Schilder-Boek*. [The Lives of the illustrious Netherlandish and German painters, from the first edition of the Schilder-boeck (1603-1604)]. Edited by H. Miedema. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994-1999.

Varchi, Benedetto. *Orazione funerale ... fatta, e recitata ... pubblicamente nell'essequie di Michelangelo Buonarotti in Firenze, nella Chiesa di San Lorenzo*. Florence: Giunta, 1564.

Vasari, Giorgio. *Le Opere.* Edited by Gaetano Milanesi. Florence, 1906.

_______. *The Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*. Translated by A. B. Hinds. London: J. M. Dent; New York: E. P. Dutton, 1927.

_______. *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e archittetori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568.* Edited by Rosanna Bettarini, with comments by Paola Barocchi. 8 vols. Florence: Sansoni, 1966-1987.

_______. *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori* [1568]. Edited by Paola Della Pergola, Luigi Grassi and Giovanni Previtali. Novara: Istituto geografico De Agostini, 1967.

_______. *Le Vite de più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani*. Introduction by Maurizio Marini. Rome: Grandi Tascabili Economici Newton, 2005.

Vaughan, Genevieve, ed. *The Gift, Il Dono. A Feminist Analysis*. Rome: Meltemi, 2004.

Veca, Alberto. "Una vanitas per Napoli." In *Forma vera: contribute a una storia della natura morta italiana*, edited by Pietro Lorenzelli and Alberto Veca. Exhibition catalogue. Bergamo: Galleria Lorenzelli, 1985, 163-181.

Veldman, Ilja M. "The Business of Prints in the North (c. 1575-1650) and the Publishing House of Crispijn de Passe." In *Economia e Arte. Secc. XIII-XVIII*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Atti della 'Trentateesima Settimana di Studi', 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002.

Venturi, Adolfo. *La Regia Galleria Estense in Modena*. Modena: Toschi, 1882.

Verboven, Koenraad. "The Economy of Friends. Economic Aspects of *Amicitia* and Patronage in the Late Republic." In *Collection Latomus*, vol. 269. Bruxelles: Editions Latomus, 2002, 11-47.

Verdenius, W. J. *Mimesis. Plato's Doctrine of Artistic Imitation and its Meaning to Us*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Vermeylen, Filip. *Painting for the Market. Commercialization of Art in Antwerp's Golden Age*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003.

Vertova, L. "Ricordando Pietro Testa, il Lucchesino." In "*Aux Quatre Vents": A Festschrift for Bert W. Meijer*, edited by A. W. A Boschloo et al. Florence: Centro Di, 2002, 121-130.

Viatte, Françoise and Catherine Monbieg Goguel, eds. *Dessins baroques florentins du Musée du Louvre: LXXIVe exposition du Cabinet des dessins.* Exhibition catalogue. Louvre, 2 octobre 1981-18 janvier 1982. Paris: Ministère de la culture, Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1981.

Vickers, Brian. "Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance." *New Literary History* 14: 3 (1983): 497-537.

_______. *In Defence of Rhetoric.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Virgil. *Georgics*. Loeb Classical Library. London: W. Heinemann, 1930.

Vita, Alessandro del. "Lo Zibaldone di Giorgio Vasari." *Il Vasari* VII (1935): 61-4.

Vita, Silvano del. *Giovanni Martinelli: un pittore emergente del Seicento Fiorentino* (Montevarchi 1600 - Firenze 1659), in *Memorie Valdarnesi*, Anno 165, Serie VII, 1999-2000, Fascicolo XII, Montevarchi, Accademia Valdarnese del Poggio, 2000.

Viviani, Vincenzio. *Carteggio Famliare*, in *1647-1651: Discepoli di Galileo, Tomo LI*. Vol. 7. Ms Gal. 161, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence.

Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca. Venice: G. Alberti, 1612. Facsimile edition. Florence: Licosa Reprints, 1974.

Volpi, Caterina. "Salvator Rosa e Carlo de Rossi." *Storia dell'Arte* 93-4 (1998): 356-373.

_______. "L'ordine delle immagini e il disordine della ricerca." In *Scienza e Miracoli nell'Arte del '600*, edited by Sergio Rossi. Milan: Electa, 1998, 74-81.

_______. "Salvator Rosa e il cardinale Franesco Maria Brancaccio tra Napoli, Roma e Firenze." *Storia dell'Arte* 112: 12 (2005): 119-136.

_______. "Salvator Rosa, nuovi documenti e riflessioni sul primo periodo romano e su quello fiorentino." *Storia dell'arte* 120 (2008): 85-116.

Vottero, Dionigi. *Lucio Anneo Seneca: I Frammenti*. Bologna: Patron, 1998.

Wackernagel, Martin. *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: projects and patrons, workshop and art market*. Translated by Alison Luchs. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Wallace, Richard. "The Figure Paintings of Salvator Rosa." Phd Dissertation, Princeton University, 1965.

_______. "The Genius of Salvator Rosa." *Art Bulletin* 47 (1965): 471-480.

_______. "Salvator Rosa's 'Death of Atilius Regulus'." *Burlington Magazine* CIX: 772 (1967): 395-397.

_______. “Salvator Rosa’s *Democritus* and *L’Umana Fragilita*.” *Art Bulletin* 50:1 (1968): 21-38.

_______. *The Etchings of Salvator Rosa*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

_______. *Salvator Rosa in America*. The Wellesley College Museum, Jewett Arts Center, 1979.

_______. “Salvator Rosa’s *Figurine* in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.” *Print Quarterly* 6: 1 (1989): 45-49.

Wallace, William E. “Michelangelo at Work: Bernardino Basso, friend, scoundrel and capomaestro.” *I Tatti Studies*, vol. 3. Florence: Villa I Tatti, 1989, 235-277.

Walker, Frank. “Salvator Rosa and Music.” *Monthly Musical Record* LXXIX (1949): 910; LXXX (1950): 913-14.

Wark, R. R. “A Note on Van Dyck’s ‘Self-Portrait with a Sunflower’.” *Burlington Magazine* 98: 635 (1956): 53-54.

Warnke, Martin. *Kommentare zu Rubens*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1965

_______. *The Court Artist. On The Ancestry of the Modern Artist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Warwick, Genevieve. “Gift Exchange and Art Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta’s Drawing Albums.” *Art Bulletin* 79: 4 (1997): 630-646.

Waterhouse, Ellis K. “An Exhibition of Paintings by Rembrandt arranged ... For the Edinburgh Festival Society,” no. 5, 1950.

Wazbinski, Zygmunt. “Annibale Carracci e l’Accademia di San Luca. A proposito di un monumento eretto in Pantheon nel 1674.” In *Les Carrache et les décors profanes*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1988, 557-615.

Weiner, Annette B. *Women of Value, Men of Renown: New Perspectives in Trobriand Exchange*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Weiss, Harry B. “Francesco Redi, the Father of Experimental Entomology.” *The Scientific Monthly* 23: 3 (1926): 220-224.

Weissman, Ronald. “Taking Patronage Seriously: Mediterranean Values and Renaissance Society.” In *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, edited by F. W. Kent and Patricia Simons. Humanities Research Centre, Canberra; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 25-45.

_______. “The Importance of Being Ambiguous: Social Relations, Individualism, and Identity in Renaissance Florence.” In *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, edited by Susan Zimmerman and Ronald F. E. Weissman. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989, 269-80.

Wenley, Robert Mark. *Stoicism and its Influence*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963.

Werness, Hope B., et al. *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in Art*. New York: Continuum, 2004.

Wernick, Andrew. "The Work of Art as Gift and Commodity." In *Experiencing Material Culture in the Western World*, edited by Susan M. Pearce. London and Washington: Leicester University Press, 1997, 175-195.

Wesselski, Albert. *Angelo Polizianos Tagebuch, zum ersten Mal herausgegeben.* Jena: Diedrich, 1929.

Weyl, Martin. *Passion for Reason and Reason of Passion: Seventeenth Century Art and Theory in France, 1648-1683*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Wheatley, Henry B. *The Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend. A Chapter in Literary History.* London: Elliot Stock, 1887.

Whigham, Frank. "Interpretation at Court: Courtesy and the Performance-Audience Dialectic." *New Literary History* xiv (1983): 623-39.

Whitehouse, David. *The Moon. A Biography*. London: Headline, 2001.

Whitfield, Clovis and Jane Martineau, eds. *Painting in Naples 1606-1705. From Caravaggio to Giordano*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1982.

Wilcox, Amanda. "Exemplary grief: gender and virtue in Seneca's consolations to women." *Helios* 34:1 (2006).

Wind, Edgar. *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1958.

Wittkower, Rudolf. *Art and Architecture in Italy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1958.

_______ and Margot Wittkower. *Born under Saturn. The Character and Conduct of Artists: A Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution*. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1963.

_______. "Imitation, Eclecticism, and Genius." In *Aspects of the Eighteenth Century*, edited by E. R. Wasserman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965, 143-61.

_______. *Gian Lorenzo Bernini*. London: Phaidon Press, 1966.

_______. "El Greco's Language of Gesture." In *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

Wolfe, Karin. "Caravaggio: Another 'Lute Player'." *Burlington Magazine* 127: 988 (1985): 451-452.

Wood, Christopher. "Why Autonomy?" *Perspecta* 33 (Mining Autonomy) (2002): 48-53.

Woodall, Joanna, ed. *Portraiture. Facing the Subject*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.

_______. *Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority.* Studies in Netherlandish Art and Cultural History. Zwolle, Netherlands: Waanders, 2006.

Woodring, C. "What Coleridge Thought of Pictures." In *Images of Romanticism*: *Verbal and Visual Affinities*, edited by K. Kroeber and W. Walling. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.

Woods-Marsden, Joanna. "'Ritratto al Naturale': Questions of Realism and Idealism in Early Renaissance Portraits." *Art Journal* 46: 3 (1987): 209-216.

_______. "Toward a history of art patronage in the Renaissance: the case of Pietro Aretino." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24: 2 (1994): 275-299.

_______. *Renaissance Self-Portraiture.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.

Woollett, Anne T. and Ariane van Suchtelen, eds. *Rubens and Brueghel: A Working Friendship*. Exhibition catalogue. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum; The Hague: Royal Picture Gallery. Zwolle: Published in Association with Waanders Publishers, 2006.

Zambelli, Paola. "A proposito del 'De vanitate scientiarum et artium' di Cornelio Agrippa." *Rivista Critica di Storia della Filosofia* 15 (1960): 167-81.

Zanta, Leontine. *La Renaissance du Stoicisme au XVie siècle*. Paris: H. Champion, 1914.

Zeichnungen alter Meister aus deutschen Privatbesitz. Exhibition catalogue. Hamburg, Stuttgart, Bremen. Bremen: Kunsthalle, 1965.

Zeri, Federico, ed. *La Galleria Pallavicini in Roma, catalogo dei dipinti*. Florence: Sansoni, 1959.

Zika, Charles. "The Corsini Witchcraft Scene by Salvator Rosa: Magic, Violence and Death." In *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, edited by David R. Marshall. The Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne. Florence: Centro Di, 2004, 179-190.

Zilsel, Edgar. *Die Entstehung des Geniebegriffes; ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der Antike und des Frühkapitalismus*. Tuebingen: Mohr, 1926.

Zimmermann, T. C. Price, "Paolo Giovio and the Evolution of Renaissance Art Criticism." In *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, edited by Cecil H. Clough. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976, 406-24.

Zöllner, Frank. "'Ogni Pittore Dipinge Sé': Leonardo da Vinci and 'Automimesis'." In *Der Künstler über sich in seinem Werk: Internationales Symposium der Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rom, 1989*, edited by Oskar Bätschmann and Matthias Winner. Berlin: Akademie Verlag Berlin, Acta Humaniora, 1992, 137-160.