

provide any conclusive evidence to support his attribution. In spite of this, this collection of essays constitutes a valuable contribution to scholarship on Mantegna.

**Römische Grabmäler der Hochrenaissance. Typologie – Ikonographie – Stil.** (Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, 13). By Jutta Götzmann. 436 pp. incl. 166 b. & w. ills. (Rhema, Münster, 2010), €62. ISBN 978-3-930454-41-9.

Reviewed by JAN L. DE JONG

RENAISSANCE TOMB MONUMENTS in Rome have lately become a popular topic with German scholars. In Berlin, the *Requiem* project was launched, which focuses on the tombs of popes and cardinals for the period 1420–1798. It has given rise to several publications and an excellent website with a very useful and well-illustrated database.<sup>1</sup> Two volumes of the *Praemium Virtutis* project, headed by Joachim Poeschke, are dedicated to tomb monuments and burial rituals, with a heavy emphasis on Rome,<sup>2</sup> and one of the latest volumes of the Münster *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, instigated and edited by Poeschke, also deals with tomb sculpture in Rome.

The book under review discusses tomb monuments from 1505, when work began on the tomb of Pope Julius II, to 1527, the year of the sack of Rome. Although the designs and history of Pope Julius's tomb have been examined extensively, there has never been a coherent study of it within the context of the development of High Renaissance Roman sepulchral art. After an introductory discussion of the most important aspects of these monuments, Jutta Götzmann explores their development by focusing on four key works: the twin tombs of the Cardinals Ascanio Maria Sforza and Girolamo Basso della Rovere in S. Maria del Popolo, the double-tomb of Cardinal Giovanni Michiel and Bishop Antonio Orso in S. Marcello al Corso, the double-tomb of Cardinal Francesco Armellini and his father, Benvegiate Pantaline, in S. Maria in Trastevere,<sup>3</sup> and finally the monument of Pope Hadrian VI in S. Maria dell'Anima. Not all these memorials have been preserved in their original state or even at their initial location. Pope Hadrian's monument was trimmed down around 1750, while the double-tomb of Cardinal Michiel and Bishop Orso was moved to a different spot in the same church in 1608. In all cases, however, Götzmann carefully reconstructs the genesis and original appearance of the monuments, using archival material, drawings and other documents, providing new details and adjusting long-held assumptions. In the final chapter she concludes that the most important new aspects of Roman tomb monuments at the start of the sixteenth century – almost exclusively wall

tombs – were the use of the triumphal arch as a 'form-giving element of the wall structure', which 'pulls together the multi-storied and compartmentalised nature of quattrocento tombs, bringing the various tiers into a single large entity'. Another aspect is the 'activation' of the statue of the deceased from a reclining and seemingly dead or sleeping figure into a *demi-gisant*, lying on his side and resting on his arm. Götzmann studies this transformation in detail and considers its possible sources and meaning (pp.31–49). She suggests that this motif can be connected to the artistic aim 'to represent the process of dying and the transition from life to death – an idea which was also the subject of theological debate'. A third aspect was the attempt to enshrine the memory of the deceased in the liturgy and, to that end, to move the monument close to the high altar. Thus, the tombs of Cardinals Sforza and Basso della Rovere, and of Hadrian VI, can be seen as important steps in the development of the memorial chancel. The most important artists to emerge from Götzmann's account are Andrea Sansovino and, perhaps a little surprisingly, Baldassare Peruzzi. Although the latter was no sculptor, he was nonetheless actively involved in designing tomb monuments, which were carried out by his Siense compatriots such as Angelo di Mariano, alias Michelangelo Senese, whose career is sketched on pp.237–41.

Götzmann's study is based on solid research and is backed up by an appendix giving the inscriptions on the monuments and relevant documents (both published and unpublished). Unfortunately, some errors occurred when quotations from them were integrated into the text (for instance, p.65, quoting from pp.270–71). Götzmann is firmly focused on the development of the typology and iconography of the tomb monuments, which means that such aspects as the intentions of the patrons, the manner in which the deceased person is represented and views on death and afterlife receive only limited attention. In this sense, her study offers an antidote to the book on cardinals' tombs from the same period published by the *Requiem* project, also in 2010, which was criticised for overemphasising their social dimension at the expense of artistic aspects.<sup>4</sup> The black-and-white illustrations are adequate, but it would have been a nice gesture to have included a reference to the excellent colour photographs on the *Requiem* website.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www2.hu-berlin.de/requiem/cms>.

<sup>2</sup> J. Poeschke and B. Kusch et al.: *Praemium virtutis. Grabmonumente und Begräbniszereemoniell im Zeichen des Humanismus*, Münster 2002; *idem: Praemium virtutis II. Grabmonumente und Begräbniszereemoniell im Zeichen des Humanismus*, Münster 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Curiously, this tomb was not included in the otherwise excellent *Requiem Datenbank* (<http://www2.hu-berlin.de/requiem/db/>, accessed on 20th April 2011). Good pictures are available via the equally outstanding website *The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church*, <http://www2.fiu.edu/~mirandas/cardinals.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> A. Karsten and P. Zitzlsperger, eds.: *Vom Nachleben der Kardinäle. Römische Kardinalsgrabmäler der Frühen Neuzeit*, Berlin 2010; reviewed by T. Pöpper in *Journal für Kunstgeschichte* 15/1 (2011), pp.25–33, esp. p.31.

**La Cena in casa di Levi di Paolo Veronese. Il processo riaperto.** By Maria Elena Massimi. 205 pp. incl. 55 b. & w. ills. (Marsilio, Venice, 2011), €30. ISBN 978-88-317-1086-2.

Reviewed by XAVIER F. SALOMON

PAOLO VERONESE'S *Feast in the house of Levi* (Fig.49) is usually and understandably related to the five-page document, first published in 1867 by Armand Baschet, recording the examination of the artist by the Inquisition on Saturday 18th July 1573.<sup>1</sup> The enormous canvas, painted for the refectory of the Dominican convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Venice, had only been finished a few months earlier and is inscribed with the date 20th April 1573. A second inscription gives the subject of the painting and its source: 'FECT D[OMINVS]. CO[N]VI[VIVM]. MAGNV[M] LEVI / LUCAE CAP[VT]. V'. – the event pithily described in the Gospel of St Luke (5:29): 'And Levi made him [Christ] a great feast in his own house: and there was a great company of publicans and of others that sat down with them'. The Inquisition's text, however, reveals a more intricate story. The examination revolved around the subject of the painting; when asked what it represented, Veronese answered: 'this is a painting of the Last Supper, that Jesus Christ and his Apostles had in the house of Simon'. The painter was then mainly questioned on a series of details in his work – the man with a bleeding nose, the German-looking armed figures, the dwarf with the parrot – and answered that these were added 'for ornament, as one does'. His answers included such asides as 'we painters take liberties, the same way poets and lunatics do' and 'I paint pictures with such consideration as is called for, and as my understanding can grasp'. Veronese was eventually asked 'to improve and change his painting' in the following three months, but as far as can be ascertained he only added the inscription, changing the subject from a *Last Supper* to a *Feast in the House of Levi*. Veronese's interrogation has been scrutinised by art historians and interpreted in drastically different ways, ranging from Veronese the dim-witted ornamental painter to Veronese the Protestant heretic.<sup>2</sup>

Maria Elena Massimi's book re-examines the episode and the painting in great detail, illuminating much of its early history. The author should be commended for having produced new material on the topic and for providing as an appendix a very exact transcription of the Inquisition's examination – none of the previous transcriptions and translations is as precise as this. Massimi also presents her findings on Veronese's inquisitors – the document, unfortunately, does not name any of them. Taking Gino Fogolari's 1935 article as a starting point, she reconstructs the historic characters of the inquisitors, Aurelio Schellino, the Patriarch Giovanni Trevisan, re-identifies the *nunzio* as Giovan Battista Castagna, the future Pope Urban VII, instead of Giovan Battista

## BOOKS

49. *Feast in the house of Levi*, by Paolo Veronese. 1573. Canvas, 555 by 1280 cm. (Gallerie dell'Accademia, Venice).



Dei (a mistake caused by Fogolari's incorrect reading of documents), and writes about the *Savii all'eresia*, three of whom would have been present at the inquisition. Massimi also discusses sixteenth-century texts on banqueting and feasting in Venice, such as Domenico Romoli's *La singolare dottrina* (1560) and Bartolomeo Scappi's *Opera* (1570). This is a '*convito nobile*', a noble feast, and with her painstaking descriptions the author draws the reader's attention to most objects in the painting, from furniture to tablecloths, from the accoutrements on the table to the servants. She persuasively identifies the man in green in the foreground as the *scalco* – the master of ceremonies, and the portly man in a multi-coloured, striped outfit as the *trinciante*, who, among other things, supervised the meat cutting at the table. The two halberdiers at the lower right '*armati alla Thodesca*' are two *piantoni*, essentially the bouncers at the party.

The most captivating section of this book is the extensive account of historical events at the convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in the sixteenth century, focusing on the long and intricate dispute between the conventual and observant branches of the Dominican order. Entrenched in its conventual tradition, SS. Giovanni e Paolo harboured profoundly cultivated and intellectual men but also friars described as 'rogues and depraved'. Two years before 1573 the convent was portrayed as a 'den of iniquitous and criminal men' (*antro di homeni scelerati et di mala vita*). Massimi recounts tales of friars openly living with women and of two masked men getting into a brawl during Carnival in the company of women only to discover, once unmasked, that they were both members of the same convent. The struggle of the convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo to elude the reforms imposed from Rome was particularly passionate during the sixteenth century.

Massimi's main thesis is to do with the canvas's original iconography. According to her the painting cannot be a Supper in the House of Simon the Pharisee because Mary Magdalene is missing; it would be 'atypical' as a *Last Supper* and would only highlight Veronese's 'compositional incapacity', as it does not seem to represent the institution of the Eucharist or the announcement of Judas's betrayal. For her 'such ambiguity in an image is absolutely

unacceptable'. According to Massimi the painting refers to the passage in Luke 11:37–54 in which Christ dines at the house of a Pharisee and accuses him of hypocrisy when he reproved Christ for not washing before the meal: 'ye Pharisee make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness'. The large canvas would be a 'conceptual expansion of the text' with a 'polemical intent'; it was strategically positioned in the refectory as a metaphor of the battle between conventual and observant Dominicans, between purity and impurity, interior and exterior cleanliness, between good and bad friars. The two figures in the centre foreground of the canvas would be the Pharisee and a lawyer who was also at the feast; and many of the characters – the man with a bleeding nose, the mute dog, the dwarf and the (allegedly drunk) parrot – would be symbols of the bad priest. The empty glasses in the banquet are apparently visually relevant to the argument; and the domesticated falcon just about visible on the right would be a 'hypocritical and "Pharisee" bird, who appears to be meek but is not and associates with men who are powerful, mean and rapacious'. The tall tower under the central arch and above the seated figure in red could symbolise the Pharisee's ambition; and the meat on St Peter's plate is said to represent faith (the breast) and good works (the leg). This type of approach to the reading of paintings and related wild iconology has been unfortunately only too common in recent years among art historians trained in Venice. For the present reviewer this convoluted iconological construction is altogether unconvincing.

The author identifies the man sitting at the table to the right with a napkin on his shoulder – undoubtedly a portrait – as an image of Camillo Spera, the conventual *vicario* opposed to the observant Eliseo Capys. She dismisses too readily the fact that Ridolfi identified this same man as Frà Andrea de' Buoni who 'offered Paolo a certain amount of money for this work, which he had left over from charity and confessions'.<sup>3</sup> Too little is known about Andrea de' Buoni, who died aged ninety-two at SS. Giovanni e Paolo in 1588, and it would have been useful to find out more about him before proposing an alternative candidate. Veronese could have appropriately depicted

Frà Andrea as an apostle, most likely St Andrew.

Veronese's interrogation was, as Massimi acknowledges, a matter of little consequence for the artist. The fact that no early source mentioned the event and that it had no effect on Paolo's career demonstrates that it must have been a rather minor episode. The Inquisition's typical cases involved 'apostasy, necromancy, the eating of prohibited food, witchcraft, the abuse of the sacrament, iconoclasm, atheism, the violation of clausura, Judaizing, Moslemizing, Grecianizing (i.e. schismatism), Lutheranism, heretical conversations, the trafficking in prohibited books, polygamy', so it is not surprising that Veronese's *Feast* was not high on their list of priorities.<sup>4</sup> The text of the examination has been unquestionably over-interpreted in the past, and it seems likely that the most basic and clear-cut reading of it is almost certainly the most probable. Against Massimi's whimsical hypothesis, everything points to the fact that Veronese did indeed originally intend to paint a *Last Supper*. The location of the Supper in the gospels was only described as 'a large upper room furnished and prepared' (Mark 14:15 and Luke 22:12) that belonged to 'a man'. The event follows directly after the supper in the house of Simon, suggesting that some confusion between the two episodes or at least between the 'man' and Simon may not be altogether out of place, even for an intelligent artist. The room depicted by Veronese is indeed upstairs and 'furnished and prepared', and he must have chosen to show a noble banquet as his supper, including the man in red in the foreground, probably the gospel's 'goodman of the house'. Christ is at the centre of the scene, between Peter and John; all twelve apostles are clearly present, including Judas on the extreme right, with his hand in a bag of money. The decision to include the remaining figures and to turn the usually simple Last Supper into a '*convito nobile*' is altogether appropriate for Veronese's art. He reasonably argued that 'my orders were to decorate the canvas as seemed best to me, and it is a large canvas and capable of holding many figures, as I thought right'. The final result is splendid, but the crowd of more than fifty people must have created a certain confusion for an audience used to a long tradition of *Last Suppers* where the participants are typically only thirteen. Instead of drastically changing and simplifying his composition – which would have meant repainting the entire canvas – Veronese cannot be blamed for choosing an effortless way out and simply changing its title, by relating it to an event mentioned in the gospels. In the age of the Counter-Reformation, when the Church promoted the production of clear and comprehensible religious images, it should not be surprising that the Inquisitor would have found Veronese's *Last Supper* challenging. Massimi's book proves that the Inquisition cannot be blamed for trying to determine the meaning of the painting, as the iconography of Veronese's spectacular canvas to this day can still give rise to misguided readings.

<sup>1</sup> A. Baschet: 'Paul Véronèse appelé au Tribunal du Saint Office, a Venise', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 23 (1867), pp.378–82.

<sup>2</sup> Key studies include G. Fogolari: 'Il processo dell'Inquisizione a Paolo Veronese', *Archivio Veneto* 17 (1935), pp.352–86; G. Delogu: *Veronese. The Supper in the House of Levi*, Milan and New York 1951; P. Fehl: 'Veronese and the Inquisition. A Study of the Subject Matter of the so-called "Feast in the House of Levi"', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 58 (1961), pp.325–54; C. Gould: 'Veronese's Greatest Feast: The Inter-Action of Iconographic and Aesthetic Factors', *Arte Veneta* 43 (1989–90), pp.85–88; and M. Gemin: 'Riflessioni iconografiche sulla Cena in casa di Levi', in *idem*, ed.: *Nuovi studi su Paolo Veronese*, Venice 1990, pp.367–70.

<sup>3</sup> C. Ridolfi: *Le Maraviglie dell'Arte (1648)*, ed. D.F. von Hadeln, Berlin 1914, I, p.314.

<sup>4</sup> P. Fehl and M. Perry: 'Painting and the Inquisition at Venice: Three Forgotten Files', in D. Rosand, ed.: *Interpretazioni veneziane. Studi di storia dell'arte in onore di Michelangelo Muraro*, Venice 1984, p.371.

**Robert Nanteuil (ca. 1623–1678).** By Audrey Adamczak. 366 pp. incl. 88 col. + 354 b. & w. ills. (Arthena, Paris, 2011), €96. ISBN 978-2-903239-47-3.

Reviewed by NEIL JEFFARES

THE NAME OF Robert Nanteuil resonates magically among various constituencies: addicts of the Grand Siècle whose personalities he brought so vividly to life; aficionados of the plumbago technique, notably in England, due especially to the famous portrait of his 'particular friend' John Evelyn, exiled in Paris in 1650; lovers of the medium of pastel, in the development of which Nanteuil played a key part; and print collectors who esteem his 220 engraved portraits above all others. Audrey Adamczak's approach in this definitive monograph is to view these strands as a single activity, analysed with an exhaustive assembly of the primary documents and secondary literature, not just of the works themselves.

Although Nanteuil's date of birth remains elusive, we now know a great deal about his development. The son of a wool merchant from Reims, he was sent to the Jesuit college there in the hope of fitting him for a legal career. But his gift would not be suppressed and, after incessant drawing and engraving (which led to his expulsion by the Jesuits and transfer to the more tolerant Benedictines), he was eventually allowed to pursue his inclinations professionally, working with a local engraver, Nicolas Regnesson, whose sister he married in 1646. But it was not until he moved to Paris around 1647 and came under the influence of Philippe de Champaigne and Abraham Bosse that his genius began to emerge. His unusual path (avoiding the normal childhood apprenticeship) was to be crucial in his career: as 'a Scholar and a well-bred Person' (as Evelyn described him to Pepys) he mixed comfortably in society, and he even appears as a figure in a novel by the *précieuse* Madeleine de Scudéry. He defended print-making as a liberal art, fiercely resisting proposals in the late 1650s to

set up a *maîtrise*. His progress was facilitated by his talent for witty conversation, deployed to animate his sitters' expression, and by a love of food and drink which led both to notable obesity and to an unpaid wine-merchant's bill of 845 livres at his death. Diplomacy allowed him to avoid the taint of Jansenism despite close association with figures from Port-Royal, not least Champaigne himself. Putting personal relations above religious principles was no doubt crucial to his ascent (he was to portray Louis XIV seven or eight times, despite never joining the Académie royale); but one cannot help wonder, among all these benevolent faces, whether it limited the depth of his art: adept resemblances, but few tortured souls.

Nanteuil's working method centred on the production of engraved portraits after his own drawings. The demand for these largely came from the system of presenting theses dedicated to illustrious personages whose patronage the candidate sought to attract: huge printed sheets (over a metre in height) included a portrait engraving as well as an engraved summary of the *thèse* itself. Nanteuil rapidly became the artist of choice for these highly prestigious commissions. His fame spread throughout Europe: so impressed was Cosimo de' Medici during his visit to Paris in 1669 that he sent the young Domenico Tempesti to learn Nanteuil's trade, and his testimony (in a manuscript in Venice) is a particularly valuable account of his master's working methods. This was also a lucrative business: the contract for the last portrait of the king (unfinished because Nanteuil succumbed to a fatal fever during the *séance de pose* at Versailles) involved a prodigious 10,800 livres for the pastel and 2,500 printed copies.

To fulfil these commissions, much of the engraving work was delegated to assistants (Balducci, another early biographer, estimated that as few as three plates were fully autograph). But Nanteuil himself made the preparatory drawings *ad vivum*. Initially these were in ink, chalk, pencil or even wash. By the mid-1650s, subtle light effects and extreme precision of detail were obtained by his use of plumbago (black lead on vellum), a technique which Nanteuil brought to an unequalled level of perfection. In 1658 he was appointed *Dessinateur et graveur en taille-douce ordinaire du roi*.

By 1660, as Christiaan Huygens noted on a visit, Nanteuil had turned to pastel. Although this was by no means a new medium, Nanteuil's crucial discovery (the jealously guarded secret that Huygens failed to extract during his visit) was how to make pastels soft enough to allow him to paint with them. The first steps are evident in the earliest dated pastel, the almost monochrome portrait of Dorieu (1660; cat. no.139); in that of Beaumanoir (no.140) the handling is closer to the *crayons de couleur* of his contemporaries. He rapidly developed a technique capable of the astonishing beauty of likenesses of Colbert (no.243), Pomponne (no.240), the Uffizi Louis XIV (no.207) and a self-portrait (no.194; Fig.50). No mere preparatory studies, these independent works of art are nevertheless all bust length, in standard, even stereotyped poses and limited



50. *Self-portrait*, by Robert Nanteuil. c.1665–69. Pastel on paper, 52 by 41 cm. (Uffizi, Florence).

tonality. While the face is always rendered immaculately, in some the execution of the accessories is perfunctory, if not gauche (to the point where attribution has been understandably but unjustly doubted), perhaps reflecting Nanteuil's struggle with his materials. Nevertheless the medium's expressive power and the effects of colour must have dazzled. Adamczak (endorsed in Maxime Préaud's substantial introduction) rightly views Nanteuil as the key stepping-stone towards the brio of the eighteenth-century pastellists.

Nanteuil's celebrity has ensured that many drawings and pastels have been assigned to him incorrectly. Adamczak has sorted these out with great thoroughness and, in my view, commendable accuracy if occasional severity. While the engraved *œuvre* is well documented and underpins a largely secure chronology, the author's inference that lost drawings are in pastel where the print is inscribed '*pingebat*' is logical, but raises some difficulties (a few prints seem to be based on the same images as earlier plates captioned '*delineabat*'). A great deal of biographical information complements these images, none more colourful than the Fitzwilliam's Jacques Tardieu (no.178), ridiculed as Molière's *L'Avare* shortly after he and his wife were murdered by thieves. The pastels are lavishly illustrated; while all the engravings are reproduced, some oddly duplicated in colour, print specialists will not find the size adequate for the inspection of the minutiae of different states – but this catalogue does not set out to replace Petitjean & Wickert (1925). The omission of even thumbnails of many of the rejected items is a minor inconvenience, while the total absence of any authenticated works by some of the possible alternative 'pastellists' (such as the abbé du Buisson, whom Florent Le Comte thought Nanteuil's equal) is a continued challenge to us all, not least because of the ambiguity of the term in contemporary usage. The result, however, leaves this artist with a remarkably