

and, subsequently, to Philip II's chapel at El Pardo, while numerous copies of the *Deposition* produced for various destinations in Spain leave their own legacies; in this context, Michiel Coxcié's homage to the *Ghent Altarpiece* is additionally introduced (the inclusion of quality color plates is welcome and helpful in careful stylistic comparison). The discussion of the reception of the copies is especially intriguing, as derivative images, regardless of their quality, rarely garner detailed treatment. This attention to the conditions of their creation, function, and reception provides insight into the varied ways in which images could be understood in the early modern period and the diverse values attached to them. These values encompassed, at times, the sacred and devotional, aesthetic and connoisseurial, and social-political in their service to the identity formation of the individual, family, and state (in the case of Rogier's work and Coxcié's homage to the Ghent altar at the Spanish court, an invocation of the Burgundian past).

The questions of art, aesthetic value, and originality serve as dominant themes in the second section, which centers on the acquisition of the Heller and Paumgartner altarpieces and their incorporation into Maximilian I of Bavaria's princely galleries. This section considers the reception of the substitute images that replaced these altarpieces in their initial religious foundations, the emergence of a desire for original works by select painters in the context of collecting practices and connoisseurship, and the transformation of meaning when religious works are physically and conceptually relocated to the secular context of the gallery. While this well-produced volume presents a wealth of concrete historical data concerning the works, their sites and contexts, and their reception, in grappling with concepts including originality, the emergence of artistic canons, and the function of images and production of meaning, it additionally contributes a thought-provoking reflection on the image at the dawn of the era of art.

Mitzi Kirkland-Ives, *Missouri State University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.233

L'Accademia di San Luca nella Roma del secondo Seicento: Artisti, opere, strategie culturali. Stefania Ventra.

Quaderni sull'Età e la Cultura del Barocco 2. Florence: Olschki, 2019. xlv + 370 pp. €55.

Stefania Ventra's volume attempts to answer the question that the author addresses as the main focus of her research: was there a dominant academic culture in Rome, from the 1670s onward, based on the canon inspired by the cult of the antique and its modern declination expressed by Carlo Maratti and Giovan Pietro Bellori? By examining the archival material of the Accademia di San Luca in detail—already studied but always in a fragmented way—Ventra overturns an established critical statement by demonstrating how the academic institution, at this crucial moment after the end of Barberini's

pontificate, promoted a broad and inclusive figurative culture, the result of the sum of all those artistic tendencies that still made Rome the capital of the arts in Europe.

Nicolaus Pevsner, in his pioneering study *Academies of Art* (1940), pointed out how the academies promoted education based on a universally accepted style and how, following the foundation of the Académie de France in Rome, in 1666, San Luca became a sort of reflection of the French academic system. In 1976, Carl Goldstein confirmed that the Roman academy had encouraged the creation of “a supra-individual style that all young artists were expected to adopt” (C. Goldstein, “Art History without Names: A Case Study of the Roman Academy,” *Art Quarterly* 1 [1977–78]: 14). In this sense, according to Zygmunt Ważbiński, it was Giovan Pietro Bellori, with his famous speech “The Idea,” read to the academicians of San Luca in 1664, during the principate of his friend Maratti, who sanctioned the definitive embrace between academic ideology and classicist doctrine, based on the perfection of the ancient example and the painting of Raphael and Annibale Carracci (Z. Ważbiński, “Annibale Carracci e l’Accademia di San Luca: A proposito di un monumento eretto in Pantheon nel 1674,” in *Les Carrache et les décors profane* [1988]: 587–615).

This interpretative framework, built on the symbiosis between the presence of the Maratti-Bellori duo in the academy and San Luca’s unconditional adherence to the classicist credo, has been punctually and convincingly demolished by Ventra’s research, which shows how the panorama of trends in the second half of the seventeenth century was highly heterogeneous. A systematic examination of the presences at the academic sessions immediately reveals that Bellori and Maratti were absent from the meetings for long periods of time: the former, scarcely present during the principate of his friend Maratti (1664–65), was secretary of the institution for a few years from 1666 onward and finally left the academy in 1679, while Maratti spent twenty years (1678–99) away from the life of the institution. It is significant that the most active artists at the Accademia di San Luca at this turn of the century were the pupils and collaborators of the two great masters of the Roman Baroque: Pietro da Cortona and Gian Lorenzo Bernini. One just has to think of Giovanni Battista Gaulli, Ciro Ferri, or Giacinto Brandi, or the sculptors Ercole Ferrata, Antonio Raggi, and Paolo Naldini.

They indeed represented the Roman academy, which reacted to the election of Charles le Brun as prince in 1676. Since Le Brun was busy in Paris, he was replaced by Charles Errard, director of the Académie de France in Rome. It was above all Giuseppe Ghezzi, secretary of San Luca from 1674, who consolidated the institution, promoting “a project of cultural affirmation based on the variety with which the Roman Academy, unlike the French one, succeeded in expressing itself and where the lack of an established canon became a strong element of originality” (116–17). It is no coincidence that in 1696, on the occasion of the institute’s centenary celebrations—in the exact year that Giovan Pietro Bellori died—two works by Bernini were assigned to young artists in training: *Saint Theresa* for the third painting class, and *Saint Daniel* of the Chigi chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo for sculptors. A clear demonstration,

as Ventra emphasizes, of the desire to support contemporary Roman artistic production as a new reference model.

Cristiano Giometti, *Università degli Studi di Firenze*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.234

Mannerism, Spirituality and Cognition: The Art of Enargeia.

Lynette M. F. Bosch.

Visual Culture in Early Modernity. Abingdon: Routledge, 2020. xii + 144 pp. \$160.

This book, part of the series Visual Culture in Early Modernity, is a compilation of Lynette Bosch's conference presentations given over a nearly twenty-year period. Acknowledging the frightening chaos that confronted sixteenth-century Europeans, Bosch proposes a consideration of "how artists, patrons, and audiences sought to connect to God's plan for humanity's salvation, through the images made to be seen and understood within ritual and liturgical environments" (1). *Enargeia*, or "vividness," is key to understanding the connection between Mannerism and Roman Catholic spirituality in the sixteenth century.

Chapter 1, "From the *ars nova* to the *maniera moderna*," explores the significant influence of Northern European art on Italian painters. Bosch offers many examples of works by Northern artists commissioned by Italian patrons or discussed by Italian writers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and she credits numerous art historians for this material, most notably Paula Nuttall (*From Flanders to Florence: The Impact of Netherlandish Painting, 1400–1500* [2004]). The influence of oil paint on "representational vividness" (7) was critical in "mak[ing] the past present" and "bring[ing] the absent to presence" (20), but Italian artists and patrons were also interested in Northerners' choices of color, idiosyncratic perspective, and interpretation of classical elements. The final assessment here is that Northern European visual traditions were far more significant for the development of Mannerism than has generally been accepted. With this in mind, the brief mention made of Francisco de Hollanda's account of his conversations with Michelangelo dating to around 1538–1540 (not 1528 [16]) and the artist's rejection of Northern art is particularly interesting. Noting that both Vasari and Condivi, Michelangelo's contemporaries and biographers, remarked on the artist's copying of Schöngauer's *Temptation of Saint Anthony* while in Ghirlandaio's studio, Bosch suggests that "Michelangelo's slighting remarks to Hollanda about Netherlandish painting need to be understood not as a dismissal of all Northern art but perhaps as a deflection, given that his appropriation of the work of Norther[n] artists reflected admiration" (18). Future research might consider Michelangelo's continued engagement with Northern art and artists through the