

Alice Jarrard. *Architecture as Performance in Seventeenth-Century Europe: Court Ritual in Modena, Rome, and Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xvi + 298 pp. + 125 illus. \$80.00. Review by ALLISON LEE PALMER, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

Alice Jarrard's careful assessment of the complex confluence of issues surrounding Italian Baroque patronage—a topic that has long held the interest of art historians—provides new answers to a series of questions about art and political identity. While most scholars have focused on Rome, interpreting the city as the cultural center of Italy in the seventeenth century, Jarrard has chosen to focus on the secular court of the d'Este in Modena in order to show how these ducal courts, often understood as “provincial” compared to the courts of Rome, were at times more creative in their cultivation of a “princely” image, given that these courts needed to negotiate their reputations simultaneously on regional, papal, and international levels. The d'Este family is an excellent example to begin this discussion because they were the first family to be granted a duchy on the Italic peninsula. From this point in the mid-fifteenth century they had established their home and a thriving court system in Ferrara until 1597, when they were driven out of the city by Pope Clement VIII Aldobrandini, who claimed this wealthy center as papal territory. Thus, the d'Este, at the height of their power, were forced to move to the small town of Modena. Further complicating their authority at the height of their prominence was the fact that the Medici had, only thirty years before, been elevated to an even higher level of authority—that of the “Grand Duchy,” while the Farnese, with the Duchy of Parma and Piacenza, had already gained a firm foothold in Rome, and the Savoy dukes in Turin were vying for increased titled authority in Northern Italy.

Jarrard begins her discussion with the idea of “magnificence” as defined by Machiavelli, whereby “magnificence exists in sumptuous, grand and sublime things” and consists of “public things and great expenditures” (2). She then demonstrates how, in the seventeenth century, these notions become more concrete, based in part on the ideas of Giovanni Botero, in his *Della ragion di stato*, published in 1598, which demonstrated how reputation preserved power, and art cultivated reputation. Then, in addition to the very propagandistic accounts of courtly events published by the courts that most scholars have used in their research, Jarrard expands her archival study to

include lesser-known documentation of formal ambassadorial reports and etiquette texts, as well as less formal letters and contracts to provide a fuller picture of patronage in the secular court.

Francesco remains a pivotal figure in the d'Este family, and thus provides a case study for Jarrard's ideas. Despite Francesco d'Este's importance, however, he has long been characterized by scholars as "feckless" (Brown, 86), "frivolous" (Haskell, 63), and one who demonstrated a certain "prudishness" (Southern, 88) in his patronage. How could this be true, given his importance in the world stage at this time period? Jarrard argues that Francesco, in fact, set the stage for a more sophisticated political display that in some ways anticipated the commissions of the papacy and of Louis XIV. She notes that his "frivolous" reputation was perhaps founded upon the fact that the majority of his commissions, at least early in his career, focused on defensive or festive works, mainly involving the creation of ephemeral architectural sets for theatrical performances and tournaments. It is interesting that none of his early works were permanent religious or civic monuments or buildings, which Jarrard attributes to a need to create impressive works very quickly in order to help secure his immediate rule in the city of Modena. In Francesco's final testament, however, he never mentions his temporary works, but instead it is precisely the permanent works that he describes as necessary to a more tangible and lasting transfer of power (215).

Jarrard organizes her text with a chronological overview of Francesco's commissions, showing how his political goals changed over time. Within this chronology, she begins with Francesco's temporary public works, then moves to his more intimate temporary work, then his ducal residence, and finally, his portraits, including a fine discussion of Bernini's famous marble image of the Duke from 1651. In Francesco's thirty-year reign, portraiture changed from primarily historical images that drew on classical models to a more focused depiction of Francesco glorified in military dress, in order to secure, as Bernini stated, "a reputation among foreigners" (145). It is an interesting fact that while Louis XIV commissioned a very similar portrait from Bernini in 1664, unlike Francesco, the French monarch was able to command the personal attention of Bernini via an "arduous" trip to Paris (186).

Most of Jarrard's focus is on the ephemeral works made under Francesco's reign. Unlike the religious processions and festivals discussed by Jennifer Montagu in her book *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art* (1989),

Francesco chose to revive feudal myths centered on the tournament in order to show his worth before the Emperor (18). Taking this topic a step further, it would be interesting to examine the first d'Este tournament, from 1630, with earlier traditions of chivalric display beginning with the courts of the Visconti and Sforza, that then spread through much of northern Italy in the Renaissance and very likely also provided an important source of inspiration for Francesco d'Este. Instead, Jarrard carefully lays out how the popular carnival becomes the sophisticated theater, with highly technical theatrical advancements and vast sums of money spent to dazzle the audience. To compare some of the sums spent on such ephemeral displays, Jarrard notes that while the Medici paid 50,000 *scudi* for a wedding and the Barberini spent 60,000 *scudi* on a joust, the d'Este spent four times that amount on a tournament (52). The Medici in particular were well aware of these events which, after all, were made to impress foreigners first and foremost. This is confirmed with the very seating arrangement of one such tournament, where Jarrard carefully demonstrates how the Cardinal of Savoy, Duke Oduardo Farnese, and then the Florentine Ambassador and his wife, together with other visitors and members of the d'Este family, sat carefully arranged around the Duchess of Modena, Maria Farnese, while the noblewomen of Modena were left to make their own seating arrangements (26).

Finally, Jarrard shifts her discussion to the family palace in Rome, giving a secular emphasis to a topic where most attention has been focused on papal, high clerical, or local noble family palaces. It is worth noting, however, that Francesco's dream of a Roman palace did not come to fruition during his lifetime, but occurred in conjunction with the appointment in 1688 of Rinaldo d'Este as cardinal. It certainly might have been Francesco's aspiration to claim a palace in Rome, given his gradual shift from feudal to Roman ambitions, but a fuller discussion of this palace in the context of Rinaldo's position in Rome would provide a more complete understanding of the building. I find it quite impossible to separate out temporal from sacred issues in these discussions, and have found Tracy Ehrlich's *Landscape and Identity in Early Modern Rome: Villa Culture at Frascati in the Borghese Era* (2002) to be a good demonstration of the complexity of these challenges. For this discussion, Jarrard cites Waddy's important work in the field of Roman Baroque *palazzi*, but other sources can be used to provide a fuller picture, including Thomas Dandeleit's article "Setting the Noble Stage in Baroque Rome: Roman Palaces,

Political Contest, and Social Theater, 1600-1700,” in *Ambiente Barocco: Life and the Arts in the Baroque Palaces of Rome* (1999).

Overall, Alice Jarrard provides a focused, well- detailed and interesting study of the patronage of Francesco d’Este that does much to restore his reputation as a serious patron, and highlight the sophisticated diplomatic skills that allowed him to cultivate an international acclaim and secure a lasting place for his family in the world of art history.

Maryvelma Smith O’Neil. *Giovanni Baglione: Artistic Reputation in Baroque Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xxiii + 404 pp. + 15 color and 108 b&w illus. \$125.00. Review by JEFFREY FONTANA, Austin College.

As O’Neil states in her introduction, her goal is to redress the “standard antagonistic position against Baglione” as an “academic toad” taken by modern scholars, particularly of Caravaggio (1). The two painters were rivals in early seventeenth-century Rome, and while Giovanni Baglione (c. 1566-1643) gained greater success as measured by social status Caravaggio was by far the more innovative, which has made the latter the clear favorite of art historians. Baglione’s situation as an accomplished gentleman-painter was similar to that of Giorgio Vasari in Florence during the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and like Vasari Baglione is valued today more for his collection of artists’ biographies than for his paintings. Baglione brought a lawsuit for libel against Caravaggio and three others, prompting scholars to side with or against him. O’Neil pleads Baglione’s case in the court of scholarly opinion through an examination of his career and writings and an analysis of the libel trial. By gathering together much archival and photographic documentation to demonstrate the high reputation Baglione enjoyed she serves both the painter and the reader well.

O’Neil begins her rehabilitation of Baglione’s image by treating his lawsuit against Caravaggio and three co-defendants in 1603, brought in response to slanderous verses attributed to these men. She examines the verses as an attack on his reputation, and she justifies his reaction in the context of heightened contemporary efforts in Rome to punish defamation. She further argues Baglione’s absence of vindictiveness from the even-handed evaluation