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ABSTRACT

Agostino Carracci (1557-1602) has long been extolled as one of Italy’s most skilled engravers, primarily in regard to his refined reproductive prints after Italian master paintings. The present study, however, pertains to prints after Agostino’s own designs—the erotic series known as the *Lascivie* (c. 1590-1595). These sensual prints, often overlooked, embody the principles of the artistic reform effectuated by Agostino, his brother Annibale (1560-1609), and their cousin Ludovico (1555-1619) in their native Bologna soon after the Counter-Reformation. The *Lascivie*, as will be argued, are the antecedents to what is considered the pinnacle of the Carracci’s oeuvre and their reformed style, namely, the fresco cycle adorning the Farnese Gallery vault in Rome, an achievement traditionally credited to Annibale. It is Agostino’s erudition and the artistic method he employed in composing the *Lascivie*, however, that reveal him to be the likelier mastermind behind the complex conceits of the Farnese Gallery, and even the generator of the precepts of the Carracci’s reformed style.
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INTRODUCTION

The series of erotic prints known as the *Lascivie* (c. 1590-1595) is the unexpected epitome of the Carracci’s style and the surprising herald of the fresco program adorning the Farnese Gallery. The creator of the prints, Agostino Carracci (1557-1602), was lauded at home and abroad as the finest Italian engraver of his time. His reproductive prints after Italian master paintings were prized commodities. A passage from Malvasia’s biography of Agostino reads, “His prints were so sought after that each one was seen as a lucky find, and valued as a great jewel, and there was not a single nobleman who did not wish to have a copy of each of them, nor a dealer who did not take whole bales of them to send to other countries…”¹ While Agostino’s reproductive prints made him famous, his libidinous original prints made him infamous, even eliciting censure from Pope Clement VIII. It was in Bologna that Agostino, his cousin Ludovico (1555-1619), and brother Annibale (1560-1609) entered into an artistic partnership, which culminated in the founding of the Carracci Academy, whose methods and ideologies were the sources of a reformed style of painting and artistic practice. The *Lascivie* have been overlooked as characteristic of the Carracci’s artistic reform, perhaps due to their erotic content. It is in these original designs, as well as in Agostino’s reproductive prints, that the Carracci’s

theories of art are fully conceived and made manifest. Agostino employs his knowledge of classical literature and art, of anatomy, of past Renaissance masters, and of the traditions and implications surrounding erotic art in composing his sensual prints. The *Lascivie* are the forebears to what is most often perceived as the supreme achievement in the Carracci oeuvre—the fresco cycle bedecking the ceiling of the Farnese Gallery in Rome, an achievement for which Annibale is lauded as the inventor and Agostino is given little commendation. The compositional, literary, and thematic elements of the *Lascivie*, generated by Agostino’s erudition and his careful study of artistic practice and precedent, are also displayed in the celebrated frescoes of the Farnese Gallery. The complex pictorial program of the Gallery is distinguished as the zenith of the Carracci’s reformed style, enhanced by way of a keen classicism, ostensibly pioneered by Annibale as a result of his relocation to Rome and a close communion with the antique and Roman High Renaissance that he found there. Agostino’s *Lascivie*, however, had already exemplified this refined classical and Romanized mode. The *Lascivie’s* similitude to the Farnese Gallery requires that the agency behind the fresco cycle’s evolution and authorship be reconsidered, and even emended, for it is Agostino’s foray into unseemly art that establishes him as the unsung virtuoso in the Carracci trinity.
CHAPTER ONE

THE CONTEXT OF THE LASCIVIE

A better understanding of the Lascivie requires a brief introduction to the nature and function of erotic art in Italy during the Renaissance. The expansion of the print industry created a whole other venue for erotic art, one that was accessible to a wider variety of collectors. This newfound accessibility made the production of erotic art a profitable venture for printers and publishers, much to the chagrin of church officials. It is important to investigate Agostino’s Lascivie equipped with a modicum of knowledge in the genre of erotic art.

Erotic Art in Renaissance Italy

Erotic art was not a novelty in Agostino’s age, or in any other. In Renaissance Italy, owning salacious art was mostly confined to a moneyed intellectual coterie. Erotic art demonstrated the patron’s privilege and power, since obtaining it required wealth, and understanding it required education. What made erotic art acceptable and exclusive in Renaissance Italy was its use of classical mythological subjects to depict sexually

---


3 Findlen, 1993, 103.
suggestive or frankly libidinous scenes. Comprehension of these subjects required knowledge of classical literature on the part of the viewer. The use of classical mythology had the effect of elevating erotic art from the depraved and vulgar to the erudite and lofty. With the advent and rise of the print industry, however, erotic art became highly accessible. Prints could be inexpensively produced on a massive scale and distributed easily and widely. Since a high-quality drawing was around ten times more expensive than a decent print, the price of prints allowed for a diverse group of collectors. The maturation of the print industry, which coincided with the revival of classical culture, resulted in an abundance of erotic subjects appearing in print. Although erotic art became widely available, it retained its private functions of delight and contemplation. A print could be displayed like a painting, bound in a book, or tucked away in a cabinet like a drawing.

Agostino produced his *Lascivie* in the wake of the Counter-Reformation in Italy when ideologies surrounding church reform extended to the visual arts. The 1563 decrees of the Council of Trent resolutely decried salacious paintings and printed texts, although no specific mention was made of printed images:

---

4 Talvacchia, 1999, 45.

5 Raphael and his shop’s work in reproductive engraving are credited with the success of the commercial print industry in Rome. For more information, see Paolo Bellini, “Printmakers and Dealers in Italy during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” *Print Collector* 13 (May-Jun.) 1975: 18-19.


7 Talvacchia, 1999, 73.

8 Ibid., 72.
Books which professedly deal with, narrate, or teach things lascivious or obscene are absolutely prohibited, since not only the matter of faith but also that of morals, which are usually easily corrupted through the reading of such books, must be taken into consideration, and those who possess them are to be severely punished by the bishops. Ancient books written by heathens may by reason of their elegance and quality of style be permitted, but may by no means be read to children.9

The post of *Maestro del Sacro Palazzo* was the papal instrument used to quell printed matter in Rome.10 It was the *Maestro’s* job to inspect all printed materials that were to be published, sold in, or even imported to Rome. It is assumed that his jurisdiction included printed images.11 Although Pope Clement VIII explicitly forbade the printing of dissolute images in 1596, officials found it difficult to prosecute offenders without resembling the

---

9 Quoted in Rev. H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978), 275. The Council did say, in regard to images, that, “all lasciviousness [should be] avoided, so that images shall not be painted and adorned with a seductive charm, or the celebration of saints and the visitation of relics be perverted by the people into boisterous festivities and drunkenness…” Ibid., 216-217.

10 This high-ranking papal appointment originated in 1218 and was generally conferred on a member of the Dominican order. The initial duty of the tenured position was to act as papal theologian in charge of examining sermons and orations for doctrinal errors. In 1515 Pope Leo X mandated that before anything went to print in Rome, it had to be sanctioned by the *Maestro*.

11 To date, no documentation has been found indicating that printed images were either considered analogous to text, and therefore under the jurisdiction of the *Maestro*, or that they were regarded as an independent class of printed material. Talvacchia keenly points out a comment made by Lodovico Dolce in his *Dialogo della pittura* (Venice, 1557) that suggests the restrictions applied only to text, at least during his time: “Indeed, the law prohibits the printing of immoral books: how much more necessary is it to prohibit similar things in pictures!” Quoted in Talvacchia, 1999, 11, n. 20. The original Italian reads, “Ecco che le leggi proibiscono che non si stampino libri disonesti: quanto maggiormente si debbono proibir simili pitture!” See Paola Barocchi, ed., *Scritti d’arte del cinquecento*, vol. I (Milan and Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1971), 819.
much-loathed iconoclasts of the Protestant Reformation. In Bologna, Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti (Bishop, and later Archbishop, of Bologna) strove to fashion the city into a *respublica christiana*. In 1586 he published his *Discorso interno alle immagini e profani* in which he expressed his ideas on art and its use in religious reform: “…for that which concerns obscenities, painted in a lascivious and provocative manner, or showing unseemly limbs, one should impede even their private possession. In the future, whoever dares to paint and sculpt them will be severely punished as a corrupter of manners.”

Paleotti preached edification in art, advising the artist to impart pleasure through careful consideration of the nature of his viewing public. It was in this seemingly stifling environment that the *Lascivie* were conceived.

The *Lascivie*, subsequently named for their erotic nature, are made up of fifteen prints from copperplate engravings whose subjects are either Biblical or mythological,

---

12 Talvacchia, 1999, 74. In Pope Clement’s new index of forbidden books, he added that the printing of salacious images was also strictly forbidden. Perhaps Agostino’s *Lascivie* prompted this new ruling.


14 From Paleotti’s *Discorso interno alle immagini e profani*; quoted in Findlen, 1993, 58. Parts of Paleotti’s *Discorso* were published in 1582 and available in Bologna.

15 Boschloo, 1974, 128, n. 15.
although at times, the mythological designations are dubious at best. The prints today are considered as a group despite their disparate size and subject matter. Their dating is problematic since Agostino neither signed nor dated these prints. Because scholars posit that the prints show no influence of Agostino’s second journey to Rome in 1594 and because it is known that they were censured by Pope Clement VIII, whose term lasted from 1592 to 1605, they are usually dated between 1590 and 1595. Bellori, one of the Carracci’s seventeenth-century biographers, provides few specifics simply stating, “He, however, is condemned for having published in his prints and engravings such lascivious

16 Agostino made several other prints possessing similar mythological and erotic themes as the Lascivie, but which are not considered part of the series. For more information on these prints, see below.

17 Thirteen prints range in size from 140 to 156 mm. in height and 99 to 117 mm. in width. The final two prints are larger in format but possess a similar erotic subject matter. Because their size is important in understanding the nature of the group of prints, their dimensions have been included within the body of the text.

18 Diane DeGrazia Bohlin suggests that Agostino might not have signed the prints so as to protect himself from any subsequent scandal. See Diane DeGrazia Bohlin, Prints and Related Drawings by the Carracci Family: A Catalogue Raisonné (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1979), 301.

19 The exact manner in which Pope Clement VIII rebuked Agostino and the exact date of the censure are unknown. Perhaps when Malvasia wrote that the publisher sold the prints “to people who ought to have forbidden him to do this,” he was referring to members of the papal curia and other officials whose duty it was to prevent such libidinous images from going to print. See below for Malvasia’s quotation. It is unlikely that if the prints had been in circulation for any length of time prior to Pope Clement’s accession, that his condemnation would have proved very effective. Also, Agostino’s figures after 1595 begin to acquire a more sculptural quality through the heightened influence of classical models following his second journey to Rome. See DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 289. It is posited that Agostino made his first journey to Rome in 1581. See below.
figures, this being inconsistent with his good habits.” Malvasia attempts to exculpate Agostino of any impropriety by excusing the prints as a moneymaking scheme on the part of his publishers:

…it is enough to say that his prints were so appreciated throughout the world that the proliferation and sales from all sides enriched Tibaldi, Bertelli, Rosigotti, and other publishers, who competed with one another to get him away from other printers by offering him a large share in the profits, and finally bought his copperplates at a very high price. This also explains in large part why Agostino published those prints with figures in lascivious poses…If Agostino had received rebuke rather than acclaim and such enormous remuneration, he would not have published any more of these, which was the excuse he then presented…Not that there was any escape from punishment for Rosigotti, who was behind the whole affair, and who sold them as it were in secret, with some hesitation, and at a very steep price to people who ought to have forbidden him to do this, indeed punished him for it;…he had promised his confessors that he would burn those prints and destroy the copperplates but had never done this owing to his avarice and desire for profit.

The Lascivie were indeed lucrative. Their popularity is evinced through the poor quality of many of the extant prints, denoting the overuse and subsequent deterioration of the plates. The details surrounding the production of the series are elusive. There is no

---


22 It is uncertain whether Agostino or his publishers even intended for the prints to constitute a series. In his biography of Agostino, Bellori inventories a number of Agostino’s prints and refers to “[a] small book of caprices of nude women, sixteen in number: in quarto.” Bellori, 1968, 104. If Bellori is indeed referring to the Lascivie, and if the information is accurate, then it seems that the prints were regarded as a unit, although this does not settle the issues concerning subject matter and the considerable difference in size of the two largest prints from the rest of the erotic assemblage. Although the sixteenth print Bellori mentions is unaccounted for, it is possible that he was referring to one of Agostino’s other mythological/erotic prints that scholars today do not consider part of the Lascivie. Two additional prints by Agostino with an inherent eroticism and not considered part of the Lascivie are Reciproco Amore and Love in the
evidence of a specific commission, and as is common with prints, no way of determining patronage. A specific ordering and a narrative reading of the group prove indeterminate—one print cannot be said to relate to another.23

Description of the *Lascivie*

The first of the Biblical scenes is *Susanna and the Elders* (154 x 110 mm.) (Fig. 3), wherein the nude Susanna returns from her bath and is accosted by two licentious onlookers.24 Susanna’s assailment takes place on a veranda surrounded by a lush private garden enclosed by mature trees. The print undoubtedly depicts the moment when Susanna rebuffs the advances of the hoary men. As one of the perpetrators rests his hand on her bare hip and whispers the particulars of his wicked proposal in her ear, Susanna raises her left arm in a forceful gesture of refusal, turns her head away from the hot breath of her loathsome attacker, and flees down some stairs.25 The second perpetrator excitedly

---

23 The order in which the prints are discussed follows the order established by Diane DeGrazia Bohlin in her 1979 Catalogue Raisonné.

24 The story is from chapter 13 of the Book of Daniel in the Apocrypha. DeGrazia Bohlin notes the presence of a cryptic cipher carved on the far right tree in the image. She also notes that it reappears in Figure 36, but I see little resemblance between the two signs. See DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 291.

25 All three of the Carracci produced images of *Susanna and the Elders* in the course of the 1590’s. Annibale made an etching and engraving dating from 1590-1595 (Fig. 4). Ludovico produced two paintings depicting Susanna (Figs. 5 and 6). His first is dated from 1598 and the later example from 1616. Neither Annibale’s nor Ludovico’s images possess the same erotic charge as Agostino’s print. In fact, in both of Ludovico’s
observes the incident. He raises his robes to expose his right leg and to allow his right hand access to his genitalia, conveniently hidden by a pillar. The second, and final, Biblical scene is *Lot and His Daughters* (Fig. 7), where a drunken Lot couples with his daughters who, after the decimation of Sodom, mistakenly believe that they are all that remain of the human race and must therefore repopulate the earth. In the print, the figures are all completely nude and set in a barren and forbidding rocky landscape, their access to the world beyond blocked by distant sharp peaks. One of the daughters is seated in Lot’s lap. He pulls her close to him, goading her into a kiss. Although it was the daughters’ incestuous plan to couple with their father, the appalled expression on his daughter’s face, with her bent leg pushing against the rock as she pulls away from her father’s grasp, bespeaks of repugnance. The other daughter witnesses the affair, not unlike the elder voyeur in the *Susanna* print. As she anticipates her turn, she gropes at her genitalia, which is conveniently covered by the drapery clasped in her hand. This daughter resembles the *Mazarin Venus* (Fig. 8), which depicts Venus at her bath. Both paintings, he chose to emphasize Susanna’s chastity, the central theme of the Biblical text. See Babette Bohn, *Ludovico Carracci and the Art of Drawing* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2004), 271. Annibale bashfully hides Susanna’s nakedness with a mantle, perhaps emphasizing her chastity as well. DeGrazia Bohlin sees the manner in which Annibale pushes the figures to the front of the picture plane and includes an enclosing landscape background in his print as comparable to Agostino’s *Susanna*. DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 444.

From Genesis, 19. It is interesting that Agostino included a lone figure in the middle distance of the composition. Perhaps he did so to underline the fact that Lot and his daughters were indeed not the last vestiges of the human race and that their copulation was indeed not necessary, therefore heightening the print’s eroticism.

The statue is a Roman copy of a late Hellenistic version of this Greek type. It was discovered in Rome in 1509 and in 1643 was purchased for Cardinal Mazarin’s collection in Paris. When the statue was found, its right arm was cut off at the shoulder and it was at a later date restored. See Phyllis Pray Bober and Ruth Rubinstein, *Renaissance Artists*
figures hold their mantles over their pudenda in a similar manner; the body of Lot’s daughter twists and leans slightly forward in consonant with the *Venus*. The most startling similarity between the two figures is in the delineation of their navels.\textsuperscript{28} Even the broad, slightly squared hips supporting their respective narrow ribcages seem akin. The vessels at the bottom left of the composition undoubtedly allude to the daughters as childbearing receptacles and the knife laid on the lip of the fruit bowl at the bottom right of the composition surely refers to the impending penetration and the fruit the daughters will bear.

The remaining thirteen prints are taken from mythology, at times rather loosely taken. *Orpheus and Eurydice* (140 x 101 mm.) (Fig. 10) depicts the moment when Eurydice is being sucked back into the depths of Hades after Orpheus violated the one stipulation of her recovery from the underworld and gazed on his wife before they reached the safety of the world of the living.\textsuperscript{29} The laurel-wreathed Orpheus looks away from Eurydice, his mouth agape in horror as she slips from his loving arms.\textsuperscript{30} His bearded

---

\textsuperscript{28} The navels are practically identical in their unusual shape and form. This is even more evident when one compares Agostino’s rendering of the navel to a drawing of the *Mazarin Venus* from the Raphael School, which also shows the statue without its restored right arm (Fig. 9).

\textsuperscript{29} Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (X.1-85).

\textsuperscript{30} Because Orpheus looks away from Eurydice and because it looks as though the flames engulfing her are pulling her back into the underworld, it must be assumed that Agostino is not depicting the moment when Orpheus violated the stipulation of Eurydice’s return, but rather the consequences of his violation. After losing Eurydice for a second time, Orpheus foreswore the company of women and thereafter practiced pederasty. Ovid credits Orpheus for introducing the practice of pederasty to the Thracians. Perhaps by showing the consequences of Orpheus’s actions and, therefore, the
face, shrieking in terror, resembles the horrified expression and emotion of the *Laocoön* 31 (Fig. 11). Orpheus’s body seems modeled after the *Belvedere Torso* 32 (Fig. 12). Agostino has presented almost the mirror image of the *Torso* with the additions of a head and limbs. The similarities include the manner in which Orpheus leans to one side, the upper part of his body pushed slightly forward, his pelvis pushed back as if he were about to be seated, while the rendering of his thighs seems borrowed from the statue’s projecting amputated legs. Eurydice looks worriedly back at the approaching flames, one of which wraps around her left leg, drawing her into the inferno. The instrument on which Orpheus played the sweet imploring music that compelled the gods to release Eurydice from the underworld has fallen to the ground, its persuasive powers rendered useless. *Andromeda* (152 x 108 mm.) (Fig. 13) depicts the princess exposed and chained to the barbed rocks.

---


32 The statue dates from the 1st century B.C. and could have been re-discovered in Rome as early as 1420. Like the *Laocoön*, it was revered and copied. See Bober and Rubinstein, 1986, 166-168.
She is made an offering to the minatory sea-monster, sent by a vengeful Poseidon, in the hope that her sacrifice might abate the god’s wrath which was fomented by the boasting of Cassiopeia, Andromeda’s mother.\textsuperscript{33} One arm is manacled to the rock face above her head, the other is chained at her side. Her naked body is rendered in a three-quarter turn, yet her face is in full profile. The monster’s slimy serpentine tail rises out of the choppy water and casts a menacing shadow over Andromeda’s face and body, accentuating the contours of her nude body and her subsequent vulnerability. Another print (Fig. 14) (150 x 99 mm.) has been identified as depicting either Andromeda or Hesione chained to the rocks as a sacrificial offering to a sea-monster. Her identification as Hesione hinges on the fact that she is shackled to the rock by one hand rather than two, true to the tradition of her myth.\textsuperscript{34} In the next print (151 x 108 mm.) (Fig. 15), a sound identification of the figure is once again elusive. The main figure could represent either Galatea\textsuperscript{35} or Venus. The nude woman, escorted by three putti, clings to the wind-laden sail made by the billowing drapery she holds over her beautifully coiffed head. She is seated in a shell

\textsuperscript{33} Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses} (IV.671-761). Agostino does not depict any evidence of Andromeda’s impending rescue by Perseus.

\textsuperscript{34} DeGrazia Bohlin credits Louis Dunand for this observation. DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 294. Hesione’s plight is recalled in \textit{Metamorphoses} (XI.211-214). Hesione was the daughter of the Trojan King Laomedon, who invoked Poseidon’s anger by cheating the god out of his wages. As recourse, Poseidon sent a sea-monster to attack Troy. The oracles promised relief to Laomedon if he chained his exposed daughter to the rocks for the sea-monster to devour. Hesione’s reprieve came when she was rescued by Hercules, signs of which Agostino does not include in the print.

\textsuperscript{35} Ovid writes about Galatea in \textit{Metamorphoses} (XIII.738-898). If Agostino did indeed intend for this print to depict Galatea, he did not choose to represent a specific moment from the Ovidian narrative. The figure also might depict Amphitrite, wife of Poseidon, who often was depicted being drawn through the water by marine creatures. This identification was suggested to me by Dr. Frances Van Keuren, University of Georgia, April 23, 2008.
supported by two dolphins that pull her through the calm waters. The few attributes within the print—the *putti*, the shell, the dolphins, and the sail—are common to both Galatea and Venus, making a definitive identification of the figure prohibitive.

The cryptic *Venus Punishing Profane Love* (152 x 112 mm.) (Fig. 16) requires a close examination. It depicts a nude Venus with reeds in hand, ready to strike a tussling pair of *putti*. A figure resembling a sleepy toddler rubbing his eyes sits nearby straddling what appears to be a quiver of arrows. The wrestling figures, one winged and blindfolded, might represent Eros and Anteros, typical emblems of Love and Love Reciprocated. The earliest known reference to Eros and Anteros was made by Pausanias in his description of the gymnasium at Elis: “There is also a third enclosed gymnasium…and in one of the wrestling-schools is a relief showing Love and Love Returned, as he is called. Love holds a palm-branch, and Love Returned is trying to take it from him.”

---

36 The identification of this object was suggested to this author by Dr. Shelley E. Zuraw, University of Georgia, March 18, 2008.

37 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, (V.23.5), trans. W.H.S. Jones and H.A. Ormerod (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918). In the fourth century A.D., the orator Themistius spoke of Anteros’s origins saying that Venus was concerned about her son Eros’s inability to grow and discovered that the cure for his condition was to provide him with a brother, a peer—Anteros. The significance of the fable is that for love to grow and develop, it must have reciprocated feelings—love requires mutual love. Guy de Tervarent says that Themistius’s account of Anteros most likely stems from a more ancient tradition of the fable, whereas Robert V. Merrill sees it as Themistius’s own creation. See Guy de Tervarent “Eros and Anteros or Reciprocal Love in Ancient and Renaissance Art,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 28 (1965): 205 and Robert V. Merrill, “Eros and Anteros,” *Speculum* 19 (Jul. 1944): 272. Themistius’s Orations was first printed in Venice in 1534 by the Aldine Press. The critic Mario Equicola used an unpublished manuscript of Themistius’s writings in the 1525 edition of his *Libro di natura d’amore*, in which Equicola gave a chronology of Anteros’s appearance in mythology and literature. See Merrill, 1944, 273. These texts would have been available
Celestial Venus and the Vulgar or Earthly Venus.\textsuperscript{38} The two Venuses are constantly engaged in a struggle, with Celestial Venus being aided by Reason in her fight against the base and irrational propensities of her earthly counterpart.\textsuperscript{39} The victor of the struggle is awarded the palm. Here, Eros and Anteros, the Venuses’ offspring themselves embodying Heavenly and Earthly Love, respectively, wage this battle. That this concept was understood in the sixteenth century is made evident by the mythographer Vincenzo Cartari’s handbook, which stated, “Of the heavenly Venus was born the heavenly Cupid [or Eros], and that divine Love which raises the human mind to the contemplation of God…The other Love, [Anteros], was born of the second Venus whom Plato calls common, worldly, and earthly; and he is in like manner common and earthly, and full of human lust…”\textsuperscript{40} Cartari also understood the classical interpretation of the natures of Eros to Agostino and it is likely that he at least had knowledge of their contents. See the discussion below on Agostino’s intellectual pursuits.

\textsuperscript{38} The notion of the Twin Venuses comes from Plato’s \textit{Symposium} and was mentioned only briefly, yet managed to become a fundamental principle in Renaissance Neo-platonic thought. See Kenneth Clark, \textit{The Nude: A Study in Ideal Form}, A.W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts 1953, Bollingen Series 35 (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1956), 71.


\textsuperscript{40} Vincenzo Cartari, \textit{Le imagini delli dei de gli antichi}, Venice, 1571 (1\textsuperscript{st} ed., 1556) 495 and 497:

\ldots due [Amori] furono posti da Platone, si come e\'i pose due Venere parmente. L’una celeste, della quale nacque il celeste Cupido, e quel divino Amore, che solleva l’animo humano alla contemplatione di Dio\ldots Nacque questo Amore\ldots dell’ altra Venere, la quale chiamo Platone volgare, mondana, e terrena, volgare parimente e terreno, e pieno di lascivia humana…

English translation quoted in John Rupert Martin, \textit{The Farnese Gallery} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 87. Cartari was the first mythographer of the sixteenth century to employ the vernacular. Anteros was also interpreted, or misinterpreted, as “Amor Virtutis,” or “the love of Virtue.” This most likely stemmed from Andrea
and Anteros, the interpretation transmitted by Pausanias, writing that, “Love increases in one who at the same time loves and is loved with a love equal to his own.” In Cartari’s handbook is an illustration showing Eros and Anteros fighting for the palm (Fig. 18). Pictured with them is their third brother, Lyseros or Amor Letheo/Letheaeus, extinguishing the flaming torch of love in a meandering river. Of the three eroti in Agostino’s print, the figure on the left might be intended to represent Lyseros, who, by snuffing the torch’s flame, expunges all pain and sorrow effected by Love. Agostino has blindfolded his Eros, a motif derived from classical literature that was later transformed by Renaissance

---


42 The 1571 edition of Imagini was the first to contain illustrations, which were done by Bolognino Zaltieri.


44 In this regard, the object upon which Lyseros sits could be an extinguished torch, though, having never seen a square torch, its box-like shape seems more appropriate to that of a quiver. A quiver is still an appropriate attribute for Lyseros, because, as Equicola noted in his Libro, Ovid described Cupid as possessing golden-tipped arrows “for rousing passion” and lead-tipped arrows “meant to repel it” (Metamorphoses 1.468-470). See Merrill, 1944, 273.
thinkers and artists. The notion that “the lover is blinded about what he loves so that he judges wrongly of the just, the good, and the honorable” was pervasive in classical literature. In the Middle Ages, this notion of the blinded lover became associated with Eros in order to emphasize the irrationality of love from which no one was immune. The Italian author and poet, Boccaccio, wrote that, “Painters cover his eyes with a bandage to emphasize the fact that people in love do not know where they drive, being without judgment or discrimination and guided by mere passion.” In the Renaissance the blindfolded Cupid came to represent Divine Love, able to transcend the realm of human intellect. The blindfolded Eros also might be employed to signify carnal

---


passions and Anteros, then, would be seen as the guardian against such desires.\textsuperscript{49} Examples of the blindfolded Cupid were pervasive during the Renaissance. Perhaps for Agostino, the most influential and accessible examples of these images were found in the \textit{Symbolicarum Quaestionum}—the emblem book of the Bolognese humanist Achille Bocchi.\textsuperscript{50} The first edition was published in 1555 and enjoyed immense popularity not only for its intellectual content, but also for its refined illustrations by Giulio Bonasone. Agostino later re-cut many, if not all, of the original plates which had sustained severe damage due to overuse, for the 1574 edition of Bocchi’s book.\textsuperscript{51} He would have been conversant with the various symbols within the book that contained examples of blindfolded Cupid, including Symbols VII (Fig. 19) and XX (Fig. 20), and he no doubt understood their erudite significance.\textsuperscript{52} In Symbol XX, titled “Platonico Cupidini,”

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{49}] In the Renaissance, artists began using whichever interpretation of Eros, Anteros, or blindfolded Cupid that best served their purposes. See Panofsky, 1967, 123-127.
\item[\textsuperscript{50}] Achille Bocchi, from an aristocratic Bolognese family, was the former pupil of Andrea Alciati. He was a professor of Greek, Latin, poetry, and rhetoric at the university in Bologna and in 1546 he founded the \textit{Accademia Bocchiana}, located in his home, which edited and published humanist writings. Bocchi taught two members of the Farnese family, Pier Luigi and Alessandro. For more information on Achille Bocchi, see Elizabeth See Watson, \textit{Achille Bocchi and the Emblem Book as Symbolic Form} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) and Karen Elyse Pinkus, “\textit{Symbolicae Quaestiones} of Achille Bocchi: Humanist Emblems and Counter-Reformation Communication” (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1990).
\item[\textsuperscript{51}] Malvasia, 2000, 90, n. 22.
\item[\textsuperscript{52}] Bocchi’s emblems were different from the books of Boccaccio and Cartari in that they did not function as reference tools for artists. Bocchi did not set out to explain his emblems’ complex references, iconography, and significance. They were meant to stimulate an erudite audience of humanists and gentleman. Agostino, ever the erudite humanist, understood the emblems and was stimulated enough to apply them in his work. For comments on the nature of Bocchi’s emblems, see Pinkus, 1990, 24.
\end{itemize}
Platonic Love wards off the blindfolded Love with two flaming torches. In Agostino’s print, we might then be witnessing the battle between Sacred and Profane Love with Celestial Venus chastising the bestial nature of the blindfolded Eros.

*The Three Graces* (154 x 110 mm.) (Fig. 24) represents the mythological goddesses who preside over all facets of beauty, grace, and munificence. The Graces were sometimes regarded as the handmaids of Venus. Because of their propinquity to Venus, Neo-platonic scholars of the Renaissance renamed them Pulchritudo, Amor, and Voluptas. Agostino’s print is singular in the manner in which he forms the trio’s traditional circular stance through the suggestive placement of each Grace’s left hand, whether obscured or in full view. The Grace at the right, whose left hand is brazenly placed at her genitalia, gazes coyly but unabashedly at the spectator. The left hand of

---

53 Among the many emblems, Symbol LXXX (Fig. 21) not only depicts Anteros, but includes an inscription of his name in Greek. Also, a highly finished drawing by Agostino from the same period as the *Lascivie* (c. 1591-1594) depicts Love burning the arrows of Cupid (Fig. 22). The theme is drawn from Bocchi’s Symbol XX. Alciati depicts this in his Emblem CX, wherein Anteros has tied Cupid to a tree while a blazing fire consumes his treacherous bow and arrows (Fig. 23).

54 They were also associated with love, fecundity, creativity, and nature. Among the many names bestowed upon the Graces are Aglaea (Splendor), Euphrosyne (Joy), and Thalia (Rejoicing). See David Kravitz, *Who’s Who in Greek and Roman Mythology* (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, Inc., 1975). The sculpture group of the Graces (a Roman copy of a Hellenistic original) housed in the Piccolomini library (Fig. 25) inspired most depictions of the trio in the Renaissance. The *Three Graces* statue was installed in Siena by 1503 in the collection of Cardinal Piccolomini. See Bober and Rubinstein, 1986, 95-97.


56 The reciprocated gaze and placement of the hand is not unlike Titian’s *Venus of Urbino* (c. 1538) (Fig. 26), which was bought from Titian by Guidobaldo delle Rovere. This is not to say that Agostino was quoting the painting because it is unknown what
the middle Grace is hidden, but by the placement of her arm it is clear that it is on the lower buttocks of the Grace on the right. Because her back is turned, the left hand of the first Grace is not visible, but the placement of her arm implies that her hand, too, is placed snugly at her genitalia. Agostino’s middle Grace approximates the Venus Pudica of Cnidian Type\(^57\) (Fig. 27) with her similar high sloping right hip cocked to one side over her weight-bearing leg, the angle of her knees, and with her similar diminutive and oddly-shaped breasts placed unnaturally high on her chest.

The remaining prints employ stock mythological types and situations rather than specific characters from specific moments in specific myths. In *A Satyr Approaching a Sleeping Nymph* (151 x 106 mm.) (Fig. 28) a nude nymph naps under the cool shelter of the forest brush. She has been spied by a satyr who emerges from the sylvan shadows. He meets the viewer’s gaze as he holds his finger to his lips imparting an admonishing

---

\(^57\) The statue is a Roman copy of a Greek original and is first recorded as being in the possession of Prospero Santacroce in Rome at the end of the fifteenth century. Although the *Venus’s* calves and feet were restored at a later date, the similarity between Agostino’s Grace and the statue is still notable. See Bober and Rubinstein, 1986, 61 and Christine Mitchell Havelock, *The Aphrodite of Knidos and Her Successors* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995).
hush.\textsuperscript{58} Thematically similar is the \textit{Satyr Looking at a Sleeping Nymph} (152 x 117 mm.) (Fig. 30). Here the elongated nude body of the soporose nymph\textsuperscript{59} is on full display for the

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{58} The print resembles Correggio’s \textit{Venus, Cupid, and a Satyr} (c. 1525-1528) (Fig. 29) in the subject matter of a lecherous satyr encountering a sleeping nude beauty splayed on the ground in the secluded depths of the woods. In both Correggio’s painting and Agostino’s print, the viewer is meant to feel as if he is the satyr’s spying counterpart. The painting was probably intended for a small private room where it could be contemplated in isolation. Agostino’s print probably was viewed in a similar manner. Correggio is said to have used antique sculpture as well as aspects of Michelangelo’s \textit{Temptation of Adam and Eve} from the Sistine Chapel as departure points for the painting. See Marcin Fabianski, “Correggio’s ‘Venus, Cupid and a Satyr.’ Its Form and Iconography,” \textit{Artibus et Historiae} 17 (1996): 159-173. Correggio had already used Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel as inspiration in his work in S. Giovanni in Parma in the 1520’s. The Carracci, as will be discussed below, were highly influenced by Correggio. His art, while still grounded in the northern Italian tradition, was in essence a filter of classical sculpture and Roman Renaissance art. This allowed the Carracci to be exposed to a sort of classicization at an early date, years before they ever arrived in Rome.

\textsuperscript{59} The motif of the sleeping female nude, which emerged as a novel subject around 1500, soon became a favorite theme in Venetian painting and at times would include a spying satyr in the compositions. For more information on this type, see Millard Meiss, “Sleep in Venice. Ancient Myths and Renaissance Proclivities,” \textit{Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society} 110 (Oct. 1966): 348-382. The latitudinous pose of Agostino’s sleeping nymph could be taken from the \textit{Sleeping Ariadne} (Fig. 31). She echoes the ancient sculpture with her crossed feet, head supported on her hand, and her raised torso buttressed against the terrain. The Ariadne, a Roman copy from the 2nd century A.D., was acquired by Julius II in 1512 for his Belvedere sculpture garden. It was drawn by Amico Aspertini, engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi, and copied by Primaticcio for Francis I. The position of the nymph’s left arm in \textit{A Satyr Approaching a Sleeping Nymph} also resembles the \textit{Sleeping Ariadne}. The motif of the satyr revealing the nude beauty to the viewer was in fact derived from a motif found on Bacchic sarcophagi depicting the satyr’s discovery of Ariadne. See Lynn Frier Kaufmann, \textit{The Noble Savage: Satyrs and Satyr Families in Renaissance Art} (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), 69. An etching and engraving by Annibale dating from 1592, known as \textit{Venus and a Satyr} (Fig. 32), is similar in its subject matter to Agostino’s engraving. Annibale’s version has been compared to Titian’s \textit{Pardo Venus} (c. 1530-1540) (Fig. 33), which by the 1560’s was in Spain, but probably still available in copies, either painted or engraved. DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 450. DeGrazia Bohlin sees Annibale’s version as adhering more closely to a drawing by Agostino from the 1590’s called \textit{Venus and a Satyr} (Fig. 34). She cites this drawing, in which the Venus figure’s left arm resembles the \textit{Sleeping Ariadne}, as evidence that in the 1590’s Annibale was still quite reliant on his brother for inspiration.
\end{flushright}
enjoyment of the satyr perched on a nearby rock who conspicuously places his left hand between his legs. In *A Satyr Whipping A Nymph* (150 x 102 mm.) (Fig. 35) the nymph’s backside is in full view as she appears to scramble up the tree to which she is bound in order to escape the blows of the satyr’s whip. Tied to the base of the tree is a pair of ram’s horns, the significance of which is unclear. The scene is witnessed by a club-wielding satyr set in the middle distance, separated from the foreground action by a winding stream. The whip-wielding satyr’s torso also resembles the *Belvedere Torso* quite closely in its posture and musculature. *A Satyr and a Nymph Embracing* (150 x 102 mm.) (Fig. 36) graphically displays the mythical couple copulating on a rock. The pair is unaware of any viewer as they concentrate on their amorous enterprise. The trio in the *Nymph, Putto, and Small Satyr* (153 x 106 mm.) (Fig. 38) performs a cryptic dance. The seated nymph slings one leg over the shoulders of the small satyr whose attentions (and left index finger) are fixed on her genitals. The standing putto, supporting her raised foot in his hand, appears transfixed by her delicate toes. The two final prints from the series

---

60 Horns were an ancient symbol denoting bestial strength and the ram signified male sexual prowess and energy. See Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, *Dictionary of Christian Art* (New York: Continuum Publishing Co., 1998), 162 and 286. In the Renaissance, the satyr was viewed as a fitting personification of male fertility. See Kaufmann, 1984, 71. DeGrazia Bohlin mentions that the horns refer to the satyr cornuto, or cuckolded satyr. DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 360, n. 2.

61 The amorous couple can be compared to the bronze statuettes of il Riccio (Andrea Briosco), a Paduan sculptor of great merit and renown in his day, who worked mainly in Venice. His *Satyr and a Satyress* (c. 1515-1520) (Fig. 37), in all its sexual frankness, resembles Agostino’s print. Riccio was sought after by the wealthy literati, who admired the deft use of humanist concepts within his sculpture. See Peter Meller, “Riccio’s Satyress Triumphant: Its Source, Its Meaning.” *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 63 (Oct. 1976): 325-334.

62 The sort of playful licentiousness of the print evokes Annibale’s painting *Venus, Satyr, and Two Cupids*, which was commissioned by a member of the Bolognetti family,
are the only examples set in an interior. In *The Satyr Mason* (201 x 134 mm.) (Fig. 41) a female figure, in the traditional beauty pose with her arm behind her head, is splayed on a bed while a satyr, resting his left hand atop a pillar, looms above the woman, taking a plumb line to her genitals with his right hand. A *putto* keeping watch lifts the folds of drapery that envelop the bed. Other enigmatic elements include a cat under the claw-footed bed, a bowl and a container on the windowsill, and a caged bird hanging in the window.\(^{63}\) Finally, *Ogni cosa vince l’oro*\(^ {64}\) (213 x 162 mm.) (Fig. 42) shows a woman, no

---

63 The cat seems to be resting atop either a book or a plank of some sort. It is likely that the mysterious elements in the print formed an amusing and/or erudite riddle and significance that would have been known to some members of Agostino’s audience. For information on the print and its audience, see David Landau and Peter Parshall, *The Renaissance Print* 1470-1550 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 99.

64 The title’s literal translation is, “everything earns the gold” or “gold conquers all” (this translation is Dr. Frances Van Keuren’s, University of Georgia, April 27, 2008). A more appropriate translation might be, “Anything to get the gold” or “Everyone has to earn a living.” The title is derived from the rather arcane pictographs at the bottom edge of the print, the meaning of which has been lost. The glyphs include truncated claws, hoofs, and a toe, a human thigh cut off below the knee, a tipped over vase spewing liquid, a “C,” an “L’,” and a pile of coins. The various mammalian feet are meant to represent the *ogni*, or *unghie* (nails); the thigh, or *coscia* in Italian, stands for *cosa*; *vince* is derived from the carafe of wine (*vino*) and the “C,” which would be pronounced like the Italian *ci*; and the “L’” with the coins constitute the *l’oro*, or “gold.” Such rebuses were popular among artists and humanists in the sixteenth century. See DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 304.
doubt a prostitute, nude from the waist down, half on and half off the bed, tussling with a fully dressed bearded man who reaches into the moneybag around his waist to pay for the services about to be rendered. A smiling Cupid figure stands on the bed striking a bow across his knee alerting the viewer that this is not a scene of true love.65 A dog sits on the floor, too engaged with licking himself to take notice of the activity. Through the open doorway appear a child in a basket, on the verge of tipping over as he reaches for what seems to be a piece of fruit that has fallen on the ground, and an adult female figure who leans against the low wall of a balcony, oblivious to the child’s potential peril as she gazes onto a cityscape, denoted by a tower and rooftop.66

Agostino’s *Lascivie*, spawned in the aftermath of the dictates of the Counter-Reformation, are collectively and individually enigmatic, sensual, and provocative. Through the use of classical art, ancient literature, and Renaissance philosophy, Agostino
elevates his ignoble designs to high art. Their simplified technique belies their erudite
content. Agostino’s *Lascivie* are at once titillating and sophisticated.
CHAPTER TWO

AGOSTINO AS IL DOTTO AND THE BIRTH OF THE CARRACCI ACADEMY

Agostino’s intellectual propensities, his background in Bologna, his training, and his travels elucidate the nature of his erotic assemblage and the rationale behind it. His mastery of the art of engraving, his technique, and credo exemplify the Carracci’s reformed style in the art of painting. Agostino’s contributions as a scholarly artist helped to codify the principles laid down by the Carracci Academy and to secure the Academy’s subsequent success in the vibrant, literate city of Bologna.

Agostino’s Education and Artistic Training

Agostino’s biographers marveled at his predisposition toward intellectual endeavors:

From childhood, burning with a very ardent love of learning, [Agostino] set out on the pursuits of the sciences and the arts...He turned his mind to the mathematical sciences and philosophy. From geometry he gathered the foundations of painting and from arithmetic the theory of music. From those he went on to astrology, geography, and the other sciences.67

---

67 Bellori, 1968, 91-93 and additionally, see Malvasia, 2000, 88. The accuracy of the information provided by the biographers is somewhat suspect, since both Bellori and Malvasia had ulterior motives—Bellori’s aim was to glorify Annibale as the savior of painting and Malvasia, in his exercise in campanilismo, wished to extol Bologna and therefore Ludovico, perhaps because Ludovico was the only one of the Carracci to have remained in Bologna his entire career. See Charles Dempsey, Annibale Carracci and the Beginnings of Baroque Style, Villa I Tatti Studies 3 (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1977; reprint Villa I Tatti Studies 16 (Fiesole: Edizioni Cadmo, 2000), 49 (page references are to reprint edition). Praising Agostino, it is important to note, furthered neither Bellori nor Malvasia’s purposes. Their laudations are in keeping with the information provided by...
Agostino’s literary scholarship, as discussed by Bellori, deserves mention. Through reading the “best books,” Agostino mastered the Latin Vulgate and all its idiomatic and poetic nuances. He continued his erudite pursuits throughout his artistic training and subsequent career. Agostino’s formal training began in his birth-city of Bologna in the shop of a goldsmith where, as was common, he learned to engrave. He then studied painting under the Bolognese Mannerist Prospero Fontana. Agostino passed through the studio of Bartolomeo Passerotti before working in the shop of Domenico Tibaldi as an engraver, where, according to Malvasia, “Tibaldi realized that Agostino would in short order surpass the fine engraving technique of the then famous Cornelis Cort himself,

Agostino’s funeral oration written by Lucio Faberio. The oration, along with an account of the funeral, was made into a booklet dedicated to Cardinal Odoardo Farnese and published after Agostino’s 1603 obsequies. Although the oration follows certain literary precepts that perhaps call for overly enthusiastic encomia, it must be remembered that it was written by someone who knew Agostino and was delivered to an assemblage of his intimates and admirers. For excerpts of the oration, see below.

68 Bellori, 1968, 92.

69 Prospero Fontana, as well as being Ludovico’s first master, was a former pupil of Vasari. See Malvasia, 1841, I, 173-179 and Bohn, 2004, 27. According to Malvasia, Prospero collaborated with Bonasone in designing a number of the plates for Bocchi’s Symbolicarum Quaestionum.

70 Bartolomeo Passerotti was admired for his skill in etching, drawing, and in painting. See Malvasia, 1841, I, 187-193. Passerotti was also known for his impressive art collection about which one contemporary observer wrote, “In the home of Sig. Bartholomeo Pasarotti one can see antique marble statues, Paintings of great men, Portraits of famous ancient and modern men, intaglions and cameos in cornelian, agate and such precious stones, little statues in metal, ancient coins and drawings of all sorts; finally his house is home and shelter to all art scholars.” F. Amadi, Della nobilità di Bologna, compresa ne suo specchio della nobilità d’Europa, Cremona, 1588, 154; quoted in Angela Ghirardi, Bartolomeo Passerotti, Painter (1529-1592), trans. Isabella Vichi (Rimini: Luisè Editore, 1990), 36.
because he already had a superior knowledge of good drawing.”\textsuperscript{71} While working with Tibaldi, Agostino took an interest in sculpture. He studied relief under Alessandro Menganti, which, “gave an opportunity to his brothers to avail themselves of it with great benefit to art.”\textsuperscript{72} His time in Tibaldi’s shop conferred experience and acclaim upon the young engraver, as once again noted by Malvasia: “…Agostino was making such brilliant progress as an engraver that it was publicly recognized that he had surpassed everyone else—indeed not only overtaking the engravers of his time, but even equaling those of the preceding century…”\textsuperscript{73} Agostino garnered praise for his reproductive prints,\textsuperscript{74} which,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} Malvasia, 2000, 90. Agostino, by 1578, was probably in the shop of Domenico Tibaldi, who is not to be confused with his famous brother, Pellegrino. Domenico Tibaldi’s work in printmaking played a crucial role in forging the printmaking industry in Bologna. See Michael Bury, The Print in Italy 1550-1620 (London: The British Museum Press, 2001), 204. Also, see Malvasia, 1841, I, 158-160. Tibaldi was not only an engraver, but also a sculptor and an architect. Coincidentally, he designed the Palazzo Magnani in Bologna, which the Carracci would later adorn with a fresco cycle depicting the \textit{Foundation of Rome} (c. 1589-1590). See DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 33.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Bellori, 1968, 92. Bellori goes on to note, “Alessandro Menganti was a Bolognese sculptor of great merit who did the bronze statue of Gregory XIII above the door of the Palazzo Pubblico in Bologna.” In Faberio’s oration, he wrote that Agostino referred to Menganti as “il Michelangelo incognito,” or, “the unknown” or “unsung Michelangelo.” See Malvasia, 2000, 200. For more information on Alessandro Menganti, see Andrea Bacchi and Stefano Tumidei, eds., \textit{Il Michelangelo incognito: Alessandro Menganti e le arti a Bologna nell’età della Controriforma} (Ferrara: Edisai Edizioni, 2002).
\item \textsuperscript{73} Malvasia, 2000, 91.
\item \textsuperscript{74} In modern analyses, Agostino has been regarded as an inferior artist because of the reproductive nature of his work, but in the sixteenth century, a copy was not seen as a lesser reflection of an original image. Agostino’s command of the medium of engraving and his brilliant technique made it so his reproductive prints were seen as original works of genius themselves. DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 54-57. For an analysis pertaining to the inferiority of the reproductive engraving, see Arthur Mayger Hind, \textit{A History of Engraving and Etching from the 15th Century to the Year 1914; Being the Third and Fully Rev. Ed. of “A Short History of Engraving and Etching”} (New York: Dover Publications, 1963), especially chp. 4. Agostino did not set out to simply copy a painting, but to analyze it and through his technique of rendering color, anatomical form, space, and
before the advent of his *studioso corso*, or “study trip,” were primarily after Bolognese Mannerists. The marvel of these prints lies in Agostino’s ability to translate the effects of color from his painted prototypes into print form within the confines of a dichromatic scheme. Agostino achieved this effect through tumefied lines made by a curved burin, the use of which was pioneered by the very master Agostino reportedly surpassed, Cornelis Cort. As an intellectually inclined reproductive engraver, Agostino was

---

75 The term *studioso corso* is derived from a passage by Malvasia and has become commonplace when referring to the travels undertaken by the Carracci for the purposes of furthering their knowledge of art. Malvasia, 1841, I, 268: “Persuase dunque loro Lodovico, in tal congiuntura, l’allontanarsi un po’ dalla patria, trasferirsi a vedere le cose del Correggio, portarsi a quelle di Tiziano e di Paolo, e fare anch’ essi quel studioso corso, che a lui pure era stato tanto profittevole.”

76 Agostino also engraved after famous engravings and drawings by artists from Italy and elsewhere in Europe.

77 DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 31-32. Cornelis Cort left Antwerp in 1565 for Venice where he collaborated with Titian. By 1566, Cort was in Rome where he engraved after artists such as Raphael and Correggio. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese not only housed Cort while the artist was in Rome, but hired him to produce a series of prints after the most notable works of art in the city, including Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel and various compositions by Raphael. See Gert Jan van der Sman, “Dutch and Flemish Printmakers in Rome 1565-1600,” *Print Quarterly* 22 (Sep. 2005): 251-252. Cort, though, is known for his engravings after Titian, Giulio Clovio, and Federigo Zuccaro. He was admired for his innovations in engraving techniques that allowed him to elegantly capture the nuances of the *chiaroscuro*, landscape forms, and textures found in the paintings he copied. See Gert Jan van der Sman, “Prints and Printmakers in Later Sixteenth-Century Venice,” in Renaissance Venice and the North: Crosscurrents in the Time of Bellini, Dürer, and Titian, eds. Bernard Aikema and Beverly Louise Brown; for the Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali, Giovanna Nepi Scirià (New York: Rizzoli, 2000), 151-159. Agostino was exposed to Cort’s style and technique by Domenico Tizaldi. Cort is purported to
exposed to various masters, their styles, techniques, and subject matter. This exposure no
doubt enriched his artistic awareness, but his own gifts as an artist, an especially curious
and learned one, enabled him to deftly assimilate these various artistic modes in his
work.78

Ludovico Carracci traveled in the 1570’s to Florence, Parma, Mantua, Rome, and
Venice in order to see and study art.79 His example inspired his cousins, Agostino and
have traveled to Bologna, where he may well have encountered Tibaldi, who is known to
have made at least one engraving after Cort, The Entombment.

78 Stephen Edward Ostrow, “Agostino Carracci” (PhD. diss., New York University,
1966), 24.

79 According to Malvasia, Ludovico’s first painting instructor was Prospero Fontana.
Malvasia also gives an account of Ludovico’s study trip and reports that in Florence he
worked under Passignano and studied the work of Andrea del Sarto; in Parma he studied
Correggio and Parmigianino; and, in Mantua, Giulio Romano and Primaticcio. Because
Malvasia actually had little information regarding Ludovico’s training and early career,
he had to depend on oral reports and Ludovico’s early drawings (none of which have
survived) to piece together his development. See Malvasia, 2000, 84, n. 6. For more
information on Ludovico Carracci, see Gail Feigenbaum, “Lodovico Carracci: A Study of
His Later Career and a Catalogue of His Paintings,” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University,
1984); Feigenbaum, Ludovico Carracci, ed. Andrea Emiliani (Milan: Electa, 1994); and
Bohn, 2004. Malvasia owned approximately three hundred sheets of drawings by the
Carracci. Posner says that it is likely that Agostino brought Annibale into Passerotti’s
shop. Donald Posner, Annibale Carracci: A Study in the Reform of Italian Painting
Around 1590, National Gallery of Art: Kress Foundation Studies in the History of
European Art, no. 5 (London: Phaidon Press, 1971), 6. It is likely that Annibale also
learned the fundamentals of art from a goldsmith, but it was Agostino who taught him
how the engrave. Annibale’s own study trip took him to Parma, Venice, and likely to
Carracci,” in The Drawings of Annibale Carracci, exh. cat., eds. Frances P. Smyth and
Susan Higman (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1999), 23, n. 4. Also, see
Daniele Benati and Eugenio Riccòmini, eds., Annibale Carracci, exh. cat. (Milan: Electa,
2006). In the purported letters of the Carracci printed by Malvasia (he was said to have
owned more than sixty of their letters (See Malvasia, 2000, 95, n. 31)), Annibale and
Agostino excitedly report to their cousin on their respective trips. In a letter dated April
18, 1580, Annibale writes to Ludovico that he:

…arrived in Parma yesterday…in order to be able to study and draw…I couldn’t
help going immediately to see the great cupola, which so many times you have
Annibale, to set out on their own *studioso corso* in the early 1580’s. Agostino made his way to Parma and briefly to Rome in 1581 and then to Venice in 1582, where he made engravings after the paintings by artists like Tintoretto and Veronese. It was after this trip to Venice, the first of two, that Agostino’s work matured. Influenced by the renowned use of color and light in Venetian painting, Agostino made thicker marks with his burin, enlarged his repertoire of strokes, and played with the representation of more extreme light and shadow. He developed a keen ability to impart the sense of various textures, be it iridescent taffetas, silken hair, or weighty velvets. This ability proved to be one of

commended to me, and still I remained stupefied, seeing such a great machine, everything so well understood, everything seen so clearly from bottom to top with such exactness, but at the same time with such judgment, with such grace, and with a color that is so true to life…[not] even Raphael himself can hold a candle to it…Correggio’s little *putti* breathe, live and laugh with a grace and reality such that one is compelled to laugh and be happy with them.

Quoted in DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 508. A fragment of a letter written in Venice by Agostino to Ludovico reads:

As for Annibale nothing could have been better than to have him come immediately from Parma to Venice, because seeing the immense works of so many great men he remained amazed and stunned and said he expected great things from this region but that he would never have imagined so much, and he says that he now recognizes himself to be a clod who doesn’t know anything: Paolo [Veronese] he now confesses to be the first man of the world…that it’s true he surpasses even Correggio in many things, because he is more animated and original etc.


80 DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 39. By the time of Agostino’s first trip to Venice, his reputation as a noted engraver was secure. That he was summoned to Venice by both the Rasicotti and Bertelli publishing houses, with whom he entered into contracts, is testament to his prominence. It has also been suggested that the profusion of engravings after Veronese indicates that he and Agostino had entered into some sort of business agreement. See Bury, 2001, 75, especially n. 73. For information regarding the print industry and publishing, see Bellini, 1975, especially 30-35 for the publishers with whom Agostino’s prints are associated.
his greatest achievements as a printmaker.\textsuperscript{81} After Venice, he went to Milan and Cremona before returning to Bologna in 1583 to begin work on the Palazzo Fava frescoes with both Annibale and Ludovico.\textsuperscript{82} By 1586 Agostino was once again in Parma engraving after Correggio’s compositions. During his second sojourn in Venice, which lasted from 1587 until 1589, he again modeled engravings after Tintoretto.\textsuperscript{83} He then returned to Bologna where he remained for some years, except for an excursion to Rome with Annibale in 1594-1595.\textsuperscript{84}

The Formation of the Carracci Academy and Its Resulting Principles Within the Intellectual Milieu of Bologna

For years the Carracci engaged in an artistic fellowship. They had engraved and painted together since the early 1580’s, not only with one another, but after one another’s compositions.\textsuperscript{85} The three Carracci sought one another’s opinions, advice, and knowledge

\textsuperscript{81} DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 39.

\textsuperscript{82} For a brief description of the Palazzo Fava scenes and a discussion pertaining to the Carracci’s collaboration on the project, see below.

\textsuperscript{83} Agostino became close enough to Tintoretto for him to become godfather to Agostino’s illegitimate son, Antonio, in 1589. Malvasia refers to Antonio’s birth merely as “some youthful adventures.” It is probable that Antonio’s mother was a Venetian prostitute named Isabella. Malvasia, 2000, 130, n. 100. Antonio also became a painter, and after the death of Agostino in 1602, became Annibale’s ward and purportedly worked on the wall decorations for the Farnese Gallery. For more information on Antonio Carracci, see Luigi Salerno, “L’opera di Antonio Carracci,” Bollettino d’Arte 41 (1956): 30-37.

\textsuperscript{84} For the importance of Agostino and Annibale’s Roman period, see discussion below.

\textsuperscript{85} Agostino most likely taught Annibale how to engrave and master the burin in the early 1580’s. Around 1581, Agostino made engravings from Annibale’s Baptism of Christ and Adam and Eve. Annibale modeled his etching Venus and a Satyr (c. 1592) on one of Agostino’s drawings from the time period of the Lascivie. See n. 59 above. By
to enhance their artistic endeavors. The constant exchange of ideas between the brothers and their cousin resulted in the founding of the *Accademia degli Incamminati*[^86] in Bologna around 1582, the opening of which Bellori credits to Agostino: “He organized the opening of the academy of design in Bologna in which many noble intellects in the various sciences and gentlemen of the City assembled and enrolled.”[^87] It seems feasible that Agostino’s financial success in the print market enabled them to form the Academy.[^88] Agostino designed the Academy’s *impresa*, or their emblem and Latin motto (Fig. 43).[^89] For the emblem, he chose Ursa Major, or the Great Bear, referred to as *il Carro* and the motto “contentione perfectus” (“perfected through competition”). This

[^86]: At its inception it was called the *Accademia dei Desiderosi*, a *desideroso* being an aspirant of virtue. Faberio remarked in his oration that the members of the Academy were “constantly advancing on the glorious path toward the desired goal of perfection.” Malvasia, 2000, 201. Malvasia noted that the Academy “drew such a crowd and grew so immediately and greatly in reputation…and attracted people in large numbers.” Ibid., 117-118. In the wake of its success, the Academy was renamed the *Accademia degli Incamminati*. An *incamminato* is an individual who has set out on a disciplined path of intellectual pursuits, which ultimately leads to immortality. See Dempsey, 2000, 47. Also, see n. 89 below on the Carracci *impresa*.

[^87]: Bellori, 1968, 93.


[^89]: Figure 43 is a sheet of pen-and-ink sketches by Agostino, on which the artist has scribbled the names of members of the Carracci family, drawn several studies of eyes and profiles, as well as elements from the Carracci *impresa*, including several bears emanating rays of light denoting the constellation, Ursa Major. Also, the word “*immortale/*immortale” appears more than once.
motif is appropriate, beyond its resemblance to the name “Carracci,” in that Titian also chose the bear for his impresa and because of the notion that the she-bear licked her shapeless newborn offspring into their ursine form, not unlike the artist who shaped and perfected nature.\textsuperscript{90} Ursa Major is also a fitting emblem in that the constellation never sets—it remains fixed in the sky, aimed at the lodestar, a befitting allusion for a group who referred to themselves as incamminati, for they were artists who set out on the arduous road to an unattainable perfection.\textsuperscript{91}

The Carracci Academy was unlike any Academy that had preceded it.\textsuperscript{92} It was neither a group of dilettantes bound by a common interest who met somewhat regularly

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{91} Dempsey, 2000, 73. Agostino’s design for the impresa, with its complex significance and origins, speaks to his role as the intellectual force behind the Carracci Academy.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{92} In Bologna, the painter Bernardino Baldi ran the Accademia degli Indifferanti, which functioned as a facility where artists could draw from live models. Malvasia remarked on the Carracci’s presence at this “Academy” writing that, “[t]hey spent all their time practicing drawing at Baldi’s academy, which they attended very diligently and most assiduously, and where early in the morning one would draw from plaster casts, and from life in the first two hours at night…” Malvasia, 2000, 93. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, it was not uncommon for artists from different workshops to gather in someone else’s studio to engage in activities such as drawing. These informal group meetings were called “academies.” Posner, 1971, 63. The Carracci drew upon the precedent of the Accademia del Disegno in Florence, which was incorporated in 1563. Florence’s Academy was founded with the intentions to educate artists free from the rules and restraints of local guilds and to elevate their status as intellectuals. See Nikolaus Pevsner, Academies of Art Past and Present (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 34-54 and Feigenbaum, 1993, 61. For information regarding the Florentine Academy, see Charles Dempsey, “Some Observations on the Education of Artists in Florence and Bologna During the Later Sixteenth Century,” Art Bulletin 62 (Dec. 1980): 552-569. For the most recent publication to date regarding the Florentine Academy, see Karen-edis Barzman, The Florentine Academy and the Early Modern State: The Discipline of Disegno (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
\end{flushright}
to engage in discourse and presentations, nor was it the traditional hierarchical \textit{bottega}, a workshop consisting of fathers and sons, masters, journeymen, and apprentices.\footnote{Feigenbaum, 1993, 61. Bolognese painters did not even have their own guild until 1598. In 1569 they operated as members of the guild of the \textit{Bombasari}, or calico merchants, and before that, they were part of the guild of the sword-cutters, saddlers, and scabbard-makers.} The Carracci Academy, instead, was a steadfast assemblage of men of all ages and stages of artistic development and experience who worked as peers in their common pursuit of the mastery of painting.\footnote{Ibid., 45.} The Academy’s singularity arose from its combination of functions: it acted as a university, a school to train artists, and as a more traditional Academy with its members being dedicated to intellectual inquiry.\footnote{Dempsey, 2000, 46.} It deftly combined both theory and practice.\footnote{Dempsey, 2000, 48.} The fruits of this artistic partnership made the Carracci the envoys of the artistic reform to follow, for it “pleased God that in the city of Bologna, the mistress of sciences and studies, a most notable mind was forged and through it the declining and extinguished art was reforged.”\footnote{Bellori, 1968, 6. Here Bellori is specifically referring to Annibale, but the sentiment is applicable to Agostino, Ludovico, and the whole of the Carracci Academy.} Before the Carracci, according to Bellori, the state of art in Italy was grim:
When the Divine Raphael with the ultimate outlines of his art raised its beauty to the summit, restoring it to the ancient majesty of all those graces and enriching the merits that once made it glorious in the presence of the Greeks and the Romans, painting was most admired by men and seemed descended from Heaven. But since things of the earth never stay the same, and whatever gains the heights inevitably must with perpetual vicissitude fall back again, so art...was seen to decline rapidly...all of its beauties quickly vanished. The artists, abandoning the study of nature, corrupted art with the maniera...with the fantastic idea based on practice and not on imitation.\(^9^8\)

The Carracci Academy inculcated the importance of imitating, or more rather, assimilating, the art of past masters, of careful observation of nature, of human anatomy, and of working from live models. They established for their students, who varied in their artistic backgrounds and experiences, a “curriculum” consisting of life drawing sessions, theoretical discussions, scholarly lectures, and anatomy lessons:

There one applied oneself (how important it is to have effective promoters, ardent leaders, energetic companions), there one attended with great regularity...to drawing living persons in the nude, or partly draped, military weapons, animals, fruits, and in short all created things. One learned proportion, and those qualities of grace and loveliness without which painting cannot make itself pleasing or worthy of attention. One learned the marvelous effects of perspective and made a deep study of architecture. There one discussed histories, fables and poetic inventions. One sought to find ways of creating illusory effects that would delude the viewer by means of light and shade, so that things would appear to be sculpted that were in fact drawn or painted...the Academy proved virtuous and commendable, for the talk was not empty or unworthy, and discussion would move sweetly to some noble subject; in the countryside they would draw hills, fields, lakes, streams, and anything beautiful or arresting that caught their eye.\(^9^9\)

Malvasia reports on their study of anatomy:

\(^{9^8}\) Bellori, 1968, 5-6.

\(^{9^9}\) From Lucio Faberio’s oration; quoted in Malvasia, 2000, 201. Agostino’s teacher, Bartolomeo Passerotti, was keenly interested in natural science, evidence of which is seen in his many zoological and anatomical studies. Agostino may well have absorbed this fascination for the natural world from Passerotti. For more information on Passerotti’s scientific interests, see Ghirardi, 1990, 34-47.
Unwilling to stop at what the surface of the nude reveals to the eye, the Carracci wanted to understand what is hidden underneath. This meant learning the names of the bones and their points of connection, the attachment and ligaments of muscles, the function and the effect of the nerves and veins; and to this end they did detailed anatomical dissections, having obtained cadavers privately, in which they were greatly helped by a Doctor Lanzoni, public lecturer at the university and a fine anatomist, who was [a]…kind and admiring…promoter of their curiosity and disciplined work…

The presence of Bologna’s long-established and internationally renowned university made the city a humanistic and cultural center—a boon to the Carracci Academy, indeed. Since the late fifteenth century, even Bolognese physicians, lawyers, artists, and musicians were inspired, perhaps by a fervor particular to their city, to collect ancient Roman medals, coins, and statuary. The art collections that were prevalent in this city


101 Cardinal Alessandro Farnese was studying at the university when, at the age of fourteen, he was nominated to become a cardinal by his grandfather, Pope Paul III. See Roberto Zapperi, “Alessandro Farnese, Giovanni della Casa and Titian’s Danaé in Naples,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 54 (1991): 159.

102 The largest such collection was Giovanni Filoteo Achillini’s, which was still intact in 1560. Achillini had constant contact with artists like Amico Aspertini, Francesco Francia, and Marcantonio Raimondi. In Bologna at this time, it was common practice for artists to record newly-discovered examples of ancient Roman art, and then include them in one form or another in their paintings, drawings, prints, etc., along with the allegories their humanist counterparts were formulating. Agostino was the heir to this intellectual
of scholars and scholarly ideas were undoubtedly familiar to the Carracci.\textsuperscript{103} They would have been aware of figures like Amico Aspertini,\textsuperscript{104} who made careful records of the inscriptions and sculptures from ancient Roman grottoes to further his own painting, or the natural philosopher Ulisse Aldrovandi (a man prominent in artistic circles whose official title at the University of Bologna was \textit{Lectura philosophiae naturalis ordinaris de fossilibus, plantis, et animalibus}) who deemed the inclusion of nature’s clarity and diversity essential in art.\textsuperscript{105} Aldrovandi, along with Antonio Giganti,\textsuperscript{106} transformed

and artistic exchange. For more on this exchange between artists and humanists, see Landau and Parshall, 1994, 99.

\textsuperscript{103} There is evidence in various Bolognese collections of a growing predilection for art of a mythological and erotic nature. The 1603 inventory taken at the death of the patrician Pirro Malvezzi indicates that he owned a full-length painting of Venus, a painting of Leda, and one identified simply as a nude woman. See Caroline P. Murphy, “The Market for Pictures in Post-Tridentine Bologna,” in The Art Market in Italy, 15th-17th Centuries, eds. Marcello Fantoni, Louisa C. Matthew, and Sara F. Matthews-Grieo (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini Editore, 2003), 46. Because the inventory was made at his death, one can assume that Pirro had acquired at least some of the paintings years prior and, therefore, that he was part of a more widespread trend of collecting erotic art. These collections were undoubtedly known to Agostino.

\textsuperscript{104} Since three of Amico Aspertini’s sketchbooks, or \textit{taccuini}, (dating from the early 1500’s to the 1530’s and later) are extant, it is likely that there were indeed more. They primarily consist of subjects taken from examples of ancient works of art in Rome and are often accompanied by annotations regarding their respective locations. The books, therefore, functioned as guides to the private collections of the period. Also, his sketchbooks may well have functioned as sourcebooks for artists of the period. For more information, see Phyllis Pray Bober, \textit{Drawings After the Antique by Amico Aspertini, Sketchbooks in the British Museum, Studies of The Warburg Institute, vol. 21}, ed. G. Bing (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957).

\textsuperscript{105} See Boschloo, 1974, 116. Aldrovandi was the pupil of Achille Bocchi.

\textsuperscript{106} Giganti was secretary to Cardinal Paleotti from 1580 until the Cardinal’s death in 1597. Before that, he was the secretary to the humanist Lodovico Beccadello from 1550 until 1572, whose collection of antiquities was eventually incorporated into Giganti’s museum. His museum’s inventory reveals its encyclopedic nature with its picture gallery and its collections pertaining to nature, ethnography, archaeology, philology, physics, and
Bologna into an important museological center through their respective museums, which were intended for use by scholars and as a tool for the betterment of the citizenry. Aldrovandi’s museum was more scientific in its approach, for in it he emphasized the natural world. In 1568 he founded and directed Bologna’s first botanical garden with the intent that it function as a natural laboratory and research tool for the medical and pharmaceutical communities. Aldrovandi’s scientific approach was rooted in his unrelenting observation of reality. He believed that knowledge and scientific research ought to be bequeathed to posterity, not immured by the intellectual elite and subject only to their use and benefit. In his will, Aldrovandi proudly noted that the wonders in his museum “can be and are visited and contemplated everyday by everybody.”

Aldrovandi hired all manner of artists to provide him with a visual record of his


See Giuseppe Olmi and Paolo Prodi, “Art, Science, and Nature in Bologna Circa 1600,” in The Age of Correggio and the Carracci, 1986, 219. In the botanical garden he cultivated plants from all over the globe, including the New World. By 1597, the garden contained some 3,000 specimens. While preparing his botanical garden, Aldrovandi availed himself of the garden Cardinal Paleotti had created on the grounds of his palace complex. Aldrovandi’s 1556 publication Delle statue antiche became the first gazetteer of Roman collections of ancient art. His library contained more than 3,500 volumes, which he left in his will, along with his museum, to the Senate of Bologna. His library included such texts relating to art as Dürer’s study on human proportions, Armenini’s De’ veri precetti della pittura, and Vasari’s Lives of the Artists.

Aldrovandi was closely associated with Bologna’s artistic circle, maintaining contact with figures like Francesco Cavazzoni, Passerotto Passerotti, Camillo Procaccini,
research and the contents of his museum through the execution of paintings, drawings, and engravings. Aldrovandi saw this as a scientific endeavor, not an artistic one. For him, the purpose of art, and specifically painting, was to serve science as a visual document of the natural world, a document that collapsed distance, making foreign species from far-off lands seem native to the curious viewer. Aldrovandi was so esteemed that Cardinal Paleotti sent him various chapters from the manuscript of his Discorso seeking his scholarly advice and input. Elements of Paleotti’s discourse parallel Aldrovandi’s sentiments about natural science. In chapter twelve of book I, Paleotti writes that it is painting that imparts “true information regarding trees, plants, birds, fish, quadrupeds, serpents, insects, marbles, and other uncommon species” and that painting renders “things present to men even if they are distant.” It seems likely that the Carracci, at the very least, would have been acquainted with the artistic precepts in Paleotti’s Discorso and with the activities and philosophies of Aldrovandi. Agostino engraved

Caesare Artusi, Mario Sabatini (son of Lorenzo Sabatini), Orazio Samacchini, and Prospero and Lavinia Fontana.


111 Aldrovandi and Paleotti had been intimate friends since their youth owing to their shared appreciation of the natural world and scientific investigation. Ibid., 224.


113 Ibid.

114 Agostino’s masters, Domenico Tibaldi and Prospero Fontana, also advised Paleotti throughout the writing of the first two books of his Discorso. See Boschloo, 1974, 152.
Aldrovandi’s portrait and it is most likely that Aldrovandi sat for Agostino in order for the artist to capture his likeness.\textsuperscript{115}

The Carracci’s “Eclecticism” and Reformed Style and Agostino’s Contribution as \textit{il dotto}

It was under these intellectual conditions that the Carracci, in close artistic contact with one another, began to codify the “eclecticism”\textsuperscript{116} that would characterize their art. Malvasia nicely summarizes their eclectic practices:

\textsuperscript{115} Olmi and Prodi note that on the one recorded occasion we have of Aldrovandi mentioning the Carracci he denied “any familiarity whatsoever” with the men. Olmi and Prodi, 1986, 223. Malvasia, however, reports that Aldrovandi was a frequent visitor to the Carracci Academy stating that, “The Carracci studio was a most popular gathering place for the many men of letters who flourished at the time, among them such men as Aldrovandi…” See Malvasia, 2000, 271-272. The method the Carracci propounded in their Academy relied on the observation of reality and nature and required students to anatomize and classify everything that they studied in a manner very similar to Aldrovandi’s scientific studies. For the Carracci’s method, see Dempsey, 2000, 48. Boschloo, however, thinks that it is unlikely that Aldrovandi profoundly influenced the working methods of the Carracci. Boschloo, 1974, 115. To me, it is more likely, with the Carracci’s acquaintance with Aldrovandi, the accessibility of his museum, and the circulation of his ideas in Bologna, that he surely had an effect on the Carracci, especially when one considers Agostino’s active pursuit of knowledge in the Arts and Sciences, which helped to shape the Carracci Academy.

\textsuperscript{116} The term eclectic is used without any pejorative connotations here and is removed from the anterior debates regarding the appropriateness of the designation by past scholars of the Carracci’s artistic practices as “eclectic.” The term need not be construed as detractive or inane. Denis Mahon concluded that the “main foundation for the edifice” of eclecticism is a sonnet purportedly by Agostino Carracci in praise of Niccolò dell’Abate, which Malvasia published in his Felsina pittrice in the life of Niccolò:

\begin{verbatim}
Chi farsi un buon pittor cerca e desia
Il disegno di Roma habbia alla mano,
La mossa, coll’ombrar Veneziano,
E il degno colorir di Lombardia.
Di Michelangiol le terribil via,
Il vero natural di Tiziano,
Del Correggio lo stil puro e sovrano,
E di un Rafel la giusta simetria.
Del Tibaldi il decoro e il fondamento,
Del dotto Primaticcio l’inventare,
E un po’ di grazia del Parmigianino.
\end{verbatim}
Taking the best from all the best painters with a facility that was no longer customary or appreciated, he found a succinct compendium—indeed a precious extract—that every aspiring painter longed to equal but could never hope to surpass; and joining Raphael’s perfect proportion with Michelangelo’s knowledge, and adding to these Titian’s color and the angelic purity of Correggio, he formed out of all of these manners a single one which left nothing to be desired when compared with either the Roman, the Florentine, the Venetian, or the Lombard manner.\(^{117}\)

The Carracci were rejecting the generation of \textit{maniera} painters that preceded them.

Malvasia described this generation of painters as artists who:

\begin{quote}
…gave themselves over to weak, not to say incorrect, drawing, feeble and washed out color, in sum to a certain manner that was at a far remove from the verisimilar, let alone the real, a manner totally chimerical and ideal, even if in other respects it was copious and perhaps overly finished. These were the Salviati, the Zuccari, Vasari, Andrea Vicentino, Tommaso Laurenti, and, among our painters in Bologna, Samacchini, Sabatini, Calvaert, the Procaccini and their like, who, dispensing with the imitation of antique statues not to mention the imitation of the best that nature has to offer, made their imagination the sole foundation of their art and devoted themselves to a certain swift and mannered way of working.\(^{118}\)
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
Ma senza tanti studi e tanto stento,
   Si ponga solo l’opre ad imitare,
   Che qui lascioci il nostro Nicolino.
\end{flushright}

Quoted in Malvasia, 1841, I, 129. See Denis Mahon, \textit{Studies in Seicento Art and Theory} (London: Warburg Institute and University of London, 1947; reprint, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1971), 195-229 (page references are to reprint edition). Leaving the debate over the authenticity of the sonnet aside, Dempsey sees the sonnet as a tool Malvasia used to underscore the fact that the Carracci encouraged their students to develop their own \textit{ingegno} by assimilating the art of others into their own vision. Dempsey, 2000, 65.

\(^{117}\) Malvasia, 2000, 88. He is particularly referring to Ludovico, but the statement can well be applied to Agostino and Annibale’s artistic philosophy and practices. It must be noted that examples of the “best painters” were accessible to the Carracci not only through the various art collections in Bologna and through their respective \textit{studiosi corsi}, but also through Agostino’s reproductive engravings and the collection of prints he amassed.

\(^{118}\) Malvasia, 2000, 82.
The Carracci contemptuously referred to this mode as “maniera statuina,” or “statuette style,” a diminutive that blatantly emphasized the style’s remove from a true antique manner and from the naturalistic appearance of reality.\textsuperscript{119} In its stead, they forged a painterly style which looked to the \textit{chiaroscuro} and the chromatic and illusionistic effects found in north Italian models.\textsuperscript{120} In so doing, the Carracci did not reject the established merit of figures such as Michelangelo and Raphael;\textsuperscript{121} rather, they extracted the best aspects from the work and ideas of these preceding artists and fused with them the choicest aspects of the Venetian and Emilian modes, all of which they combined with the careful study of nature, thus resulting in their reformed style of painting.\textsuperscript{122} Agostino’s own reproductive prints are the paradigmatic illustrations of the Carracci’s artistic reform and assimilatory style. This style is in evidence in his choice of northern Italian paintings, in his ability to reproduce the effects of color, light and dark, and also in the manner in which he, without any misgivings, altered or corrected his model images to better adhere

\textsuperscript{119} Dempsey, \textit{The Age of Correggio and the Carracci}, 1986, 240.

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid. These models include Correggio, Titian, and Tintoretto. Dempsey says that the Carracci, in effect, united the Tuscan principle of \textit{disegno} with Venetian \textit{colore}. See Dempsey, 2000, 42. Venetian \textit{colore}, in a very general sense, can be viewed as a sort of “naturalism.” Posner, 1971, 47. In the early part of the 1580’s, Ludovico and Annibale’s naturalistic style was modeled after Correggio, while the naturalism in Agostino’s Venetianizing style was based on the precepts of Venetian art that he so admired. See below.

\textsuperscript{121} A note written in a copy of Vasari’s Lives owned by the Carracci praises Titian by saying that, “he could easily have beaten [any Florentine painter] painting with his feet, excepting, however, the divine Michelangelo and Andrea del Sarto.” Quoted in Charles Dempsey, “The Carracci \textit{Postille} to Vasari’s Lives,” \textit{Art Bulletin} 68 (Mar. 1986): 75. For a discussion on the Carracci’s annotated copy of Vasari, see below.

\textsuperscript{122} Dempsey, \textit{The Age of Correggio and the Carracci}, 1986, 247.
to the admirable qualities of *disegno*. Agostino’s inherent brilliance and mastery of the Carracci’s canon is evident in his improvement of a figure’s anatomical accuracy or in the clarity of the subject matter or *invenzione*, and in his careful analysis and rendering of the *affetti* by introducing subtlety into the drama. Faberio called Agostino a “judicious imitator” and went on to defend this appellation saying, “Not without reason do I call him [this]: for since he considered that the object of painting is to bring delight, he always aimed at imitation of the best, guarding against the error of the many people who prefer simple resemblance, even when it concerns the worst and ugliest things, to a beauty that is free of every defect.” The Carracci, though, were more than just “judicious imitators.” Appearances were subordinate to intellection in their art.

Agostino, referred to as the *letterato* (“man of letters”) or *il dotto* (“the scholar”), was integral to the Academy and the formation of the Carracci’s eclecticism and reform through his considerable erudition. Malvasia wrote:

> His marvelously versatile mind, adorned with the varied knowledge of literature that he was acquiring, gave him certain standing. There was no area of knowledge that was completely unknown to him; he could give a good account of the maxims of philosophy and the aphorisms of medicine, would discourse learnedly on...

---

123 Dempsey, 1989, 39. Agostino’s alterations included manipulating poses and changing spatial relationships and proportions.

124 Ibid. Agostino’s *Mercury and the Three Graces* (c. 1589) (Fig. 44) exemplifies his habit of altering the original model image. The print is a copy of Tintoretto’s painting of the same title (c. 1576-1578), located in the Palazzo Ducale in Venice.

125 From Faberio’s oration; quoted in Malvasia, 2000, 203.

126 For the Carracci, it was important to use one’s intellect to comprehend and imitate the workings of nature, not just to facilely ape a so-called “created nature.” This stemmed from a Neo-platonic notion prescribed to by preceding artists, ironically, even the artists of the *maniera*. See Dempsey, 2000, 50, especially his more detailed explanation of the deterioration of the *maniera* style in terms of its precepts.
mathematical proofs, astrological observations, or the regions and places of
cosmography on a sound basis; he was knowledgeable about politics, history,
orthography, and poetry; and composed sonnets, madrigals, and sestinas so
well…”

Agostino has long been proclaimed the most erudite of the Carracci, and the
intellectual aspects of their Academy, including lectures and theoretical discussions, are

---

127 Malvasia, 2000, 119. Agostino was much loved and admired by the intellectual
community of Bologna. He was elected as an adjunct member to Melchiorre Zoppio’s
Accademia de’ Gelati, an academy devoted to poetry, after Agostino engraved the plates
for Zoppio’s Ricreationi Amorose degli Accademici de’ Gelati di Bologna. Agostino also
engraved a portrait of Zoppio, who was a professor of philosophy at the university.
Zoppio, among others, composed an epitaph on the occasion of Agostino’s funeral,
praising his genius and lamenting his loss. For the English translation of the epitaph, see
Malvasia, 2000, 186. Benedetto Morello published poems about Agostino written by
Zoppio and Bologna’s other leading poet, Cesare Rinaldo, who later taught Malvasia at
the university. Agostino also knew Aldo Manuzio the Younger, who was the chair of
rhetoric at the university and who edited the edition of Horace’s Odes for which Agostino
engraved the title page. It seems all too fitting that Aldo would ask his erudite artist
friend, who no doubt knew and understood the lyrical poetry of Horace, to complete this
task. Agostino’s circle of eminent men indeed recognized Agostino’s artistic aptitude.
Zoppio composed a poem praising Agostino’s skill in the art of emulation:

Emulo ancor de la natura sei
Non pur imitator, Carracci, ch’ella
Suo difetto apre in consumando quella,
Che vivente assai piacque agli occhi miei.

Tu per virtù de l’arte avvivi in lei
L’aria, il color, lo spirto, e la favella
E se viva non è, come a vedella
Altro senso, che vista io non vorrei.

Ma come può giammai privo sembiante
Di lingua articolar voce non sua?
Tacito anco il suo stil ti grida in lode.
Non sai, ch’occhi per lingua usa l’Amante,
E degli occhi il parlar per gli occhi s’ode,
Che dice amami, io son l’Olimpia tua.

Quoted in Malvasia, 1841, I, 309.

128 Malvasia wrote that when Annibale was taken out of school he had “just learned to
read and write” and “envious of all the fine accomplishments of his brother, he found no
better way to react than to cast scorn on these qualities by feigning a ready contempt for
them…” Malvasia, 2000, 88. Although Annibale seems to have lacked Agostino’s
intellectual ardor, Charles Dempsey has pointed out that Malvasia meant that Annibale,
likely due to Agostino’s interests and influence. His phrenic activities were no mere
dilettantish diversions; they advanced his and the Academy’s understanding and
execution of their art:

…[Agostino] would adapt his mind to whatever he longed to know just like a
chameleon, concentrating now on philosophy, now on mathematics, learning from
arithmetic the exact numerical proportions, by means which he gained a mastery
of music, including a theoretical knowledge of the principles of harmony; and
turning to geometry…he learned the art of perspective…\textsuperscript{129}

He “contributed his erudite store of books and medals” to the Academy, which “met the
needs to extend both his own learning and that of the students;”\textsuperscript{130} Other tools of the

when he was withdrawn from the \textit{Scuola di Grammatica} at around age eleven, had just
learned to read and write in Latin. Agostino, being the eldest, would have had an
additional three years of training in Latin at the \textit{scuola} upon his own withdrawal. The
purpose of these schools, where boys matriculated at around age five or seven, was to
teach eloquence, elegant speech and writing, and impeccable grammar. The curriculum,
probably, at least consisted of various works by Cicero, Cato, Ovid, and Virgil and was
overseen and taught by university masters. For more information, see Charles Dempsey,
1980. It is in such a \textit{scuola} that Agostino would have received his initial exposure to
classical literature, language, and thought that would captivate him for the rest of his life.

\textsuperscript{129} From Faberio’s funeral oration; quoted in Malvasia, 2000, 202. Faberio expounds
on Agostino’s knowledge of science and, in many ways, calls to mind the work of
Aldrovandi, especially in terms of ethnography and the New World:

How many times have we heard him, now as a cosmographer, explain to us
and draw for us the whole system of the universe…describing the variation
in length of daylight in different countries from the equinoctial regions to the
furthest reaches of the land of the Eskimos…Or we would hear him as a
geographer, describe the terrestrial globe…Or how often as a cartographer,
he would describe to us…the New World…done in such a lucid order and with
such ease and vividness, that anyone…might well think he had spent years
wandering through and living in all these places…There were the customs
of the local people to describe, and the great variety of animals and plants
proper to each region and site, and he would narrate things of note that happened
in this place or that place, as well as revealing how much there was to imitate
in the history or poetry of their peoples (as in a real mirror of human life).
Quoted in Malvasia, 2000, 202.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 119. Malvasia mentions Agostino’s copies of Virgil and Tacitus, teeming
with annotations made by Agostino himself.
Academy included large and small anatomical fragments in terracotta, purportedly fashioned by Agostino, and “the most singular casts of Roman bas-reliefs and antique heads.” Although Malvasia posits that it was Ludovico who gathered the antique prototypes for use in the academy, it was Agostino who studied sculpture, particularly relief sculpture, under the supervision of a master. It seems likely that his expertise in this area would have guided Ludovico in making the acquisitions. Antiquities might have been available to the Carracci in Bolognese collections, but they were certainly available and prevalent in print, given the popularity of antique treasures as featured themes in engravings. Agostino, as a collector of prints, surely possessed examples of these widely-distributed engravings. Scholars assert that Agostino did not begin to synthesize classical antiquities into his compositions until his second trip to Rome (1594-1595) where, at the Farnese Palace, he was surrounded by a private collection of classical antiquities. Agostino’s interest in classical art and culture, however, was well established long before his brief Roman period. The prevalence of ekphrases and copies of ancient works of art available for his study ensures that Agostino was not ignorant of antiquities, but rather that he was fully aware of them. Given that Agostino was a veritable master of artistic assimilation, to discount the influence of antiquities in his art before 1595 is an unreasonable conclusion. The importance of classical art had long been part of the

131 Ibid.

132 Surely the Carracci knew of the work in plaster casts done years earlier by Primaticcio, a fellow Bolognese painter. Primaticcio’s moulds were later purchased by the sculptor Leone Lioni and around 1550 were most likely installed at his residence in Milan. See Bruce Boucher, “Leone Leoni and Primaticcio’s Moulds of Antique Sculpture,” Burlington Magazine 123 (Jan. 1981): 23-26.

Renaissance artistic lexicon and any trained artist of the sixteenth century would have studied the particulars of the rebirth of classical culture. It was commonly recognized that it was “necessary to have a knowledge of the famous statues and beautiful paintings of Rome” but that “one can become a good painter even though he has not studied in that city.” It was perhaps his first-hand study of the antique examples he encountered in Rome which prompted a more fully-realized surge in his already existing classicism.

In Venice, where papal authority was not so onerous, Agostino received more exposure to the titillating potential of mythological and Biblical subject matter through the compositions of Giorgione, Titian, Veronese, and Tintoretto. He would have absorbed elements from compositions like Titian’s *Venus of Urbino* and *Danaë* (Fig. 45). In the margins of a copy of Vasari’s *Lives* owned by the Carracci, one of them scribbled a note about Titian, “Questo divinissimo pittore ha fatto di quelle cose che paiono piuttosto fatte dagli Angeli del cielo che di mano di un huomo mortale…” He admired Titian’s

134 Malvasia, 2000, 84.

135 The *Danaë* (c. 1545) was commissioned by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese for his Roman residence after he had admired Titian’s *Venus of Urbino* in the collection of Guidobaldo delle Rovere (who later married Alessandro’s sister, Vittoria). He originally requested a painting in a similar vein as the *Venus of Urbino* (i.e., free from a mythological veneer) with a nude female whose features should resemble those of his mistress. It seems that propriety won out and the cardinal’s “Venus” was altered (made evident through modern X-ray analysis) so as to represent an acceptable myth—that of one of Jove’s amorous romps. See Zapperi, 1991, 159-171.

136 Quoted in Boschloo, 1974, 44. My translation reads, “This divine painter has made all the things [he paints] seem as if they were made by the angels in heaven rather than by the hand of a mortal man…” The copy of *Lives*, with its annotations, was mentioned by both Bellori and Malvasia (who attributed the notes to Agostino). The preambles from two separate transcriptions of the now lost book read: “The following notes where taken from a book, which belonged to Ludovico Carracci, brother of Annibale and Agostino the famous Bolognese painters, by whose hand were the aforesaid notes.” The debate about whose “hand” to which the preamble is referring still lingers. Most scholars now believe
reliance on nature in his art. The Venetian insistence that nature form the basis of the
verisimilitude in art echoes Agostino’s own sentiments,\textsuperscript{137} sentiments that became
fundamental to the Carracci Academy. Venice had long been a center for publishing and
a seminal edition of Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses}, the first to include illustrations from
copperplate engravings, was printed there in 1584. Proofs of the engravings could well
have been circulating in Venice at the time of Agostino’s first visit in 1582. Such items
would have been of great interest to Agostino, not only because he would have been well-
versed in Ovid, which is evident through some of the subjects he depicted in the \textit{Lascivie},
but also because he engraved illustrations for books.\textsuperscript{138} Perhaps Agostino’s exposure to
this illustrated version of \textit{Metamorphoses} sparked the \textit{Lascivie}.

Without Agostino’s intellect and his grasp of the art of assimilation, the success of
the Carracci’s reform in painting seems less likely, or at least, less innovative and
influential. His varied interests and his eye for design made him an integral part in

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
that all three of the Carracci contributed to the annotations. For a transcription of the
\textit{postille}, or “notes”, see Mario Fanti, “Le postille Carraccesche alle ‘Vite’ del Vasari: Il
testo originale,” \textit{Il Carrobbio} V (1979): 148-164. For analyses on the \textit{postille}, see
Boschloo, 1974, 44-46 and Dempsey, in \textit{Art Bulletin}, 1986, 72-76. Dempsey’s article
includes two annotations that have been regarded as anti-academic and antithetical to the
Carracci’s method: “The ignorant Vasari is not aware that the good ancient masters took
their things from the life, and he would have it instead that it would be better to copy
secondary sources in the antique rather than the primary and principal things in life; but
he does not understand this art...It is a great thing that many painters, I don’t know if I
should say with little understanding of this art, spend and consume so much time on this
anatomy, since for all that the knowledge of it is good, it is not however necessary to
excavate the insides like doctors do.” Dempsey attributes these notes not to any anti-
academicism, but rather to a strong polemical reaction in northern Italy against the
Tuscan artistic supremacy touted by Vasari. See Dempsey, in \textit{Art Bulletin}, 1986, 76.
\end{flushright}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{137} Boschloo, 1974, 45. Agostino is credited with inspiring Annibale to develop his
own Venetianizing style in the late 1580’s. See Posner, 1971, 44-52.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{138} Ostrow, 1966, 174.
generating the Carracci’s precepts. The very same interests and keen awareness for
design made the *Lascivia* exemplary, the fitting inspiration for what would come to
define the Carracci’s legacy in painting—the Farnese Gallery.
CHAPTER THREE

AGOSTINO’S SOURCES FOR THE LASCIVIE AND THEIR ANTIQUE PROTOTYPES AS PRECURSORS TO THE CLASSICISM IN THE FARNESE GALLERY

In addition to renowned works of classical statuary, Agostino looked to the minor arts, and to the example set by more contemporary artists in composing his erotic prints. The erotic designs by Giulio Romano were the supreme models for the Lascivie while Giulio himself was the ideal artist to emulate. Giulio’s propinquity to Raphael and his knowledge of the antique perfectly encapsulated Agostino’s own ideals, ideals set forth by the Carracci Academy. The ancient sources Giulio Romano employed in his erotic designs certainly were not lost on Agostino, and neither was the success of not only Giulio’s compositions, but also his prosperous career.

I modi

Ostensibly, Agostino’s primary source for his erotic prints was the notorious set of prints known as I modi (or “positions”) (c. 1524) engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi after drawings by Giulio Romano.¹³⁹ The series was comprised of sixteen scenes

¹³⁹ None of Giulio’s drawings survive. The subsequent prints were distributed in Rome by the publisher Baviera. Baviera also commissioned a series of prints called Gli amori degli dei engraved by Jacopo Caraglio from drawings by Rosso Fiorentino and Perino del Vaga. The subject of the loves of the gods was an erotic theme meant to titillate. Bonasone (whose plates for Bocchi’s Symbolicarum Quaestionum Agostino recut) also made some erotic prints after Perino del Vaga’s compositions. Other erotic prints circulating at the time were done by Marco da Ravenna, Eneo Vico, and later,
depicting heterosexual couples engaged in various manners and modes of copulation. Unrefined woodcut copies of the engravings were later coupled with obscene sonnets, the “Sonetti lussuriosi,” composed by Pietro Aretino to form a book. Giulio’s designs were shocking in that they did not adhere to the admissible Renaissance standard of portraying blatantly sexual scenes as the lustful trysts of the gods. Affixing such scenes with a mythological bent served to distance them from allegations of indecency. Malvasia, when writing about Agostino’s erotic prints, compares them to the precedent set by Giulio and Marcantonio’s joint venture in making the Modi:

Giorgio Ghisi. In particular, Eneo Vico engraved a Mars and Venus after Parmigianino, whose erotic mythological work would have been familiar to Agostino. See DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 290, n. 9.

All that is left of the original Modi are fragments because both the prints and their copperplates were destroyed due to their salacious content. The character of I modi is best understood through the surviving copies by various artists (Fig. 46). The book containing the prints and Aretino’s sonnets is speculated to have been published around 1527 in Venice where, years later, it might have been seen by Agostino. For more information on I modi, see Lynne Lawner, The Sixteen Pleasures (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988) and Antonella Camarda, “I modi: genesi e vicissitudini di un’opera proibita tra Rinascimento e Maniera,” Storia dell’arte 110 (2005): 75-104.

In ancient Rome, quotidian items such as lamps, silver services, mirrors, vases, and pottery were often adorned with sexual subject matter unfettered by any mythological references. Knowledge of such items was prevalent in the sixteenth century and because these items were of ancient Roman descent, they were deemed acceptable. Bette Talvacchia, “Classical Paradigms and Renaissance Antiquarianism in Giulio Romano’s I modi,” Villa I Tatti Studies 7 (1997), 83. So, perhaps this line of thinking prompted Giulio to devise the Modi without an obvious mythological subtext.

Talvacchia, 1999, 4. Removing the mythological facade, in essence, removed the comfortable distance between the viewer and the subject. It had the unnerving, yet titillating, effect of making one feel as if one were spying on one’s own neighbors. Talvacchia, 1997, 82. This eradication of distance between the viewer and the subject recalls the goal of Aldrovandi’s scientific studies and his views on the purpose of art and it also relates to Paleotti’s directives on painting. For Paleotti’s ideas, see Boschloo, 1974, 121-133.
…Agostino published those prints with figures in lascivious poses, like those unleashed during the reign of Pope Clement by that ignoble gang consisting of the most famous and bold draughtsman, the most skillful engraver, and the most satirical writer of the time, causing the Holy Pontiff to be so justly incensed…

Both Giulio and Agostino were censured by their respective Popes (Giulio by Clement VII and Agostino by Clement VIII) for their forays into unseemly art. The censuring of both artists seems not to have exceeded a papal finger wagging. From Vasari’s comments on the episode, it is inferred that the prints after Giulio’s designs made their way into the hands of high-ranking church officials, in keeping with the tradition of an elite patronage in erotic art. It seems likely that the Lascivie moved in similarly elite circles. Malvasia notes that Ludovico “made a study of the awesome works of Giulio Romano.” With the Carracci’s constant artistic exchange, Ludovico certainly would have shared his knowledge of Giulio Romano’s work with Agostino.

---

143 Malvasia, 2000, 129-130.

144 Marcantonio was not so fortunate. He was made an example and thrown into prison briefly. It seems that Giulio’s drawings, and therefore Giulio, were not deemed criminal, just the engravings, and therefore, the engraver. Talvacchia, 1999, 9. By the time the scandal had emerged in Rome, Giulio had already departed for Mantua to become court artist at the behest of Federico Gonzaga.


146 Both the Modi and the Lascivie would have also been available to less elite circles, even belonging to “lowly” personages. Talvacchia mentions an account in a Venetian document from the end of the sixteenth century that records an incident wherein a soldier vaunting his collection of erotic prints, mentions that he had procured some of them in Saint Mark’s Square on a feast day. Ibid., 10, n. 16.

147 Malvasia, 2000, 83.

148 Because the Lascivie were Agostino’s original designs, he was not obligated to recreate the color and tonal effects of a painting. His simplified hatching and uncomplicated compositions resemble swiftly generated pen sketches, as observed by
Marcantonio were ideal artistic figures for Agostino to emulate, for Giulio had been the heir to his master Raphael’s shop and its legacy of commercial printing. He was a darling of the Renaissance:

There was no one who imitated Raphael more closely in style, invention, design, and coloring than Giulio Romano, nor was there anyone among them better grounded, bolder, more confident, inventive, versatile, prolific, and well-rounded, not to mention for the present time that he was extremely gentle in conversation, jovial, affable, gracious, and absolutely abounding in manners. These attributes caused him to be well-loved by Raphael, who could not have loved him more had he been his son.149

Vasari’s laudations of Giulio are similar to the praise heaped upon Agostino, especially in regard to their comments concerning the respective artists’ congenial dispositions and shared adeptness in imitation:

…how noble in character was Agostino Carracci, how gentle in action, graceful in speaking, amusing in conversation, grave in discourse, flexible in disputes, subtle in questioning, how copious in inventions, clever in their arrangement, and ingenious in perfecting them, how courteous in teaching, modest in correcting, loyal and indefatigable in serving patrons, and equally excellent at drawing, engraving and painting.150

Marcantonio, a native son of Bologna, had been the most celebrated engraver of his day, mostly for his reproductive work.151 His prints reached far and wide, including

DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 42. This unpolished rendering could have been a conscious effort on the part of Agostino to evoke the original drawings by Giulio Romano that spawned the *Modi*.


150 From Lucio Faberio’s funeral oration; quoted in Malvasia, 2000, 198.

151 Marcantonio also trained as a goldsmith, apprenticing in the shop of Francesco Francia in Bologna, where he became an established printmaker before moving on to Rome. Marcantonio’s work as a reproductive engraver was pivotal in disseminating knowledge of ideal art forms and the classical styles of figures like Michelangelo and Raphael to subsequent generations, including Agostino. See Elizabeth Broun, “The Portable Raphael,” in *The Engravings of Marcantonio Raimondi*, ed. Elizabeth Broun
Agostino’s own collection. Their popularity is denoted by the poor quality many of the prints display indicating the overuse and subsequent erosion of the plates. Vasari commented that, “Our arts are much indebted to Marc’Antonio, in that he made a beginning with engraving in Italy, to the advantage and profit of art and to the convenience of her followers…”\textsuperscript{152} In emulating Giulio and Marcantonio, Agostino became an heir (although once-removed) to the legacy of Raphael.

Both Giulio and Marcantonio were known for their \textit{all’antica} style wherein antique models were fluidly translated into modern compositions.\textsuperscript{153} Battista Armenini commented that Giulio’s “style so closely conformed to the ancient sculptures of Rome because he had studied them most intensely all through his youth; so that whatever he set down and gave shape to seemed to be culled from them.”\textsuperscript{154} Although I \textit{modi} appear devoid of a classical context due, for example, to the absence of satyrs, nymphs, and other Ovidian characters, they are culled from antique prototypes, a feature which Agostino would have recognized. A knowledge of the sex manuals of the ancient Greeks and Romans, with their descriptive cataloguing of copulation, had survived into the

\hspace{1cm}(Lawrence, KS: Spencer Museum of Art, 1981), 20-46. Also, see Malvasia, 1841, I, 57-64 for the entry on Marcantonio Raimondi and see Lisa Pon, Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004). For Francesco Francia, see Malvasia, 1841, I, 43-50.


Renaissance. Astyanassa, fabled servant of Helen of Troy, was acknowledged as the architect of the genre, her name being associated with a text known in the Renaissance (but not extant) as *On the Postures for Intercourse*. The genre became synonymous with the Greek poetess Elephantis, whose sex manuals were purportedly replete with instructional images. Another source of ancient erotica available in the Renaissance was found in numismatics. The first treatises on the subject were published by the second decade of the sixteenth century. Coins and medals revealed aspects of ancient culture, including the names of famous men and their families, the iconography of the gods, and the appearance of lost and ruined monuments. One type of these ancient medals depicted couples engaged in intercourse and was known as *spintria*, a term that stemmed from the Latin for “male prostitute,” *spinthria* (Fig. 47). The numismatist Sebastiano Erizzo, expounding on the ill behavior of the emperor Tiberius, guides his readers to ancient medals as valuable tools and equates medals to printed matter, the medals being imprinted with an image and produced serially (not unlike a set of erotic prints). He says:

---


156 Elephantis means “ivory.” The manuals of Elephantis were known by name and subject matter only, since no original text survived into the Renaissance.

157 Martial mentioned Elephantis’s manuals in the *Priapea*, which was in circulation in the sixteenth century. See Talvacchia, 1999, 53. Ovid perpetuated the tradition of Elephantis in his *Ars amatoria*, Book III, in which he enumerated various sexual positions for women of various body types.

158 Examples of treatises include Leonardo da Porto’s 1516 *De sestertio* and Andrea Fulvio’s 1517 *Illustrium imagines*, both published in Rome.

159 In the sixteenth century, *spintriae* came to be interpreted as allusions to salacious sexual misconduct, the location of such activities, or the individuals who engaged in them. For an overview on *spintriae*, see Talvacchia, 1997, 94-99.
“In such medals, as in published books, all manner of lewdness carried out at the behest of Tiberius on the island of Capri is made known to posterity.”\textsuperscript{160} The 1528 inventory of Giulio Romano’s belongings cites one box filled with thirty medals and another with eleven leaden items with figures and heads impressed upon them. Vasari wrote, “Giulio, who was a most universal talent, knew how to converse about everything, but above all about medals. He spent much money and a lot of time to gain expertise about them.”\textsuperscript{161} Agostino, too, had a collection of medals that was used for study in the Carracci Academy. The knowledge these men had of these ancient artifacts, in their possession and elsewhere, was transposed to their art. The \textit{spintriae} specifically provided a valuable model for subject matter and composition.\textsuperscript{162}

Certain mechanical processes of their art allowed engravers in particular to work in another \textit{all’antica} mode. The respective tools of the engraver and the celebrated

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{160} Sebastiano Erizzo, \textit{Dichiaratione di medaglie antiche} (Venice, 1559); quoted in Talvacchia, 1999, 191-192. Also, see Talvacchia, 1997, 95.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{162} Talvacchia, 1999, 63. Pirro Ligorio, a Bolognese antiquarian (who was also one of the scholars who advised Paleotti on his \textit{Discorso}), wrote extensively on Roman coins and recorded the contents of great collections, like those of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese and Fulvio Orsini. In his \textit{Antichità romane} (probably written between 1571 and 1583), Ligorio makes the earliest known reference to \textit{spintriae}:

It is necessary at least to note, but not to illustrate, all the medals of Tiberius, because many are found to display lascivious acts along with the number of the act…it pleased him to make a public display of all the acts engaged by having them engraved on small coins. He must have given these as a tease and as a tip to his sexual partners…And he used them to kindle his lust by watching them, wherefore he called them his \textit{spintriae}, from the verb \textit{spintir}, which means to light or ignite.

sculptor were equated with one another—the Latin term *caelum* referred to both the chisel and the burin. Some engravers sought to endow their prints with a mien of antique sculpture. Marcantonio Raimondi, for example, abraded the surface of his plates with a volcanic stone in order to attain a subtle tonal range of grays and in order to pit the surface of the subsequent print so that it would evoke its stony ancient sculptural prototypes. Engravers, thus, could elevate their modern designs by associating them with classical sculpture.  

With all of Agostino’s purposeful study of art, he surely was aware of this technique, and perhaps even practiced it himself.

Giulio Romano, as the heir to Raphael’s shop and his precepts, and Marcantonio Raimondi, as the disseminator of ideal art forms through his prints, became pivotal sources for Agostino. The facility and fluidity with which these preceding masters practiced their art and utilized the *all’antica* mode, made them fitting models not only for the *Lascivie*, but also for the classicization and ideal style found in the Farnese Gallery frescoes.

---

163 See Madeleine Viljoen, “Prints and False Antiquities in the Age of Raphael,” *Print Quarterly* 21 (Sep. 2004): 235 and 244.

164 During the purported period of the *Lascivie*, Agostino’s drawings evince a discernable enthusiasm for ancient and Renaissance sculpture (Fig. 48). DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 43.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE FARNESE GALLERY

The fresco cycle of the Farnese Gallery ceiling (c. 1597-1600) is most often cited as the pinnacle of the Carracci’s reformed style, and the saving grace of Roman painting with Annibale credited as its savior. Its all’antica style, its adept assimilation of past masters into a modern and novel scheme, and its conversant use of Ovid’s Metamorphoses and other literary sources as subject matter are used to applaud Annibale’s bravura and his achievement in perfecting the Carracci’s artistic philosophy and practice. Yet Agostino’s prints, in particular the Lascivie, realized all of these feats prior to the invention of the celebrated Farnese Gallery frescoes. It is in Agostino’s prints and in his erudition that one finds the sources for these ingenious frescoes.

A Brief Introduction to the Farnese Palace

Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (later Pope Paul III)\textsuperscript{165} began the construction of the Palazzo Farnese in 1517 (Fig. 49) Upon his ascendancy to the papacy in 1534, he embarked on a series of renovations and expansions to ensure that the palace was a befitting symbol of the Pontifex Maximus and a befitting residence for his family in

\textsuperscript{165} It was Pope Paul III Farnese who convened the first meeting of the Council of Trent in 1545. For more information on the Farnese family, see Helge Gamrath, Farnese: Pomp, Power and Politics in Renaissance Italy (Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2007).
Rome. Over the years, a number of preeminent architects contributed to the design of the palace, including Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, Michelangelo, Vignola, and Giacomo della Porta. The retral Gallery overlooks the palace garden and the Tiber just beyond it. The stately room measures approximately sixty-six feet long and twenty-one feet wide. At its apex, the barrel-vaulted ceiling reaches just over thirty-two feet tall.

---

166 The palace, in the vicinity of the Campo de’ Fiori, overlooks the Piazza Farnese in the front and the banks of the Tiber in the rear. The construction of the palace, including the exterior, was not completed until 1589. The Farnese purchased the Chigi’s villa just on the other side of the Tiber from the Farnese Palace, which subsequently became known as the Farnesina. The Farnesina contains frescoes by Raphael and Giulio Romano that influenced the decoration of the Farnese Gallery. See below.

167 Antonio da Sangallo the Younger studied under Bramante. Vignola (Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola) and his student, Giacomo della Porta, were the primary architects of the Church of the Gesù in Rome (a project funded by another Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, the grandson of Pope Paul III), the façade of which is often distinguished as the first example of truly Baroque architecture. Vignola was in service to Francis I at Fontainebleau and the young architect assisted Primaticcio with his massive mould-making project in 1540. On Vignola’s return to Bologna, he designed the Palazzo Bocchi, which not only functioned as Achille Bocchi’s residence, but also housed his Accademia Bocchiana, which enjoyed the auspices of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. Agostino’s master, Prospero Fontana, is said to have executed the frescoes in the meeting room of the Palazzo Bocchi. For more information, see Marcus Kiefer, Emblematische Strukturen in Stein: Vignolas Palazzo Bocchi in Bologna (Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 1999) and Watson, 1993, 54-63. Bartolomeo Passerotti’s first biographer, Borghini, reported that Vignola was the artist’s first master. In addition, Prospero Fontana, who is said to have taught both Ludovico and Agostino, collaborated with Vignola on the Villa Giulia. See Ghirardi, 1990, 28 and 30. For more information on the Farnese Palace, see “La construction et la decoration du Palais Farnèse,” in Le Palais Farnèse, vol. I, École française de Rome (Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1981), 127-328, especially the sections on Sangallo, Michelangelo, Vignola, and Giacomo della Porta.

168 The architecture of the Gallery is ultimately determined by the preexisting architectural features of the façade. The three large windows governed the placement of the system of pilasters and niches along the walls, which in turn determined the placement of the frescoes on the ceiling. For more information, see Martin, 1965, 8 and 70.
The Gallery showcased part of the Farnese collection of ancient sculpture. The niches lining the walls housed ten full-length statues and six busts.\textsuperscript{169}

**The Carracci Commission**

The Carracci, already eminent masters, were invited to Rome by Cardinal Odoardo Farnese who originally intended for them to decorate the palace’s *sala grande* with a cycle celebrating the achievements of Alessandro Farnese.\textsuperscript{170} Agostino and Annibale made a preliminary journey to Rome, probably late in 1594, to assess the assignment and finalize the contract with the cardinal.\textsuperscript{171} They then returned to Bologna,

\textsuperscript{169} The Farnese’s collection of antiquities, which included gems and coins, was one of the largest in all of Rome and the result of purchasing preexisting collections, including those of the Chigi, the Rossi, the Colonna, the Sassi, and the Buffali. Martin has attempted to identify the ten full-length statues once housed in the niches: on the long windowless east wall were *Satyr and Infant Dionysos, Antinous, Apollo, Hermes, Dionysos, Satyr and Infant Dionysos*; on the long west wall were *Ganymede and the Eagle, The so-called Antonia, Draped Female Figure*, and *Eros*. Martin, 1965, 69.


\textsuperscript{170} Ludovico declined the Cardinal’s invitation and remained in Bologna. Although the Farnese court in Parma had known of the Carracci since the 1580’s, they were not the first candidates considered for the decoration of the Gallery. Odoardo initially considered the Alberti brothers, who were admired for their keen ability in illusionistic painting on ceilings. See Posner, 1971, 77.

\textsuperscript{171} The conjecture of this timeline was based on a letter by Odoardo dated February, 1595 in which he discusses his plans for the *sala grande*. See Hans Tietze, “Annibale Carracci’s Gallerie im Palazzo Farnese und seine römische Werkstätte,” *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 26 (1906-07): 54 and 57 and Martin, 1965, 13. During this preliminary visit to Rome, the *Lascivie* would still have been current in Agostino’s mind and undoubtedly influenced the eventual schema of the Gallery.
no doubt to fulfill their obligations to other patrons before they began their lengthy term with the Farnese. A letter from Duke Ranuccio Farnese to his brother Odoardo dated November 8, 1595, referring to Annibale as “your painter,” establishes the artist’s residency at the palace by this date.\textsuperscript{172} Agostino probably did not join Annibale in Rome until sometime in 1597.\textsuperscript{173} From what scant information is available, it is gathered that the Carracci began painting the vault of the Farnese Gallery in 1598,\textsuperscript{174} after Agostino’s

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[173] Martin comes to this conclusion by piecing together that Agostino’s engraved portrait of Ulisse Aldrovandi must have been executed in Bologna in 1596, since the print broadcasts Aldrovandi’s age as seventy-four (he was born in 1522). In addition, the Farnese archives indicate that in October of 1597 Agostino was compensated for a portrait of Duke Ranuccio stating that, “he…presented [it] to Cardinal Farnese.” Parma, Archivio di Stato, Mastri Farnesiani, c. 286; quoted in Martin, 1965, 14. It is assumed that Agostino delivered the said portrait upon his arrival in Rome. During the interim period between Annibale’s arrival at the Farnese Palace and Agostino’s arrival nearly two years later, Annibale executed paintings for the ceiling of the Camerino Farnese. See discussion below.
\item[174] The Farnese archives are silent when it comes to any documentary evidence regarding the Farnese Gallery project. One reason a commencement date of 1598 was suggested is that the date is painted below one of Agostino’s frescoes, the \textit{Glaucus and Scylla/Peleus and Thetis} panel. See Giuliano Briganti, André Chastel, and Roberto Zapperi, \textit{Gli amori degli dei: Nuove indagini sulla Galleria Farnese} (Rome: Edizioni dell’Elefante, 1987), 32. Despite the decades that have passed since the publication of Martin’s book, scholars agree, for the most part, with his timeline regarding the Gallery’s decoration. Briganti, Chastel, and Zapperi, however, do argue for a slightly different timeline, one that serves to diminish Agostino’s length of service at the palace, and therefore probably his influence. See Briganti, Chastel, and Zapperi, 1987, 31-36. Even if Agostino had spent very little time in Rome, it certainly could have been time enough for him to guide his brother through the complicated conceits which, as I will argue, he formulated for the Gallery. Also of interest, although they make no mention of the Farnese Gallery project, are the financial records of the Farnese Palace. See École française de Rome, \textit{Le Palais Farnèse} (Rome: École française de Rome, 1980), vol. 3 pt. 1, \textit{Le Palais Farnèse à Travers les Documents Financiers (1535-1612)}, by François-Charles Uginet.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
purported arrival. The decoration of the Gallery seems to have been executed in three phases: first, the vault was painted, followed by the Perseus frescoes on the two short walls, and then, the frescoes on the lateral walls and the caryatids below the Perseus frescoes. The vault decoration was most likely concluded in 1600, a date substantiated by the numerals MDC, which are inscribed beneath the *Polyphemus and Galatea* fresco. This termination date is congruous with the departure of Agostino (whose two frescoes were among the last to be painted) for Duke Ranuccio Farnese’s court at Parma in July of 1600.

The ceiling frescoes (Fig. 50) and their locations are as follows: *Bacchus and Ariadne* (Fig. 51) runs down the spine of the vault and is flanked by *Pan and Diana* (Fig. 52) and by *Mercury and Paris* (Fig. 53); *Polyphemus and Acis* (Fig. 54) is located in the coving of the vault’s short north wall; Just opposite this panel on the south wall is *Polyphemus and Galatea* (Fig. 55); Agostino’s fresco, *Aurora and Cephalus* (Fig. 56) is

---

175 I would argue that Agostino was so integral to the realization of the Farnese Gallery vault, that Annibale could not begin work until his brother’s arrival.

176 Martin notes that the first phase of the decoration was a swift proceeding sustained by “an extraordinary surge of creative energy.” Martin, 1965, 51. This energy, as I see it, is the result of Agostino’s hand in the project. There were lengthy interruptions between the completion of the vault decorations and the start of the second phase of painting as well as between the completion of the second phase and the start of the third phase of painting. These interruptions, however, occurred long after Agostino’s departure, and even, after his death. The accepted termination date for the decoration of the entire Gallery is 1608. The second and third phases of painting are out of the scope of this paper and will not be discussed.

177 Tietze suggested that the MDC inscription commemorated the marriage of Duke Ranuccio to Margherita Aldobrandini (niece of Pope Clement VIII, Agostino’s rebuker) which took place in May 1600, the preparations for which had already begun in 1597. Tietze, 1906-07, 125. Such a commemoration was appropriate in the Gallery, since love and marriage are dominant themes in the frescoes. See below.
centrally placed in the coving along the extended west wall of the Gallery; On the east wall, just opposite this panel, is Agostino’s *Glaucus and Scylla/Peleus and Thetis*\(^{178}\) (Fig. 57). Both compositions are second only to the *Bacchanal* in their size and even in their central placement. The frieze consists of a series of painted fictive bronze medallions, stony atlas herms, fruited garlands, masks, shells, and *putti* and *ignudi* painted *al naturale* interspersed between painted panels. The panels on the east wall, flanking Agostino’s marine scene, are *Jupiter and Juno* (Fig. 58) and *Diana and Endymion* (Fig. 59). On the west wall, *Hercules and Iole* (Fig. 60) and *Venus and Anchises* (Fig. 61) flank Agostino’s *Aurora and Cephalus*.\(^{179}\) The frescoes are rendered as *quadri riportati* (literally “transferred pictures”) so that they seem as if they were framed easel paintings that have been transferred and affixed to the architecture of the ceiling.

At the south and north ends of the vault are *Polyphemus and Galatea* (Fig. 55) and *Polyphemus and Acis* (Fig. 54), respectively, both of which come from an episode in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (XIII.738-897) when Galatea is giving Scylla an account of her trials and tribulations. The scene follows Ovid’s text very closely, even including the fiery Mount Aetna mentioned by the poet. Polyphemus’s forceful kinetic pose as he readies himself to catapult the rock that will strike Acis looks like Agostino’s satyr from *A Satyr Whipping a Nymph* (Fig. 35), especially in the arm drawn in front of his chest. Polyphemus is also the mirror image of Agostino’s Orpheus from *Orpheus and Eurydice*

\(^{178}\) The varying identifications of this fresco will be discussed below.

\(^{179}\) For a detailed description of the frescoes, see Martin, 1965, 69-126.
(Fig. 10), but instead of gripping a rock like Acis, Orpheus clings to his wife.\textsuperscript{180} The turn of their heads, the position of their arms, their musculature, and even their fluttering mantles are all extraordinarily similar. Annibale’s Polyphemus is said to exhibit the influence of Michelangelo and antique sculpture.\textsuperscript{181} Agostino’s Orpheus, conceived years earlier, displays a similar influence. In the scene of Polyphemus wooing Galatea, Acis is nowhere to be found. This depiction adheres more closely to Philostratus’s account in his \textit{Imagines} (II.18):

\begin{quote}
...for he loves Galatea, who is sporting here on the sea, and he watches her from the mountainside...The nymph sports on the peaceful sea, driving a team of four dolphins yoked together and working in harmony; and maiden-daughters of Triton, Galatea’s servants, guide them...She holds over her head against the wind a light scarf of sea purple to provide a shade for herself and a sail for her chariot...
\end{quote}

If Agostino’s print from the \textit{Lascivie} is meant to depict Galatea sailing the peaceful sea (Fig. 15), then it, too, seems to adhere more closely to Philostratus. She holds the presumably purple mantle above her head to catch the wind, although her Nereid servants have turned into \textit{putti} and the four dolphin engines have been pared down to two.

The largest fresco, \textit{The Triumph of Bacchus and Ariadne} (Fig. 51), dominates the space by way of its size and central placement on the vault.\textsuperscript{183} Bellori tells us in his

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{180} The figures’ left legs, rather than being mirror images of one another, are nearly identical in their pose and placement.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{181} See Martin, 1965, 110.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{183} Drawings indicate that Annibale at first did not intend for the \textit{Bacchus and Ariadne} to be the central fresco. Martin, 1965, 200. One drawing places an abbreviated version of
lengthy ekphrasis that, “Bacchus returning victorious from India found Ariadne abandoned by Theseus. Inflamed by her beauty he chose her as his wife, as we see her now in this painting.”\textsuperscript{184} The Bacchanalian procession reads like an ancient sarcophagus frieze, and while Annibale surely drew upon the motifs of Dionysian sarcophagi, the fresco bears a resemblance to a preparatory drawing by Perino del Vaga of the \textit{Triumph of Bacchus} (Fig. 65). The drawing had been requested by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese for the so-called \textit{Cassetta Farnese} and resided in the Farnese collection, managed by Fulvio Orsini, the Farnese’s librarian.\textsuperscript{185}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{184} Bellori, 1968, 34-35. One of the flying \textit{amoretti} crowns Ariadne with her starry diadem, mentioned in Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses} (VII.178-183): “…Bacchus swept her up in his arms and came to her rescue. ‘My star,’ he declared, ‘you must shine forever!’ Removing the crown from her forehead, he launched it skyward. It whirled and spun through the air, and during its flight the gems were changed into brilliant fires, coming to rest once more in the shape of a jeweled circlet between the Kneeler and bright \textit{Ophiúcus}…” Trans. David Raeburn, (London: Penguin Group, 2004). Ludovico produced a \textit{Bacchus and Ariadne} (c. 1592) for Agostino’s poet friend, Cesare Rinaldi, but the painting lacks the dynamism and erotic intrigue of that in the Farnese Gallery (Fig. 64).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{185} Martin, 1965, 118. For a discussion of Fulvio Orsini, see below. Martin also notes that the drawing was engraved by Giorgio Ghisi and Marcantonio Raimondi and that the prints were widely circulated. He goes on to assert that it was Fulvio Orsini who recommended the drawing to Annibale to use as a guide. I would assert that it was Agostino who recommended the use of the drawing as a compositional and thematic guide. Agostino would have known the work of Perino del Vaga, Giorgio Ghisi (as stated
The octagonal fresco of *Pan and Diana* (Fig. 52), a myth not often depicted in art, is situated to the left of the *Bacchanal*. The episode comes from Virgil’s *Georgics* with which Agostino was surely conversant: “With such snowy wool for dower, if belief be deigned, Pan the god of Arcady ensnared thee, O Moon, in his treachery, when he called thee into the depth of woodland and thou didst not scorn his call.” Pan is reminiscent of Agostino’s robust satyrs from the *Lascivie*. Even the simplified landscape evokes those found in Agostino’s prints. The same can be said of the landscape in *Mercury and Paris* (situated to the right of the *Bacchanal*) (Fig. 53), which depicts an episode from Book X of Apuleius’s *Golden Ass* wherein Mercury descends from the heavens to deliver the golden apple that Paris must award to the most beautiful of Mount Olympus’s goddesses.

*Jupiter and Juno* (Fig. 58), to the left of Agostino’s marine scene, depicts the divine couple’s marital bed. Elements of this overtly sexual fresco resemble elements earlier, both of these artists were involved in the production of erotic prints), and Marcantonio through his own work as an engraver and through his collecting of prints. This seems even more likely when it is revealed that Annibale’s *Bacchanal* evolved slowly through various preliminary studies and that the final composition was settled upon only after these various studies were modified and discarded. Martin, 1965, 120. Also, see Feigenbaum, 1999, 159. If the use of the drawing had been Fulvio’s idea, it seems odd that he would not have submitted it to Annibale at an earlier stage in the preparation. Also, Bellori identifies the lolling *repousoir* figure on the right as “the Common or Earthly Venus” and “beside her is Impure Love.” These are protagonists Agostino had delightfully depicted, with all their inherent meaning, in the *Lascivie*. In the fresco, Bellori sees the Venus’s proximity to Silenus as the clever “correspondence between drunkenness and lust.” Bellori, 1968, 36. On an amusing note, Bellori insisted that Agostino served as the live model for the corpulent Silenus depicted in the fresco.

---


187 For information of Agostino Carracci’s landscapes, see Whitfield, in *Les Carrache et les décors profanes*, 1988, 73-95.
from the *Lascivie*, especially the charged sensuality. The cave-like drapery surrounding the bed is quite similar to that in both *The Satyr Mason* and *Ogni cosa vince l’oro* (Figs. 41 and 42). The beds in all three images are strikingly similar, especially the angle at which they are presented. The simple inclusion of a window or threshold in each of the scenes serves to enhance their readability as interior settings. Jupiter is in almost the reverse pose of Agostino’s *Hesione/Andromeda* (particularly his legs) (Fig. 14) as he sits on the cushy bed coaxing Juno onto the cool silky sheets. Juno’s pose seems to be a derivative of the woman’s pose in *Ogni cosa vince l’oro*: the knee propped up on the bed has been reversed and she coyly turns away rather than exposing herself to the gaze of the viewer.

Pausanias, in his description of Elis, mentions the shepherd Endymion and the moon goddess who swooned over him writing that, “The Moon, they say, fell in love with Endymion and bore him fifty daughters.” The myth would have been well known to Annibale through antique sarcophagi, yet he made no use of this prototype in composing his *Diana and Endymion* (Fig. 59) fresco (situated to the right of Agostino’s *Glaucus and Scylla/Peleus and Thetis*). In fact, the composition evokes Agostino’s *A Satyr Approaching a Sleeping Nymph* (Fig. 28). The *putto* under the cover of the brush holds his finger to his lips in the same “hushing” gesture as Agostino’s satyr. Endymion’s pose is quite similar to the slumbering nymph’s. Both compositions include mantles that

---

188 Pausanias, *Description of Greece* (V.1.4), 1918. It is in Pausanias’s entry on the Eleans that he describes the depiction of Eros and Anteros, with which Agostino was undoubtedly familiar.

189 Martin, 1965, 91.
envelop and protect the bodies of the respective figures from the damp ground. The landscapes in the two images read closely: the figures are propped up against the terrain creating a shallow foreground and a flattened composition, the foliage in the respective images is rendered in a similar fashion, and even the shallow screen of the sky with striations of clouds extending across the top of the respective compositions is almost identical. The napping dog curled up at Endymion’s side looks like an enlarged version of the unconcerned dog licking himself in *Ogni cosa vince l’oro*, particularly the shape of his head and muzzle and the distinct pattern of silky fur on his ears and tail.

Bellori describes the *Hercules and Iole* fresco (Fig. 60) thus:

> What force can resist love? Observe Hercules draped effeminately in the golden mantle of his lover Iole seated beside him. With his right hand the conqueror of monsters shakes the round, lascivious timbrel and turns toward her...In this myth Annibale followed the description that Tasso, that marvelous artist, presented in poetry: he had Amore gaze at Hercules from the loggia and laugh and point with his hand at the strong hero, effeminized and conquered.  

Bellori is referring to Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* (Canto XVI.3) which states, “...he who had once conquered Hell and ruled the stars now twirls a spindle; and Love looks and laughs. Here Iole is seen, her armless hand wielding the murderous weapons in contempt; her shoulders show a lion’s hide, which seems too rough and rude for such fine, tender limbs.” It is important to note that Agostino illustrated a 1590

---

190 Martin points out that Endymion’s pose shares a “clear reminiscence” with the *Venus and Adonis* fresco in Cardinal Bibbiena’s bathroom, which was engraved by both Marcantonio Raimondi and Agostino Veneziano. Martin, 1965, 91. Certainly Agostino was familiar with the engravings. Perhaps it was his suggestion to refer to them in the composition of the Farnese fresco.

191 Bellori, 1968, 44.

192 Trans. Joseph Tusiani (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press, 1970), 338. Martin notes that Hercules’s spindle has here become a tambourine, meant to allude to
edition of the *Gerusalemme Liberata* and undoubtedly knew the text well, perhaps even referred to it in the planning stages of this fresco. The smirking winged Amor behind the couple resembles the winged Amor from *Ogni cosa vincit l’oro*, with his curly locks, mischievous smile, and curved bow. It seems that Annibale modeled his brawny Hercules after the *Farnese Hercules*\(^\text{193}\) (Fig. 67).

The *Venus and Anchises* (Fig. 61) is evocative of Agostino’s *Nymph, Putto, and Small Satyr* (Fig. 38) with the slung-leg pose of Venus,\(^\text{194}\) Anchises’s preoccupation with her feet, and the rocky landscape beyond the threshold, which is uncannily similar to the crags found in the print. More telling is a pen-and-ink drawing correctly attributed to Agostino that served as a preliminary nude study for Anchises (Fig. 68). The drawing is rendered in Agostino’s typical expressive style with its hatching and cross-hatching, befitting an engraver.\(^\text{195}\) Agostino often drew with pen and ink, unlike Annibale, who preferred chalk, although in this particular drawing, Agostino applied the ink over an initial, very general rendering in red chalk.\(^\text{196}\) The final fresco does indeed differ from the sketch. In the drawing, Anchises is completely nude, save the sandal on his right foot, the one carried by Voluptas in the *Choice of Hercules* from the Camerino Farnese (Fig. 66). The tambourine thus refers to Hercules’s sensual passions. Martin, 1965, 91.

\(^{193}\) Martin, 1965, 91. The *Farnese Hercules* was also well known through engravings.

\(^{194}\) The slung-leg position was a common metaphor for the sex act.

\(^{195}\) James Byam Shaw, *Drawings by Old Masters at Christ Church Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 246. Prior to Shaw’s attribution, the drawing was thought to be by Annibale, but it is closer in technique to Agostino, as well as in its heightened sensuality, a characteristic that Annibale tried to diminish in the finished frescoes of the Gallery.

whereas in the fresco, he is demurely covered with a golden mantle. Also, in the final fresco Anchises is removing Venus’s sandal, rather than peeling off her silky stocking as he does in the drawing. Venus’s heel sensuously grazes Anchises’s inner thigh in the drawing, rather than inelegantly floating between Anchises’s legs as it does in the fresco.\textsuperscript{197} It has been suggested that beyond designing this fresco, Agostino was its primary painter. The panel’s proximity to Agostino’s \textit{Cephalus and Aurora} as well as its cool gray coloring (which resembles the coloring in both of Agostino’s other Farnese Gallery frescoes) prompt this conclusion.\textsuperscript{198} The literary sources for the scene also reinforce Agostino’s authorship. The stool on which Venus rests her foot is inscribed “GENUS UNDE LATINUM” (“Whence came the Latin race”), taken from Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid} (I.6), which Bellori suggests was intended to allude to “the Roman forebears of the Farnese family.”\textsuperscript{199} Because Agostino was skilled in Latin and because the Carracci had depicted scenes from the \textit{Aeneid} in the Palazzo Fava that included Latin inscriptions, it is likely that Agostino was responsible for this playful reference.\textsuperscript{200} The depiction itself is in keeping with the account given in the \underline{Homeric Hymn} to Aphrodite (V.145-170):

\begin{quote}
But upon Aphrodite herself Zeus cast sweet desire to be joined in love with a
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{197} It seems Annibale regularly altered Agostino’s designs during the course of the decoration of the Farnese Gallery in an effort to diminish the overt eroticism. See below.

\textsuperscript{198} Shaw, 1976, 246. The hypothesis pertaining to the authorship of the fresco has also been supported through the “relative lack of animation” that Agostino’s facial types exhibit here “in comparison with Annibale’s characters.” Clare Robertson and Catherine Whistler, \underline{Drawings by the Carracci in British Collections}, exh. cat. (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1996), 90.

\textsuperscript{199} Bellori, 1968, 43.

\textsuperscript{200} Robertson and Whistler, 1996, 90. They also suggest that Agostino was responsible for the Latin inscriptions in the Palazzo Fava.
mortal man, to the end that…not even she should be innocent of a mortal’s love…And so he put in her heart sweet desire for Anchises who…was…in shape like the immortal gods…Now when Anchises saw her, he…was seized with love…And laughter-loving Aphrodite, with face turned away and lovely eyes downcast, crept to the well-spread couch which was already laid in soft coverings for the hero; and upon it lay skins of bears and deep-roaring lions…And when they had gone up upon the well-fitted bed, first Anchises took off her bright jewelry of pins and twisted brooches and earrings and necklaces, and loosed her girdle and stripped off her bright garments and laid them down upon a silver-studded seat.201

Again, it is in keeping with Agostino as il dotto to not only know the text of the Homeric Hymn, but to model a composition after it as well. The scene also uses as a source Marcantonio’s engraving of the Marriage of Alexander and Roxana after the drawing by Raphael.202

To the left of the Venus and Anchises is Agostino’s Aurora and Cephalus (Fig. 56), the second largest fresco on the vault (along with Agostino’s opposite facing panel). The scene is derived from an episode in Ovid (Metamorphoses VII.694-713):

---


202 Dempsey, 1968, 368. Raphael’s drawing apparently served as the source for Sodoma’s fresco in the Farnesina, just across from the Farnese palace. Annibale undoubtedly saw the Farnesina fresco, but it also seems likely that Agostino knew and even possibly owned the engraving by Marcantonio, and that it was his suggestion to use it as a playful reference in Venus and Anchises. The Marriage of Alexander and Roxana was modeled after a passage from Lucian’s Herodotus or Aetion (VI.143-151) in which he describes an ancient Greek painting depicting Alexander and Roxana in their wedding chamber. Dempsey, 1968, 368, n. 41. Calvesi also observes that the composition of Venus and Anchises is drawn from Raphael’s drawing of The Marriage of Alexander and Roxana (which he notes was known through engravings by Caraglio), particularly in the detail of Venus’s braided hair. See Maurizio Calvesi, “Note ai Carracci,” Commentari 7 (1956): 275. It is interesting to note that Venus shares a similar braided coiffure with Agostino’s Aurora in the adjacent fresco. For more information on the comparison between the Farnesina and the Farnese Gallery, see Charles Dempsey, “La galerie des Carrache,” in Le Palais Farnèse, 1981, vol. I, 269-311, especially 295-296.
…Aurora, the goddess of dawn, caught sight of me there in the saffron light of the morning and forced me away to the sky…For all the charm of her blushing face, although she controls the frontiers of night and day,…Procris remained my adored one, Procris was there in my heart and the name of Procris was always upon my lips. I constantly spoke of our wedding rites, of the joys of love when a man and his bride are first united, our marriage so new and fresh, and now already forsaken…Aurora herself was scarcely a model of chaste behavior…203

The world has gone awry in this tale of unrequited love as Aurora neglects her duty of delivering daybreak in her fervent pursuit of the resistant and already married Cephalus, whom she tethers to her golden chariot with her unwanted and overzealous embrace. She abandons her aged husband, Tithonus, whose recumbent body is located in the foreground, wrapped in a violet-colored mantle, and in the direct path of the ascending chariot’s wheels.204 There are several extant drawings for this fresco: a rapid pen sketch of Aurora, a chalk study of Tithonus from a live nude model, and lastly, the cartoon205 (Fig. 69). In the cartoon, the putto strewing poppies is seated upon a cloud, rather than flying in an attempt to keep up with the chariot as he does in the fresco. Tithonus’s head, carved details on the chariot, and the placement of the dog’s paws all changed slightly


204 One of the many pictures that adorned the decorative/commemorative column at Agostino’s funeral depicted Cephalus and Aurora. The reference was meant to parallel Agostino’s untimely death that would fix him in the firmament forever. Morello’s account of the funeral states:
…Lionello Spada wanted to provide a picture of his own making…His picture was a graceful depiction of Cephalus being carried off to the heavens by Aurora…who, having lifted him up from the ground, was carrying him away with her toward the chariot…where one saw a large number of cupids variously equipped with flaming torches, arrows, and snares. One of these held a banner fluttering in the wind with the following words written on it: SIC VIRTUS AD SYDERA RAPIT [Thus virtue is swept up to the stars].
Quoted in Malvasia, 2000, 189.

205 The cartoon is on blue paper and was cut up so as to facilitate the transfer of the design onto the ceiling.
from the design of the cartoon to the final fresco. This was most certainly the result of Annibale’s intervention.\footnote{Martin, 1965, 213.}

*Glaucus and Scylla*/Peleus and Thetis (Fig. 57) is the other fresco that is incontestably attributed to Agostino.\footnote{The subject of the fresco has also been identified as Venus Marina, depicting an episode from Book X of Claudian’s “Epithalamium de Nuptiis Honorii Augusti” which celebrated the marriage of the Emperor Honorius to Maria. Venus, then, is shown being carried across the sea by Triton to attend the nuptials. Triton’s reward for his labor was the hand of the sea nymph Cymothoë, who might be the figure positioned behind Venus, wrapped in one end of the goddess’s fluttering *flammeum*, or marriage veil. See Miles Chappell, “An Interpretation of Agostino Carracci’s ‘Galatea’ in the Farnese Gallery,” *Studies in Iconography* 2 (1976): 41-65 and Chappell, “Further Observations on Agostino Carracci’s ‘Venus’ in the Farnese Gallery,” *Studies in Iconography* 4 (1978): 161-165. Chappell quotes Claudian at length for the purpose of illustrating what he sees as the visual parallels between Agostino’s fresco and the poem. See Chappell, 1976, 48-50. I, however, fail to see the parallels to which Chappell refers, perhaps due to the fact that he does not proffer any specific examples of these “points of comparison”. Lucio Faberio misidentified the subject as Galatea in his funeral oration for Agostino. Bellori describes it as a scene of Galatea and in 1674, when Pietro Aquila published his engravings of the Farnese Gallery, he identified the subject as Venus and Triton. See Martin, 1965, 106, n. 101 and 102.} Martin believes the subject to be that of Glaucus and Scylla from *Metamorphoses* (XIII.898-968; XIV.1-74), but in Ovid’s text, Glaucus never makes off with Scylla. Circe, in fact, denies Glaucus his true love by adulterating Scylla’s body: her limbs are transformed into hideous beasts and hellhounds before she metamorphoses altogether into a rocky escarpment jutting from the sea. Charles
Dempsey’s identification of the subject as Thetis being carried off to the bridal chamber of Peleus seems more fitting and corresponds better to Ovid’s account of the couple:

…the Carpathian prophet, Proteus, rose from the depths and said to [Peleus]… ‘you shall win the bride you are seeking. All you must do is catch her asleep… Don’t let her elude you by falsely assuming a hundred disguises. Squeeze her firmly until she returns to her normal shape’…Peleus hardly had time to entrap the nymph…when she started to take new shapes, until she saw she was tightly gripped, with her arms stretched out on either side of her body. At last she gave in, as she sighed, ‘You win!’…’ Now she was Thetis for real! The hero fondly embraces her; he had his desire…

The three amoretti gliding across the scene reinforce this reading. The Amor on the right carries a flaming torch, one of Venus’s attributes and meant to symbolize her

---

208 Ovid, Metamorphoses (XI.221-265), trans. David Raeburn, 2004. See Charles Dempsey, “Two ‘Galateas’ by Agostino Carracci Re-Identified,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 29 (1966): 67-70. Dempsey’s identification is fitting, but since it is difficult to read the fresco in the area around Glaucus/Peleus (namely the mysterious presence of wing-like fins near his waist and his absence of legs), a definite identification is difficult to confirm. It perhaps could be that Peleus is riding a sea creature or that a Triton is carrying Thetis to Peleus’s house. (These possibilities were brought to my attention by Dr. Frances Van Keuren, University of Georgia, April 27, 2008.) For the duration of the paper, however, the panel will be referred to in terms of its Peleus and Thetis designation. This identification seems appropriate since Agostino painted several scenes in the Palazzo del Giardino depicting various moments from the myth of Peleus and Thetis. See below. Charles Dempsey, however, later retracted his Peleus and Thetis argument in favor of Chappell’s identification of the panel as Venus and Triton. He explains that because the putto’s arrow, Venus’s own arrow, is aimed at the breast of the main female figure, he at one time thought that she could not be Venus, and therefore he argued that the figure was indeed Thetis. See Dempsey, 1981, 305-306 and Dempsey, Annibale Carracci: The Farnese Gallery, Rome (New York: George Braziller, 1995), 56. He acknowledges that although it is indeed a paradox, it is an appropriate one. I remain unsure as to how it is an appropriate paradox. Dempsey sees Venus here as Love’s conquest, just as she was in the Venus and Anchises panel. This, however, is not relevant to Claudian’s poem, to which Dempsey refers in supporting the Venus and Triton identification. In effect, Dempsey tells us why he once thought that Thetis was a better identification of the figure, but he does not adequately support why identifying the panel as Venus and Triton is more fitting. He does say that because there is a depiction of Venus in the arms of Triton in the Farnesina, it is appropriate that the same subject appear in the Farnese Gallery. Briganti, Chastel, and Zapperi, in their 1987 book, refer to the fresco as Glaucus and Scylla.
uncanny ability to ignite desire in the hearts of gods and mortals alike. The middle Amor has his arrow drawn, ready to strike the breast of the nubile nymph and ignite her desire for Peleus. The Amor on the left shoulders a tight bundle of faggots signifying unity in love.210 The fresco possesses an erotic vigor that is heightened by the conspicuous placement of Peleus’s left hand and by the action of the dolphin that strokes the buttocks of the Amor on his back with his tripartite tail. Both details are meant to allude to the fast-approaching consummation.211

This fresco also deviated from its cartoon212 (Fig. 70). Originally, the torso of the heralding Triton figure was represented in a frontal pose and his right arm extended out in a halting gesture.213 The putto between him and Peleus was removed altogether, and the empty space filled by the coiled tail of a dolphin. The Nereid behind Thetis gazed up at her sister, rather than averting her eyes downward. The gazes of the two putti in the

---

209 See Dempsey, 1966, 67 for the information that follows.

210 Paolo Veronese included a bundle of fasces in his Virtù Coniugali in the Villa Barbaro-Giacomelli at Maser. See Panofsky, 1967, 161, n. 107. Dempsey notes that the items carried by the amoretti are rightly associated with marriage and therefore with Thetis. He too observes that in Ovid, Scylla neither submitted to nor married Glaucus. Dempsey, 1966, 67. He cites the literary source for Thetis’s portage to Peleus’s marriage bed as Valerius Flaccus’s Argonautica (I.130-136).


212 This cartoon, like the other, is on blue paper. Although the design has been completely pricked, the fact that the cartoon survives in an uncut state suggests that an alternative cartoon was used to transfer the design onto the ceiling. See Clare Robertson, “The Gods in Love: The Carracci Cartoons Restored, National Gallery, London, 25 October 1995-14 January 1996,” Renaissance Studies 10 (Jun. 1996): 306.

213 Based on a chalk drawing attributed to Annibale, Mahon asserts that the final pose was Annibale’s invention. See Denis Mahon, “Eclecticism and the Carracci: Further Reflections on the Validity of a Label,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 16 (1953): 337.
foreground were at one time similarly affixed on the wedding party. The torch-bearing
Amor locked eyes with the viewer, rather than looking just beyond him. The Nereid at
the far left was presumably originally portrayed as completely nude, but the drapery that
preserves her modesty was drawn onto a separate sheet of paper and pasted onto the
surviving cartoon. The cartoon also attests that Agostino did not originally intend for a
strategic bit of diaphanous cloth to hinder the grasp of Peleus’s scandalously placed left
hand.

In designing the fresco, Agostino probably looked to friezes from antique
sarcophagi depicting parades of sea monsters and Nereids. He also borrowed from
Raphael’s *Galatea* in the Farnesina (Fig. 71). Thetis’s shapely body, her pose, and
even her facial type seem derived from the *Callipygian Venus* (Fig. 72) which, as part of
the Farnese collection, was housed in the *Sala dei Filosofi*, the room adjacent to the
Gallery. The model for Peleus’s brooding face is said to have come from a bust of

---


215 Ibid.

216 Ibid., 107. The sweeping and rhythmic manner in which Agostino weaves together
the figures in both of his frescoes resembles antique relief sculpture compositions. This
resemblance is reinforced by his choice to depict the action against a flat and

217 See Martin, 1965, 214; Robertson, 1996, 309; and Ostrow, 1966, 346. Agostino’s
fresco is often compared to Raphael’s *Galatea* (which was engraved by Marcantonio) due
to the commonalities in their aquatic subject, the flying *putti*, the horn-blowing Triton, a
Nereid enveloped in the lusty grasp of brutish man/creature, the billowing streams of
drapery, and the *putti* occupying the foreground. Dr. Shelley E. Zuraw would argue that
Agostino’s panel indeed depicts Galatea (University of Georgia, April 27, 2008).

218 Chappell, 1976, 53.
Caracalla that was also in the Farnese Collection\textsuperscript{219} (Fig. 73). It has been suggested that Agostino’s two leftmost Nereids are derived from a pair of nymphs found in Annibale’s painting, \textit{Diana and Callisto} (Fig. 74) and that Agostino imitated them once again in his print, \textit{Omnia vincit Amor}\textsuperscript{220} (Fig. 75). The painting, the print, and even the fresco, are all so close in date that it cannot be said with any certainty who is quoting whom. Annibale could just as easily have been copying the designs Agostino had been preparing for his engraving.\textsuperscript{221}

Although the cycle does not form an explicit narrative, it does possess a unified theme that speaks to the power of love and its ability to topple terrestrial and heavenly order:\textsuperscript{222} The virtuous and virile Hercules becomes an epicene victim of sensual desire; Juno and Jupiter halt their customary marital pettifoggery to submit to their passion; the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{219} Dempsey, 1995, 56.
\bibitem{221} Annibale’s painting and Agostino’s print are both dated from 1599 and the fresco had to be finished by July of 1600. For more information on \textit{Omnia vincit Amor}, see below.
\bibitem{222} See Martin, 1965, 92; Dempsey, 1968; and Dempsey, 1981. It was not unusual for such a monumental cycle to lack a clear unified narrative. Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici (later, Pope Clement VII) expressed his wishes regarding the subjects for his Villa Madama as follows: “I should be pleased if the subjects…were varied, and I do not wish them to be drawn out and continuous. Above all, I desire them to be well-known, so that the painter does not have to add [an inscription]…Subjects from Ovid are to my taste, provided that you make sure to choose the beautiful ones…” Quoted in Clare Robertson, “Ars Vincit Omnia: The Farnese Gallery and Cinquecento Ideas About Art,” \textit{Mélanges de l’École française de Rome, Italie et Méditerranée}, 102 (1990): 14. Marzik challenged the most traditionally accepted readings of the Gallery set forth by Martin and Dempsey in favor of the theory that the fresco cycle, by way of the inclusion of the Farnese’s coats-of-arms, was meant to aggrandize the family, much in the same way as the \textit{sala grande} was intended. See Iris Marzik, \textit{Das Bildprogramm der Galleria Farnese in Rom} (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1986) and Charles Dempsey, review of \textit{Das Bildprogramm der Galleria Farnese in Rom}, by Iris Marzik, in \textit{Burlington Magazine} 129 (Jan. 1987): 34-35.
\end{thebibliography}
goddess of love herself is made a subject in her own dominion; the virginal Diana
abandons her cosmic billet for the love of the mortal Endymion;\textsuperscript{223} Diana descends once
again to the earthly and baser level, tempted by Pan’s love offering of radiant white wool;
Mercury descends to earth to deliver the golden apple to the mortal Paris who, when he
chooses Venus as the most beautiful of the goddesses, creates earthly and heavenly
discord by taking Helen as his prize; Bacchus is the expression of Divine Love that
elevates Ariadne and triumphs over both bestial and human love;\textsuperscript{224} Polyphemus is the
embodiment of bestial and lowly desires, an example of the “most savage beasts [who]
feels love’s emotions;”\textsuperscript{225} Cephalus unwisely rejects Celestial Love in favor of his mortal
bride whose death punctuates the fugacity of earthly desires;\textsuperscript{226} Scylla, too, does not
submit to Divine Love and pays dearly, whereas if the scene depicts Thetis, she
begrudgingly submits to the mortal match chosen for her by the gods.\textsuperscript{227}

\textsuperscript{223} Martin observes an interesting relationship between these four frescoes: the two
northerly frescoes contain submissive females and assertive males; the roles are reversed
in the two more southerly frescoes, wherein the women become the aggressors and the
men their passive quarries. Martin, 1965, 93.

\textsuperscript{224} For an explanation of the Neo-platonic concepts within the fresco and
Neoplatonism in general, see Martin, 1965, 123-124, especially n. 155; Panofsky, 1967,
especially chp. 5; and Ficino, 1985.

\textsuperscript{225} Bellori, 1968, 44.

\textsuperscript{226} Martin, 1965, 105.

\textsuperscript{227} Incidentally, it was at Peleus and Thetis’s wedding feast where the discord
prompting the Judgment of Paris began. If the scene depicts \textit{Venus and Triton}, it is
unclear just how this identification fits into the schema of love conquering all. Perhaps it
is because the Emperor Honorius and his bride were struck by Love’s arrows, resulting in
the wedding to which Venus is traveling.
The pivotal elements of the vault’s allegory are the images located in the four corners: the *Fight for the Palm* (Fig. 76), the *Struggle Under the Wreath* (Fig. 77), the *Struggle for the Torch* (Fig. 78), and the *Union of Sacred and Profane Love* (Fig. 79).

Bellori writes the following:

…it is useful to point out the four cupids painted in realistic colors in the four corners of the Gallery above the cornice, as the whole concept and allegory of the work depend on them. The painter wished to represent with various symbols the strife and the harmony between Heavenly and Common Love, a Platonic division. On the one side he painted Heavenly Love fighting and pulling the hair of Common Love, symbolizing the philosophy and the most holy law taking the palm from vice and holding it high. Therefore in the center of the light glows a wreath of immortal laurel, showing that victory over the irrational appetites elevates man to Heaven. On the other side he symbolized Divine Love taking the torch from Impure Love in order to extinguish it, but Impure Love defends himself and shields it by his side in back. The other two *putti* embracing are Heavenly and Earthly Love and emotions united with reason, of which virtue and human welfare consist. In the fourth angle Anteros is shown taking the palm from Eros in the way in which the Eleans arranged the statues in the *gymnasium*: Anteros felt that he had punished Eros unjustly.\(^{228}\)

If the entire scheme of the Gallery does indeed depend on these four corners, then Agostino must receive due credit for their design and for the invention of the Gallery’s

---

\(^{228}\) Bellori, 1968, 34. Bellori’s interpretation of the Gallery as an exaltation of the triumph of Sacred Love depends on his reading of Eros and Anteros in the Neo-platonic sense, that is, Divine and Earthly Love. See Dempsey, 1968, 365. Robertson notes that Bellori, in his description, is unable to fully justify his reading. See Robertson, 1990, 10. Bellori undoubtedly knew the ancient canonical meaning of Eros and Anteros as Love and Love Returned, for he was reared by his uncle, Francesco Angeloni, the secretary of Cardinal Ippolito Aldobrandini (Pope Clement VIII), who would certainly have been familiar with both the ancient and the Neo-platonic significances of Eros and Anteros. Angeloni also owned several hundred drawings by the Carracci, many of them preparatory studies for the Farnese Gallery. For an account of Angeloni’s collection, see Martin, 1965, 170. Dempsey also recognizes that Bellori’s interpretation of the Gallery is untenable at times (Dempsey, 1981, 287), but Silvia Ginsburg Carignani cites a poem by Melchiorre Zoppio, Agostino’s literary friend, titled “La Montagna Circea” in which he celebrates the marriage of Duke Ranuccio Farnese to Margherita Aldobrandini. She does this in order to support Bellori’s argument relating to Divine and Earthly Love. See Carignani, *Annibale Carracci a Roma: Gli affreschi di Palazzo Farnese* (Rome: Donzelli Editore, 2000), 135-141.
The theme is lifted from Agostino’s *Venus Punishing Profane Love* (Fig. 16). It has been fully established that the inclusion of the four pairs of *eroti* was a later development in the planning of the Gallery.229 One early preliminary sketch (Fig. 80) shows that a lion holding a shield bearing the Farnese *impresa* was an intended occupant of the four corners. In another early sketch (Fig. 81), a *putto* with a shield, no doubt emblazoned with the Farnese *impresa*, occupies the corner.230 Martin points to a drawing that he sees as a “transitional stage” in the development of the four corners231 (Fig. 82). The red chalk drawing depicts three *eroti*, one wielding a palm branch while the others carry him on their shoulders. This must be a representation of the very three brothers—Eros, Anteros, and Lyseros—who appeared in Agostino’s print. It seems that the “transitional stage” occurred when Agostino arrived on the scene and began making suggestions to Annibale regarding the iconography of the ceiling decoration.232 The drawing of the three *eroti* evolved into the *Struggle for the Palm*, which bears a resemblance to the contest of Eros and Anteros in Agostino’s print *Reciproco Amore* (Fig. 1). The radiant wreath (like the palm branch, an emblem of victory) under which the second pair of *eroti* wrestle, may inherit its significance as an attribute of Divine Love.

---

229 Martin, 1965, 196.

230 These are rather mindless choices on the part of Annibale, especially in terms of the complexity of the subsequent cycle, a complexity that does not seem to have taken shape until later in the planning stages of the Gallery, I would argue, not until Agostino’s arrival.

231 Martin, 1965, 229.

232 All Martin says about this “transitional stage” is that the drawing “rather surprisingly” depicts three cupids, which were then pared down to two. Martin, 1965, 229.
from Alciati’s Emblem CIX\textsuperscript{233} (Fig. 17). The wreath’s effulgence may come from Cartari’s discourse on Cupid: “Divine love is like the sun, which sheds its rays throughout the universe...As the sun creates warmth wherever it touches, so does Love kindle those souls which it approaches, so that they turn with ardent desire to heavenly things.”\textsuperscript{234} The struggle under the wreath is perhaps meant to allude to Eros and Anteros’s shared esteem for the other’s divine attributes.\textsuperscript{235} The torch, over which Eros and Anteros fight, is not only an attribute of their mother, but an emblem of Love’s capacity to dispense pain.\textsuperscript{236} The struggle may be seen as Eros and Anteros exhibiting the passion aroused in one by the other, or as an attempt by Eros to keep the flame of Love from being snuffed.\textsuperscript{237} The final pair of eroti is meant to illustrate the union of Sacred and Profane Love—the palm frond leans forgotten against the balustrade and Eros and

\begin{flushright}  
\textsuperscript{233} Ibid., 88. 
\textsuperscript{234} Cartari, Imagini, 1571, 496: “…Amore divino...è come il Sole: il quale sparge i suoiraggi per l’universo...E come il Sole riscalda ovunque tocca, così Amore accende quelli animi, alle quali si accosta, onde con infiammato desiderio si rivolgono alle cose del cielo.” English translation quoted in Martin, 1965, 88. Martin notes that Bellori’s description of the eroti under the wreath is similar to Cartari’s passage. Dempsey is unconvinced that the wreath was meant to represent anything as lofty as Holy Law, especially in light of the fact that Annibale included the motif of eroti wrestling under a wreath in his Sleeping Venus (Fig. 83), done for Odoardo Farnese, which is a portrayal of a lighthearted episode from Philostratus’s Imagines (I.6.) about the mischievous play of cupids in the garden of Venus. Dempsey, 1968, 365. Annibale’s Venus dates from 1602, which makes it likely that he was, in fact, modeling the motif after Agostino’s precedents, perhaps at the request of Cardinal Odoardo Farnese. 
\textsuperscript{235} Dempsey, 1968, 364-365. 
\textsuperscript{236} Martin, 1965, 88. 
\textsuperscript{237} Dempsey, 1968, 364. This interpretation of the struggle is very fitting in terms of Agostino’s print of Eros and Anteros wrestling in the presence of Lyseros, who is the extinguisher of love.
\end{flushright}
Anteros move to embrace one another. Harmony, therefore, is possible only when Earthly Love is overseen by Heavenly Love.\textsuperscript{238} This is in keeping with Dempsey’s interpretation of the vault as representing love conquering all.\textsuperscript{239} A preparatory drawing for the *Union of Sacred and Profane Love* (Fig. 84) shows the influence of Cartari’s emblem of the three Amores; Eros, Anteros, and Lyseros.\textsuperscript{240} The benign struggle between Cartari’s eroti translated well into the benign embrace found in the fresco. It is probable that Agostino, having suggested the theme of Eros and Anteros for the four corners, recommended Cartari as a reference and a guide to the correct interpretation and depiction of the scuffling pair. Agostino had used Cartari’s Imagini himself, at the very least, for *Venus Punishing Profane Love*. The depictions of the eroti in all four corners are all iconographically accurate, despite the burden of their complex iconography.\textsuperscript{241} It seems unlikely, especially given their late inclusion in the scheme, that Annibale could have grasped the complexity of their iconography without the guidance of his intellectual

\textsuperscript{238} Martin, 1965, 89.

\textsuperscript{239} Dempsey also sees the Gallery as a sort of clever visual Epithalamic poem with its scenes of love and marriage alluding to the wedding of Ranuccio Farnese and Margherita Aldobrandini. See Dempsey, 1968, 373-374. Agostino’s literary leanings no doubt enabled him to refer to the humorous yet sophisticated conceit of Epithalamic poetry. Epithalmia are poems written to a bride and groom on the occasion of their marriage and the genre originated in ancient Greece. For information on the Epithalamium, see Arthur Leslie Wheeler, “Tradition in the Epithalamium,” *American Journal of Philology* 51 (1930): 205-223.

\textsuperscript{240} This was also noted by Wittkower, 1952, 139.

\textsuperscript{241} Panofsky, 1967, 126, n. 79a.
brother, who was already well acquainted with the sophisticated conceit of Eros and Anteros. 242

The Issue of the Literary Adviser

It is generally agreed upon that a complicated cycle of this magnitude and scope required the aid of a literary adviser. The Farnese records and other contemporary

---

242 Another important aspect relating to the interpretation of the Gallery is the group of painted bronze medallions interspersed between various scenes of the vault. They are painted all’antica, their verdigris meant to suggest that they were recently unearthed ancient artifacts. This all’antica technique is evocative of the methods used by engravers, who, in distressing their plates, paralleled their prints with antique sculpture. The subject matter, mostly taken from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, was meant to underscore the triumph of Sacred Love. For a description of all of the medallions, see Martin, 1965, 93-103. Dempsey does not read the medallions in terms of Divine Love as much as he sees them as representations of the tribulations of thwarted lovers in need of Anteros’s aid. Dempsey, 1968, 370. One medallion in particular is of interest to this topic, namely, Cupid Overcoming Pan, or, the correct title derived from Virgil’s Eclogues (X.69), Omnia vincit Amor (“love conquers all”) (Fig. 85). Bocchi also depicted the subject in his Symbol LXXV (Fig. 86). Cupid overcoming Pan allegorizes love overcoming nature and the harmony that results from Cupid’s victory. The theme’s moralizing significance was meant to symbolize Divine Love overcoming man’s bestial nature. Agostino first represented this theme around 1590 in an overmantle originally intended for the Palazzo Magnani and for which a preparatory drawing survives (Figs. 87 and 88). Agostino employed the theme again in his engraving Omnia vincit Amor (Fig. 75) from 1599, which is contemporaneous with the bronze medallion. It seems likely that the bronze medallion’s theme was the suggestion of Agostino. His use of this theme in both the print and the overmantle no doubt stemmed from his work on Bocchi’s emblems. Earlier in the 1590’s, it was common for Annibale to use his brother and his repository of ideas for inspiration. DeGrazia Bohlin regards Agostino’s Omnia vincit Amor print as the pinnacle of the Carracci’s Roman style in terms of its classical subject and its balance of forms. DeGrazia Bohlin, 1979, 44. Clare Robertson uses the example of Agostino’s fireplace fresco of Cupid vanquishing Pan to support her thesis that Annibale was the author of the Farnese Gallery’s complex program saying that he used this “Bolognese visual source as his starting point,” but she never duly considers that, in fact, it is more likely the case that the author of the Magnani fresco himself, Agostino, is proffering the image and its theme for use in the Gallery. See Robertson, 1990, 21. Riccio dealt with the allegory of Omnia vincit Amor in his bronze all’antica relief, the Satyress (c. 1520-1530) (Fig. 89). Riccio’s composition was derived from an ancient Bacchic Sarcophagus that stood in Rome until 1530 on the grounds of the Palazzo Venezia. The sarcophagus was sketched by Amico Aspertini and engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi. Riccio often referred to Marcantonio’s prints when preparing his own compositions. See Meller, 1976, 325.
sources, however, make no mention of a specific humanist consultant. From the outset of the project, Annibale would have been furnished with the general theme of the loves of the gods and given advice on the general character the patron wanted the cycle to convey. It has long been accepted that the adviser who collaborated with Annibale on the decoration of the Camerino was also responsible for the iconographic program of the Farnese Gallery, that is, Fulvio Orsini. Scholars assert that Annibale was drawn to Fulvio out of their shared admiration for the pursuit of knowledge of the classical past and that the development of the Gallery program was the result of a close and continual collaboration between the artist and librarian. It also has been long accepted, however,  

---

243 Martin, 1965, 52. Fulvio Orsini was the illegitimate progeny of a princely family. He began his tenure under the Farnese as the librarian to Cardinal Ranuccio. After Ranuccio’s death in 1565, Fulvio acted as librarian under Cardinal Alessandro and Cardinal Odoardo, who, at the tender age of seventeen, was made a cardinal. Fulvio’s duties pertained to the care and augmentation of the Farnese collections as well as to Cardinal Odoardo’s education. Fulvio also amassed a large collection of antiquities and books himself. In his library there were more than 300 Latin and 160 Greek manuscripts; his collection of art and artifacts included more than 400 carved gems, 150 inscriptions, thousands of Greek and Roman coins, fifty-eight marble busts and relief sculptures, and drawings and paintings by Raphael, Michelangelo, and Titian. Fulvio also published several books including a 1570 volume on ancient portraits titled Imagines et elogia virorum illustrium et eruditor. ex antiquis lapidibus et nomismatibus expressa cum annotationib. ex bibliotheca Fulvi Ursini and a 1577 numismatic treatise called the Familiae Romanae quae reperiuntur in antiquis numismatibus ab urbe condita ad tempora divi Augusti, ex Bibliotheca Fulvi Ursini. For more information on the library and collections of Fulvio Orsini, see Pierre de Nolhac, La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini (Paris: F. Vieweg, Librarie-Éditeur, 1887; reprint, Paris: Honoré Champion, 1976); Pierre de Nolhac, “Les collections d’antiquités de Fulvio Orsini,” Mélanges d’archéologie et histoire, École française de Rome 4 (1884): 139-231; and Michel Hochmann, “Les dessins et les peintures de Fulvio Orsini et la collection Farnèse,” Mélanges de l’École française de Rome. Italie et Méditerranée 105 (1993): 49-91.

244 See Martin, 1965, 85 and Gail Feigenbaum, “Annibale in the Farnese Palace: A Classical Education,” in The Drawings of Annibale Carracci, 1999, 111. Feigenbaum does not, however, acknowledge Agostino’s longstanding knowledge of and love for classical art and literature. She goes on to suggest that perhaps Fulvio introduced Annibale to the “methodology of the humanist, philologist, archaeologist, and
that Annibale shunned the intellectual activities that so enraptured Agostino. Certainly, Annibale must have known of and taken an interest in the collections of ancient art in the possession of the Farnese and Fulvio Orsini, but the literary, mythological, and iconographical significance of the collections seems likely to have escaped, or at the very least, disinterested Annibale, who was more likely to have regarded them as ideal archetypal art forms useful for the visual advancement of his own art and its affetti. A

antiquarian.” Feigenbaum, 1999, 117. She fails to mention that Annibale would have been introduced to such methodologies in the university city of Bologna where Agostino inundated the Carracci Academy with imminent humanists and intellectual discourse. Charles Dempsey later came to view Annibale as working independent of an adviser (Dempsey, 1987, 35), but I find no evidence that supports this. Clare Robertson also sees Annibale as the mind behind the Gallery’s scheme. She does concede that she “does not want to categorically rule out that Annibale might have consulted someone like Orsini, or even Agostino,” and says that she even gave consideration to the idea expressed by Diane DeGrazia that Agostino should be given more credit for the genius of the Farnese vault, but determined that the chronology of Agostino’s visit to Rome made it impossible to do so. I see no real conflicts that arise with the time frame of Agostino’s arrival in Rome and with the possibility of his authorship of the Gallery’s program. If Robertson means that she sees Agostino’s 1597 arrival at the Farnese as not allowing enough time for him to fully develop his classicizing Roman style, she annuls this by later stating that by the time Annibale arrived in Rome in service to the Farnese, he was well versed in depicting classical subjects by way of the Carracci’s collaborative frescoes in Bologna. She sees these Bolognese cycles as tools that enabled Annibale to develop the Farnese program. Because these were collaborative ventures, it seems wrong to preclude Agostino on the grounds that he had not been in Rome for a long enough period of time. Upon Agostino’s return to Bologna after his 1594-1595 trip to Rome, he seems to have been deeply affected by his exposure to Raphael and classical art and developed a better understanding of how to integrate antique forms in his compositions, specifically in his Christ and the Adulteress (c. 1595-1596). See Robertson, 1990, 22-23 and Diane DeGrazia, “L’Alto Carracci della Galleria Farnese: Agostino come inventore,” in Les Carrache et les décors profanes, 1988, 97-113. Here DeGrazia makes brief mention of the Lascivie towards the end of her article stating, “Se pensiamo poi alla serie di stampe di Agostino dette le Lascivie, vi riscontriamo lo stesso amore profano e la stessa sensualità che si ritrova nelle raffigurazioni della Galleria.” She refers to the Lascivie in order to suggest that perhaps Agostino did not need a literary adviser while working in the Palazzo del Giardino. See DeGrazia, 1988, 112. See discussion below on the Palazzo del Giardino. For Agostino’s stylistic change after his second trip to Rome, see Ostrow, 1966, 37-38.
continual collaboration between Annibale and Fulvio is quite unlikely as well. Fulvio died in May of 1600 at the age of seventy. Although the majority of the vault had been completed by that date, Fulvio had not been in residence at the Farnese Palace for some time.\textsuperscript{245} It seems that in the early, more problematic stages of planning the cycle, Fulvio was present, but of little assistance to Annibale in terms of developing and furthering the sophisticated \textit{concetto} apparent in the subsequent frescoes. Indeed, the early drawings give little indication of the Gallery’s final complex conceits. Fulvio’s assistance with the scheme of the Camerino Farnese has not been questioned.\textsuperscript{246} Here Annibale’s allegorical cycle was intended to honor the gallant and virtuous character of Odoardo Farnese.\textsuperscript{247} Fulvio would have provided Annibale with a sort of précis of the subjects for the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{245} Feigenbaum briefly mentions the fact that Fulvio had departed the palace, and she therefore sees Annibale as the author of the program, who sought advice from an adviser only when needed. Feigenbaum, 1999, 121, n. 27. If Annibale was indeed the author of this erudite cycle, it seems strange that the early stages of planning show a far less sophisticated and unified scheme, with decisions like the placement and grand scale of the \textit{Bacchus and Ariadne} and the presence of the four pairs of \textit{eroti} not being made until considerably later. One also wonders about the state of Fulvio Orsini’s health at the close of the sixteenth century and if this and his departure from the palace were the impetuses that brought Agostino to Rome to aid Annibale. Agostino’s arrival certainly coincides nicely with the stylistic advancement of the preparatory drawings. In Bologna, the major fresco cycles to which Annibale had contributed were the collaborative efforts of all three of the Carracci, and it is conceivable that Annibale depended on such collaboration for the fostering of the ideas behind his art, not the execution of it.

\textsuperscript{246} Carignani has most recently posited a radical theory in which she dates the decoration of the Camerino from 1599, making it contemporaneous with the Gallery’s frescoes. She also proposes that Agostino had a large role in the realization of the Camerino, stemming from an account in Malvasia, which has been accepted, for the most part, as incorrect. See Carignani, 2000. I, however, do not agree with Carignani’s proposals.

\textsuperscript{247} For a detailed account of the Camerino’s decoration, see Martin, 1965, 21-48.
decoration of the room as well as providing him with pictorial precedents.\textsuperscript{248} The Camerino cycle has been touted as “the first monument of Annibale’s Roman grand manner” and as the “indispensable prelude to the Galleria Farnese.”\textsuperscript{249} The venture is closely related, however, to Annibale’s earlier Bolognese period in its stylistic principles.\textsuperscript{250} That is not to say that it is devoid of the influence of Roman art, but it has been remarked that, on the whole, Annibale avoided the use of available classical art in the advancement of the Camerino and his style.\textsuperscript{251} In the \textit{Choice of Hercules}, Annibale did incorporate aspects from the \textit{Farnese Hercules}, antique marble relief, Michelangelo’s \textit{Cumaean Sibyl}, and Raphael’s \textit{Judgment of Paris} into the composition, but Annibale’s execution is still grounded in his north Italian style.\textsuperscript{252} Annibale, in fact, had depicted this subject in Bologna. His fresco, \textit{Hercules and Virtue} (c. 1593-1594), in the Palazzo Sampieri is similar in its styling, manipulation of form, use of \textit{chiaroscuro}, and lively

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{248} For the items in Fulvio Orsini’s collection that served as models for the Camerino compositions, see Martin, 1965, 44-48.

\textsuperscript{249} Ibid., 22.

\textsuperscript{250} Posner, 1971, 80.

\textsuperscript{251} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{252} The influence of these works of art is discussed in Martin, 1965, 25. Martin notes that the figure of Voluptas in Annibale’s painting is modeled after Raphael’s \textit{Judgment of Paris}, but he specifies that it was derived from the print version by Marcantonio and not the original by Raphael. It seems that all of the works of art to which Martin refers were well-known and well-represented through engravings and that one need not be in Rome to know of them or to use them as references. It is likely that Marcantonio’s print was part of Agostino’s own collection. Posner remarks that Annibale’s fresco maintains a strong northern Italian style. Posner, 1971, 81. It was while in Rome that Annibale seems to have rediscovered Correggio, whose northern Italian mode Annibale returns to while looking at the art of the Roman High Renaissance. See Posner, 1971, 84-87.
\end{flushleft}
If the Camerino is better classified as Bolognese in style, but Roman in location, then the flowering of the Carracci’s glorious Roman period and its pinnacle as the Farnese ceiling, cannot be traced to Annibale. Since Fulvio Orsini, as the probable adviser for the Camerino, certainly did not seem to augment Annibale’s classicism to any new heights, it is odd that he should be considered Annibale’s inspiration for and source of the classicization in the Gallery. It has been admitted, even, that Fulvio’s advisory presence in the Gallery cannot be discerned, whereas, it can be detected in the Camerino. Thus, there exists a stylistic gap from the Camerino compositions to the Gallery frescoes which has not been fully explained, or even fully acknowledged.

---

253 Ibid., 80-81. Another subject from the Palazzo Sampieri—the Hercules Bearing the Globe by Agostino—appeared again in the Camerino.

254 Martin, 1965, 52. Martin proposes a paltry excuse saying that the Camerino’s intimacy required that the decorations perpetuate a cabinet-like atmosphere by borrowing from examples of the minor arts in Fulvio’s collection and that the scale of the Gallery did not allow for such references. I see no reason why a grander scale would camouflage Fulvio’s intervention. Martin goes on to say that one does see Fulvio’s mark by way of the Gallery’s fictive bronze medallions. In particular he mentions that two of the medallions’ subjects, Europa and the Bull and Hero and Leander, were well known from ancient Greek coins. If they were so well known, Fulvio’s intervention hardly seems necessary, then. Perhaps Agostino even owned examples of such ancient coins in his own collection.

255 Posner says that the change in Annibale’s style occurred during the course of preparing the various individual compositions and the surrounding decorative elements and figures. Posner, 1971, 103. I would argue that the shift in style happens only after Agostino arrived and is due to his reworking of the program. The dates for these drawings, in which a stylistic shift is apparent, range mostly from 1598 to 1599, with very few dated from 1597, thus corresponding with Agostino’s presence at the Farnese Palace. For the dates of many of the drawings, see Feigenbaum, 1999, 150-197. A number of Annibale’s preparatory drawings reveal his careful consideration of the decorative elements of the vault and their layout. It is in many of these drawings that one does indeed see Annibale’s attainment of the classicized, Romanized style for which he is known; it is evident, for example, in his ignudi (Figs. 90 and 91) and his herms (Fig. 92). Annibale borrows his ignudi from Michelangelo’s in the Sistine Chapel and through his careful studies of the decorative figures, he learns how to better utilize Michelangesque
forms. He refines the poses of the *ignudi* derived from Michelangelo, heightens the contours of the body, and scrutinizes the effects of light on their defined musculature. Annibale borrowed his illusionistic ceiling decorations from Roman precedents like Raphael’s use of *quadri riportati* in the Farnesina, and Michelangelo’s illusionism and rhythmic arrangement of the Sistine ceiling. See Posner, 1971, 97-102; Sydney J. Freedberg, *Circa 1600: A Revolution of Style in Italian Painting* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 41; and Dempsey, 1981, 303-304. The decorative elements from the vault of the Farnese Gallery—the herms, the atalantes, the medallions, garlands, etc.—were neither new to the tradition of wall and vault decoration, nor were they new to the Carracci. For their first major commission and collaborative effort, the Carracci frescoed the largest room on the *piano nobile* of the Palazzo Fava (c. 1583-1584). In two large friezes, depicting the stories of Jason and Europa, respectively, were twenty-one individual narrative scenes framed by decorative feigned architectural details and monochrome figures representing mythological characters like Venus, Bacchus, Neptune, and even a blindfolded Cupid (Fig. 93). At this early stage in Annibale’s career, though, he showed that he “was not filled with a holy awe for heroes of classical Antiquity,” (Boschloo, 1974, 3), whereas Agostino did display a familiarity with and an affinity for antique art. Posner, 1971, 55. The Carracci’s fresco cycle in the Palazzo Magnani (c. 1589-1590) is regarded as the spark that later ignited the genius of the Farnese Gallery. Martin, 1965, 73. Here the decorative elements can truly be seen as the precursors to those found in the Gallery. The fourteen narrative panels depicting the Foundation of Rome are surrounded by simulated architectural elements, nude figures painted to look like ancient marble, fruited garlands, masks, flesh-colored *putti*, graceful figures painted to resemble bronze statues replete with the patina of age, fauns, etc., all of which impart a delightful levity to the cycle through the vacillation between what is real and what is painted (Fig. 94). Part of what makes the Farnese Gallery so outstanding had, in fact, been introduced years prior as part of the collaborative efforts of the Carracci. Thus, Annibale’s decorative figures in the Farnese Gallery, beautiful as they are, seem to be extensions of what the Carracci had already done together. Martin argues that the decorative system did not inspire the awe of the Carracci’s contemporaries and following generations. He in fact cites them as old-fashioned. Martin, 1965, 147-148. It is Annibale’s work on the decorative system that seems to be his largest contribution to the advancement of the Carracci classicism. There is no debate whether Annibale’s style changed, and changed for the better, but I see Agostino as the impetus behind this strong and fairly sudden change. Annibale may have been the more facile painter and a skilled draftsman, but it seems that without collaboration, he had trouble finding inspiration or direction for displaying and evolving his talents. Dempsey sees that one of the triumphs of the Farnese frescoes is their use of light and color, which is made extraordinary through an illusive transparency, a transparency produced by very deliberate hatching and cross-hatching. Dempsey, 1995, 18-20. As an engraver, Agostino mastered the use of hatching and cross-hatching in his prints to impart the effects of light and color. The skillful use of this technique in the Farnese Gallery might well be credited to Agostino, then. Dempsey also lauds the Gallery for elevating the “provocative gambolings” of the gods to the heights of heroic epic poetry prevalent in Roman court culture. Dempsey, 1995, 22-26. The *Lascivie*, though, can be said to have accomplished this. In addition,
The rift that formed between Agostino and Annibale by the time of the completion of the Farnese vault has been made infamous by their biographers; the particulars of their disagreement, however, are unknown. Malvasia reproduced a letter written by Annibale to his cousin Ludovico that might address the filial rupture:

…the unbearable pedantry of Agostino, who was never happy with whatever I was doing, always finding some bits of shell in the egg, interrupting me by constantly bringing poets, writers of novels, and courtiers up onto the scaffolding, which was the reason why he himself did not work, nor let the others do so, etc.256

The brothers’ collaboration ended when Agostino left for Duke Ranuccio Farnese’s court at Parma.257 He was invited to paint a vault in the Palazzo del Giardino, Ranuccio’s

---

256 Malvasia, 2000, 171. In Giulio Mancini’s Considerazioni sulla pittura, I, 217 (written around 1620), he propounds that the rift formed due to Annibale’s jealousy regarding Agostino’s skill. See Martin, 1965, 15. It seems highly probable that Annibale’s ego was so bruised by his dependence on his brother for the invention of the Farnese vault, and that he was so resentful of Agostino’s intellectual capacity, that he allowed his jealousy to drive them apart. Mancini also reports that Agostino was not able to complete much work on the vault because the effort caused him difficulty breathing. Agostino, however, was able to complete the ceiling frescoes in the Palazzo del Giardino at Parma almost all on his own, with or without the purported respiratory problems.

257 The ducal rolls show that Agostino was situated in Parma on July 1, 1600. See Tietze, 1906-07, 127, n. 4.
pleasure palace. Agostino completed four of the five sections of the vault before his death on February 23, 1602. The scenes, their theme, and their tone are all remarkably similar to those of the Farnese vault. This supports the idea that Agostino was in fact the author of the Farnese ceiling, for it only seems appropriate that Duke Ranuccio would summon the creative mind behind the much admired Farnese Gallery to execute his cycle in Parma, a cycle of great importance since it had to impress the powerful and discerning Aldobrandini clan. The central octagonal scene from the vault, depicting Eros, Anteros, and Lyseros, proves to be the basis on which the cycle’s concetto is formed, not unlike


259 As a tribute to Agostino, Duke Ranuccio did not importune another artist to complete the fifth section, and instead he insisted that an epitaph written by the Bolognese humanist, Claudio Achillini, be inscribed in its place. Anderson, 1970, 41.

260 The scenes include Three Amors in the Garden of Venus, Thetis and Peleus, Thetis Attempting to Evade Peleus, and the Marriage of Peleus and Thetis.

261 Anderson, 1970, 43. Anderson goes on to explain the complex literary precepts behind the frescoes of the Giardino. She speculates that Achillini could have acted as Agostino’s literary adviser for the project, offering the support that he was in Parma in 1600 and 1601 and that in 1627 he wrote two plays in celebration of the wedding of Duke Ranuccio’s heir that contain conceits similar to those in Agostino’s frescoes. The Giardino’s similarity to the complexities of the Farnese Gallery, however, leads one to believe that if Achillini were involved with the conception of the Giardino, it was more as literary ally with whom Agostino could engage in discussion regarding the realization of the frescoes, rather than as the primary author. It would be highly appropriate for Achillini to utilize the themes from a fresco cycle in the groom’s home when composing his celebratory plays and still not be the literary adviser responsible for the cycle’s concetto.
the purpose of the four pairs of eroti in the Farnese ceiling in forming that cycle’s meaning (Fig. 95). The complexities surrounding the decorative schemes found in both the Farnese Gallery and the Palazzo del Giardino are comprised of leitmotifs that Agostino had actively pursued for years in his intellectual studies and in his art, including the *Lascivie*. He brought with him the knowledge of classical conceits—from the literary and visual arts—including those of an erotic, sensual temper. Agostino understood the nature of the space for which his sensual displays were intended. The Farnese Gallery was a public room in a private house belonging to a powerful, wealthy, and well-educated family. The Farnese family, along with Agostino, would have been aware of the ancient Roman tradition of adorning the walls of the reception rooms in the homes of Rome’s elite families with erotic mythological scenes. These erotic frescoes were signs of the wealth and status of the homeowner, a pictorial and spatial display of eminence for the viewing pleasure of privileged guests.\(^{262}\) Knowledge of this ancient practice was certainly understood and implemented in Renaissance and Baroque Italy. The Farnese Gallery, and the Palazzo del Giardino, were superb examples of this understanding and implementation.\(^{263}\)

\(^{262}\) For an overview on the subject of this ancient Roman tradition, see David Frederick, “Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House,” *Classical Antiquity* 15 (Oct. 1995): 266-287.

\(^{263}\) Both Agostino and Annibale would have had in mind the ambitious fresco cycles by Giulio Romano in the Palazzo del Tè in Mantua, executed in the late 1520’s to early 1530’s, which were thematically similar to those in the Farnese Gallery, especially in their assimilation of classical motifs and in their eroticism. See Christine Begley, “Giulio Romano as Court Artist to Federico Gonzaga in the Late 1520’s: Studies for the Decorations in the Camera di Psiche, the Camera delle Aquile, and the Camera dei Venti, Palazzo Te; and Studies for the Sala Imperial, Palazzo Ducale,” 74, in *Giulio Romano, Master Designer*, ed. Janet Cox-Rearick (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999); Toby Yuen, “Giulio Romano, Giovanni da Udine and Raphael: Some Influences from the
Agostino seems the likelier author of the Farnese Gallery’s complex and much admired conceits. He displayed themes found in the Gallery in his earlier body of work, and even in his last project, the Palazzo del Giardino frescoes, all of which attest to his knowledge and mastery of these knotty subjects. Although there is debate over the exact timeline of the planning and completion of the frescoes, I would argue that with his arrival in Rome in late 1597, it is likely that Agostino, upon seeing Annibale’s reversion to Correggio’s style in the Camerino and his adherence to Bolognese models in the preliminary drawings for the Gallery, steered the scheme of the Gallery in a more classical, Roman direction, a direction more befitting the grand Roman palace of their patrons. Agostino’s interest in antiquity and his keen ability to extract the best parts from other works of art for use in his own designs would have prompted him to guide Annibale directly to the Roman sources, as opposed to incorporating them at a remove via northern Italian art. This, then, is when Annibale’s style began to change, when Agostino re-

---

Minor Arts of Antiquity,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 42 (1979): 272; and Egon Verheyen, The Palazzo del Te in Mantua: Images of Love and Politics (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977). Giulio’s frescoes were visual expressions of Federico Gonzaga’s prestige, which allowed the duke to display erotic subjects without their being thought indecorous. The Farnese family would have enjoyed the same privilege, allowing them to bedeck the walls of their homes with erotic displays that declare their prominence, especially to their new in-laws, the Aldobrandini. Status was conferred even upon Giulio as the designer of the Palazzo del Tè frescoes. As court artist he was able to move in powerful circles. He assured his artistic reputation and ascendancy for all posterity by producing his much admired and copied cycles. Agostino, the son of a tailor, would have understood the use of his art, particularly erotic art, as a means of attaining a degree of social standing. Bellori commented that he, “…loved the usage of great and the Court, and he fitted in with the courtiers. In that respect…he was not in agreement with his brother.” Bellori, 1968, 101. Following the example set by Giulio Romano in erotic prints and fresco cycles was perhaps a platform used by Agostino to augment his social and artistic status. This ambition in no way detracts from the artistic and intellectual merit of Agostino’s erotic art and from his contributions to the Farnese Gallery.
directed the planning of the vault. This stylistic shift is evident in the preparatory
drawings, which I would date from 1598 to 1599. While Annibale is indeed responsible
for painting the vast majority of the vault, for perfecting the compositions that form what
we know to be the Carracci’s ideal style, it is Agostino who is responsible for
transforming the broad theme of the loves of the gods into the clever, playful, sensual,
and yet erudite cycle that is so celebrated.264

264 Regardless of the divergent interpretations proposed for the Farnese Gallery and its
iconography, Agostino is still the likelier author of the complex program. It may not be
universally known which interpretation is correct or if the interpretation intended by
Agostino has even been discovered by scholars to date, but this in no way interferes with
the argument in favor of Agostino’s authorship. The frescoes, whether their meaning is
known or not, are complex and erudite and contain themes which Agostino, *il dotto*, had
investigated in his work for years.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The Carracci’s reform of painting is a movement credited to all three of the Carracci, but all too often, Annibale is accorded the acclaim for being the virtuoso behind the Farnese Gallery. Without the precedent of Agostino’s erotic and erudite *Lascivie*, however, the ascendancy of the Farnese Gallery seems unlikely. Scholars certainly do not deny the import of Agostino’s intellectual propensities or his talents as an engraver, but he is not fully recognized as the primary architect and driving intellectual force behind the Carracci’s “eclecticism” and behind the Farnese Gallery. It was Agostino who knew Latin and read authors such as Ovid and Virgil, who studied sculpture, history, anatomy, fable, geometry, and all manner of subjects outside the sphere of most artists, and outside the sphere of Annibale. It was he who collected coins and books, who studied the oeuvres of great masters through his activities as an engraver, and it was Agostino who owned a collection of prints that would have supplied many of the references the Carracci assimilated into their respective oeuvres. Agostino’s *Lascivie* are practically dismissed within the scope of the accomplishments of the Carracci and often regarded merely as a moneymaking scheme. Even if the prints were designed with profit in mind, their worth cannot be discounted, for they are the embodiment of the Carracci’s style in concept and in design. Indeed, the Carracci Academy and its precepts might not have been so successful or even viable were it not for Agostino, his intellectual pursuits, and the money and ideas his prints, notably the *Lascivie*, generated. Agostino, in composing the
Lascivie, utilized classical elements, literary, plastic, and erotic; he applied the ideas of contemporary scholars and philosophers to his artistic activity; and he incorporated the choicest aspects from the compositions of masters much admired by the Carracci. All that he utilized to compose the Lascivie recurs in the Farnese Gallery. The Lascivie’s display of the Carracci’s principles is notable in that the prints preceded the fresco cycle of the Farnese vault, which is often extolled as the masterpiece that ushered in the Baroque. The Lascivie, then, are the harbingers of the Baroque. The mind behind these prints is the Baroque’s prognosticator, Agostino Carracci.
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