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Abstract

The dissertation examines Cardinal Scipione Borghese's patronage of ecclesiastical architecture, from the initial commission to complete the decoration of the oratories at S. Gregorio Magno, to the final building of churches two decades later in his patrimonial lands south of Rome. Each project is considered in more or less chronological order, with particular focus on certain patronal themes. The main text is supplemented by a catalogue, concerned with issues of building history, attribution, documentation, and historiography. The dissertation sets the Cardinal's patronage within the context of his life in general, and to this end also examines his position as cardinal-nephew, the office that shaped his career. Finally, the details of Borghese's life uncovered in relation to his last years are the basis of an incidental reconsideration of Bernini's renowned portrait bust of the Cardinal.
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INTRODUCTION

Despite the undoubted splendour of the papacy, the patronage of religious architecture in Rome in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century is dominated by individual cardinals. Of these one name stands out - Scipione Borghese. Scipione was involved in ecclesiastical architecture almost throughout his career, organising the restoration of S. Sebastiano fuori le mura and S. Crisogono, the decoration of the oratories and the rebuilding of the atrium at S. Gregorio Magno, the erection of a new facade on S. Maria della Vittoria, the redecoration of the Caffarelli chapel and installation of organs in S. Maria sopra Minerva, and the construction of completely new churches in the regional towns of Montefortino and Monte Compatri. This was not impersonal financial patronage, for there is a marked character to all Borghese's projects, designed and executed as they

---

1Borghese's building has always been a central feature of his reputation. For Gregorio Leti, it was the other side of his family's avarice: "Perché il Cardinale suo [Paul V] nipote, che dominava assolutamente la persona del zio, e per conseguenza il papato, pigliava ogni cosa per se, e per la casa Borghese, dava qualche cosa al Papa, per lasciarlo sodisfare con la rinnovazione hora di una fabbrica, ed hora d'un'altra, e con l'abbellimento di quella, e di questa altra strada." Leti, Il Nepotismo di Roma, o vero relatione delle ragioni che muovono i Pontefici all'aggrandimento de'Nipoti, Amsterdam, 1667, voi. 1, 195. For Roman sympathisers, however, the image of Borghese as a great patron of ecclesiastical architecture for its own sake would define his biography. Lorenzo Cardella established the lineaments of the reputation. "Dal zio venne arricchito a dovizia di abbazie, e di ecclesiastici benefici; ma non mancò d'impiegarne porzione considerabile in sovvenimento de'poveri, in ornamento delle sacre basiliche, in fabbricare e ristaurare chiese, e luoghi piì dentro, e fuori di Roma: che troppo lunga cosa sarebbe, volere qui tutti noverare. Basterà soltanto dare alcun cenno delle considerabili restaurazioni, ed abbellimenti fatti alla chiesa del suo titolo; del portico di marmi a quella di S. Gregorio nel Montecelio, e della facciata a quell di S. Maria della Vittoria. Era ormai cadente e rovinosa la basilica di San Sebastiano, una delle sette chiese dì Roma; ed egli non solo ne riparò le rovine, ma vi aggiunse l'abitazione per i monaci, chiuse il claustro di buone mura, appanò la piazza, d'iridusse quel santuario dalla deformità, e dallo squallore, a gran vaghezza, ed eleganza. Nella chiesa di S. Maria sopra Minerva se costruire due bellissimi organi, e rifarci, ed ornò la cappella Caffarelli esistente in quella gran chiesa; e a quella di Loreto comparti preziosi doni. Fece fabbricare in Montefortino chiesa e convento a minori Riformati; in Montecompatri la chiesa parrocchiale, e in Roma il monastero di S. Chiara, quantunque non avesse tempo di ridurlo all'ultima perfezione. La famosa e celebre villa Pinciana, posta fuori della porta detta del Popolo, fu opera del Cardinale Borghese...." Cardella, Memoria storiche de'cardinali della Santa Romana Chiesa, Rome, 1793, vol. 6, 118-9; Cardella's description was copied almost word for word by Gaetano Moroni, Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica, vol. 6, 1840, 220; also Enciclopedia Cattolica, Vatican City, 1949, vol. 2, 1005-6, which after noting his building projects, closes with the statement "Non fu uomo di governo, ma un amabile mecenate, prodigo di benevolenza e di promesse."
were by his personal craftsmen and featuring as they do extensive decorative integration of his personal and family imagery. In the latter aspect his patronage is particularly noteworthy, exemplifying the past tradition of patronal magnificence and anticipating the highly personalised decorative approaches characteristic of architectural patronage later in the century.

Scipione's renown in other areas of the arts is a well-established field of scholarly enquiry, both as a by-product of work on the collections he established and as an historical topic in itself. His patronage of ecclesiastical architecture, on the other hand, has until recently been relatively neglected. In part, this may have been because the major components of Borghese's ecclesiastical architectural patronage were restorations of existing churches, whereas the emphases of modern architectural history has almost exclusively been with buildings constructed *ex novo*, itself perhaps a legacy of the modernist preference for architecture as independent monument.

In part, such neglect was due to the general lack of attention paid to Roman architecture from 1580 to 1630. Although extremely productive, this

---


3 As the catalogue bibliographies indicate, there have been many other studies on church buildings patronised by Borghese. Many of these, however, are little more than local history, while in others, especially those written from the point of view of palaeo-Christian archaeology, Borghese's interventions are peripheral to the authors' main concerns. The exception is Johannes Mandl, *Die Kirche des Hl. Chrysogonus in Rom*, Graz, (n.d. but 1938), which focuses on the seventeenth century restoration.
period for some time was considered a bland transitional zone between Michelangelesque mannerism and the exciting developments of the mid-seventeenth century. Since the early 1980s, however, scholarship in the field has grown rapidly. Two themes, closely related within the rubric of Counter Reformation, have been behind or have emerged from the new research. The first has been to see church building in terms of papal policy, a means of affirming the symbolic identity of Rome in a disputed religious environment. Such studies have highlighted the polemical imperatives, expressing the 'back to origins' atmosphere of Tridentine reform, behind the recovery and augmentation of Rome's Christian heritage (hence the prominence of restoration as a category of building). The second theme of research can barely be separated from the first, and concerns the decisive influence on architecture of Filippo Neri's Oratorians, in particular Cesare

---

4In this regard Rudolf Wittkower's structuring of the full Baroque around Bernini, Borromini and Cortona, who were all born in the last years of the sixteenth century, has been immensely influential: Art and Architecture in Italy, 1600-1750, (1958) Harmondsworth, 3rd ed. 1980 (Wittkower's scheme has been followed recently by John Varriano, Italian Baroque and Rococo Architecture, Oxford, 1986). Although Wittkower recognised Scipione's historic importance, his architectural views, as represented by his architect Giovanni Battista Soria, were branded conservative and accordingly granted scant consideration: idem, 34. Similarly, Howard Hibbard - whose work includes histories of the Palazzo Borghese and the Borghese Giardino on the Quirinale, and whose monograph on Carlo Maderno concerned the one architect of the period thought worthy of independent consideration - was nevertheless dismissive of Borghese's ecclesiastical architecture, noting that his earlier architect, Flaminio Ponzio, was "a man as bland as himself [Scipione Borghese]": Carlo Maderno and Roman Architecture, 1580-1630, London, 1972, 53.

5One of the first works of revision was Augusto Roca de Amicis, "Studi su città e architettura nella Roma di Paolo V Borghese (1605-1621)", Bollettino del centro di studi per la storia dell'architettura, 31 (1984), 1-97, which includes a useful discussion of the scanty earlier literature. Much of the subsequent research has been structured around Counter Reformation themes, often with the focus on Sixtus V and his influence: for example, Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (eds.), Roma Sancta. La città delle basiliche, Rome, 1985 (although based on an exhibition covering the period from the late middle ages on, the heart of the book is located in the late cinquecento and early seicento); Helge Gamrath, Roma Sancta Renovata. Studi sull'urbanistica di Roma nella seconda metà del sec. XVI con particolare riferimento al pontificato di Sisto V (1585-90), Rome, 1987; Gianfranco Spagnesi (ed.), L'architettura a Roma e in Italia (1580-1621), (Atti del XXIII Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura, 24-26 marzo, 1988), Rome, 1988; Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (eds.), Sisto V. I Roma e il Lazio, (Corso Internazionale di Alta Cultura, 19-29 ottobre, 1989), Rome, 1992; Steven F. Ostrow, Art and Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome. The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore, Cambridge, 1996, with detailed bibliography.
Baronio. Indeed, apart from being directly involved with architectural restoration himself, the importance Baronio attached to relics and the early Christian exemplar has raised a host of questions concerning the relationship of religious architecture with sacred history and with the burgeoning field of archaeology.

This renewal of interest in the period as a whole has been fertile ground for the investigation of Cardinal Borghese's architectural patronage in particular. Over the last ten years most of the individual components of Scipione's patronage have been the subject of documentary study. The first was Lorenzo Bartolini Salimbeni's short but dense analysis of the restoration of S. Crisogono, published in 1987. Identifying S. Crisogono as the defining work of Scipione's career, Salimbeni establishes building chronology via his expense books (registri dei mandati), from the installation of the ceiling to the final transformation of the high altar, and separates the name Giovanni Battista Soria from the attributional muddle of architetti di casa. In terms of motivation, Salimbeni discounts the inscription declaring the church in ruin and suggests instead that Borghese was chiefly concerned with creating a lasting legacy of his own munificence.

Salimbeni was followed by Birgitta Ringbeck, whose 1989 dissertation on Soria provides a systematic analysis of almost all the ecclesiastical commissions from the second half of the Cardinal's career. Working from

---

6Oratorian and Baronian research has of course a long and continuous history; nevertheless, one notes the particular importance to subsequent research of the essays in Romeo de Maio, et al. (eds.), Baronio e l'arte, (Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Sora 10-13 ottobre, 1984), Sora, 1984. Especially relevant are those by Ingo Herklotz, “Historia sacra und mittelalterliche Kunst während der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts in Rom”; Carla Pisanelli, “Il significato storico del patrimonio artistico negli Annales”; and Alessandro Zuccari, “Restauro e filologia baroniani”.

7These issues, along with the relevant references, are discussed in more detail in chapter 2.

8Lorenzo Bartolino Salimbeni, "Giovan Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese: Restauri a Roma 1618-1633", Quaderni dell’istituto di storia dell’architettura (Saggi in onore di Guglielmo de Angelis d’Ossat), Rome (1987), 399-406. This essay was followed by Michele Cigola, "La Basilica di San Crisogono in Roma - un rilievo critico“, Bollettino del centro di studi per la storia dell’architettura, 35 (1989), 7-49, a general study of the basilica's history.

artisanal accounts (*misure e stime*), Ringbeck is mainly concerned with building chronology and stylistic analysis. In regards to the former, the heart of the book is the long and complex restoration of S. Crisogono, a project that witnessed Soria's transformation from chief carpenter to designing architect. As to the latter, Ringbeck centrally positions the restrained classicism (particularly as exemplified in the facades) of the hitherto neglected Soria in the transition from late mannerism to Baroque. Cardinal Borghese thus emerges as perhaps the pre-eminent patron of the conservative, almost academic, architectural style that prevailed in Rome in the third and fourth decade of the seventeenth century.

The next major contribution was Elena Fumagalli's doctoral thesis on the architectural patronage of the Borghese family, particularly Scipione, presented to the University of Rome in 1992. Although the bulk of the dissertation is concerned with domestic architecture, a final section considers the Cardinal's interventions in S. Gregorio, S. Sebastiano, and S. Crisogono. Here Fumagalli is less concerned with the architecture of the churches than with aspects of their decoration, especially in matters of attribution. In the two former churches, for example, Fumagalli focuses on the activity of Guido Reni; in the process, however, she incidentally reconstructs (again via the Cardinal's *registri dei mandati*) the chronology of the building projects of which Reni's pictorial campaigns were a part. In

---

11In regard to Cardinal Borghese himself, Fumagalli defers to the standard sources, noting "*in questa sede non si vuole entrare in merito alla figura storica di ScipioneCaffarelli*": ibid., 18 n. 43.
12These questions were previewed in Fumagalli's "Guido Reni (e altri) a S. Gregorio al Celio e a S. Sebastiano", *Paragone*, 41, (May 1990), 67-94. The question of Reni's activity in the oratories of S. Gregorio had long been obscured by their inaccessibility. The eventual completion of their restoration by the *Soprintendenza per i Beni Artistici e Storici di Roma* would result in Anna Maria Pedrocchi's *San Gregorio al Celio. Storia di una abbazia*, Rome, 1993. Pedrocchi fully reconstructs the oratory project, begun by Baronio and finished by Borghese, and also considers Borghese's later rebuilding of the church atrium and facade, although in this she unwittingly duplicates earlier research by Birgitta Ringbeck, as discussed above.
the chapter devoted to S. Crisogono, she addresses the design of the ceiling, citing previously unknown accounts for its gilded decoration, and confirming Ringbeck's contention that the restoration was begun under the direction of Giovanni Vasanzio, not Soria as previously thought.

In 1992 Aloisio Antinori also presented a doctoral dissertation on Borghese's architectural patronage to the University of Rome, subsequently published in 1995. Despite the title, Antinori's work is actually limited to the Cardinal's activity from 1607 to 1616, above all his restoration of S. Sebastiano. Through an exhaustive reading of the artisanal accounts (*misure e stime*), Antinori establishes almost every detail of work on the basilica, from the initial reorganisation of the crypt of the Apostles, to the transformation of the interior, to the final reconstruction of the medieval portico as a two storey facade. In the process, he provides the most comprehensive stylistic analysis of the architecture of Flaminio Ponzio, the official papal architect whose work has been almost completely overshadowed by that of his better known colleague Carlo Maderno. Antinori is particularly concerned with the relationship between architecture and patron, in both personal and general terms. On the personal level, Antinori traces the progress of the restoration against the unfolding splendour of Scipione's career, noting that by the time of its completion in 1614 Borghese's munificent reputation was sufficiently established to allow the redirection of his resources into the augmentation of the family patrimony. More generally, he argues that the Cardinal's early restorations directly reflected the triumphalist influence of the Spanish faction, in contrast to the conspicuously humble piety of the Oratorians. For Antinori, Scipione's early commissions thus stood on the threshold of the

---

Catholic Baroque, that "historic fracture, destined to last more than one hundred and fifty years, between not only the faith but also the architecture of countries adhered to the Roman Pontiff and those of the Protestant world."\textsuperscript{14}

All these recent students of the Cardinal's architectural patronage make frequent reference to the figures provided in perhaps the most extraordinary individual contribution to Borghese scholarship, Volker Reinhardt's 1984 study of the Scipione's financial strategies.\textsuperscript{15} Working entirely from financial records (not all of which are systematically conserved) spread over hundreds of volumes in the Archivio Borghese, Reinhardt tabulates all the Cardinal's income and expenditure over the period 1605 to 1633. The summary is revealing.\textsuperscript{16} Scipione earned over 6,500,000 scudi in his career (50 scudi was a year's wage to some), derived primarily from the annuities of no fewer than twenty six abbeys and bishoprics, eighteen pensions, and thirteen official stipends, almost all assigned while he was papal nephew. Well over half of this income was spent on direct capital investment - mainly real estate and shares in the public debt - destined for the family patrimony. Despite Scipione's reputation as a great public builder, Reinhardt calculates he spent just 127,000 scudi on public architecture, a figure which represents less than 2% of his total expenditure. Reinhardt's reconstruction of Scipione is based almost entirely on economic documents, largely ignoring the more humanistic sources available in the Fondo Borghese. Accordingly, Scipione's church building is seen as the pious legitimation of a naked dynasticism. Indeed

\textsuperscript{14}"Si costituivano le premesse al grande fenomeno del Barocco, che avrebbe determinato una frattura storica, destinata a durare centocinquanta anni, tra le architetture - non soltanto culturali - dei paesi fedeli al pontefice romano e di quelli afferenti al composito mondo protestante." Antinori, 24. This argument is discussed in more detail in chapter 2.


\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 96-99.
Reinhardt subjects all the artistic patronage to a single materialist interpretation:

The artistic and cultural concerns [of the cardinal-nephew], which stem from the sociological phenomenon of nepotism, have tremendous significance not only for the urban history of Rome, but also for the architectural patronage of the Baroque style in Europe generally as it derived from Rome. The building component of the nephew's artistic patronage should be conceived in sociological terms, as is indicated from the economic/historical sources, which in fact appears to be the only possible way of explaining the motives and causes for these activities, of rationalising the relevant picture of his wide-ranging patronage of the arts, and of analysing the determining social motivations for this aspect of the nephew's activity.17

Reinhardt's book derives from a 1981 dissertation presented to the University of Freiburg, a work done under the supervision of Professor Wolfgang Reinhard. Reinhard is in fact the leading figure not only in the broader historiographic phenomenon of Borghese scholarship but also the sacred college in general at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century.18 His work emphasises three key themes: the


infrastructure of clientage in the sacred college and beyond (*Herrschaft durch Verflechtung*); the instrumental function of nepotism in the development of papal absolutism (namely, through the office of cardinal-nephew); and the critical role of cardinal-nephew as financial conduit for the dynastic ambitions of papal families. Like Reinhardt, Reinhard associates Cardinal Borghese's artistic patronage with the pretensions of his family, exemplifying the pattern of cardinal-nephews to accumulate the material basis of aristocracy while also establishing themselves as the leading patrons of ecclesiastical art and architecture.

Scholarship on Cardinal Borghese has thus thrived over the last fifteen years and he now must surely be one of the best studied figures of the period. Despite this, our image of Scipione remains fragmentary. There is still no full-scale biography, and most studies of his activities continue to rely on sketchy second-hand reports of his life. Likewise, there is little sense of an overall picture of his architectural patronage, one that positions each project in relation to another and identifies their significance within his total patronal oeuvre. This is not necessarily a fault of the literature, for intentions have largely been otherwise. Ringbeck's work is the widest-ranging, but her focus is firmly on the architect and not the patron. While she provides a useful summary of Scipione's artistic policies, her research is limited to the conventionally reported biography, mostly forgoing the wealth of primary sources other than administrative documentation directly relevant to architecture. It is Antinori who is most concerned with Scipione himself, taking a keen perspective on the relationship of patron to architecture. Nevertheless, his study is narrow in its reference, covering only a fraction of Scipione's patronage. The closest to structure of the post-Tridentine Papal State, one discussed in more detail in the following chapter.
a comprehensive assessment of the Cardinal is by Volker Reinhardt. For Reinhardt, however, Scipione is a phenomenon of income and expenditure, of which his spending on ecclesiastical architecture is factored as only a minor component. Moreover, as indicated above, Reinhardt tends to subordinate architectural patronage too vigorously to social status, unjustly ignoring other cultural imperatives traditionally the concern of architectural historians.

As will be clear, the present dissertation overlaps and builds on these earlier studies in a number of areas. It is, however, fundamentally different in its purpose and scope. Firstly, I take the perspective of the patron and not the architect. While considering stylistic issues, such an approach seeks to integrate design with questions of function, planning, and administration. No less importantly, the viewpoint is closer to that of the seventeenth century observer, for whom the patron at least as much as the architect assumed the mantle of creator of a building. Conversely, the contemporary also saw the work of architecture itself as much an ornament to the patron's excellence as an example of the architect's creativity. This is particularly relevant to the study of ecclesiastical building, which as public architecture may be seen as articulating or embodying institutional values.

Secondly, while limited to ecclesiastical architecture, I am concerned with the whole of Cardinal Borghese's career. Given that his work is almost continuously disposed over the twenty eight years of his church office, such scope means that the dissertation assumes the form of a patronal biography, reconstructed from the perspective of his patronage of ecclesiastical architecture. Apart from chronological coherence, the biographical model is an especially appropriate approach given the personalised imagery of Borghese's architecture and the intimate association of his patronage with individual and familial status. Finally, the biographical approach permits contextualisation of other areas of his patronage, and in at least one case -
Bernini's portrait bust (considered as an excursus to the final chapter) - offers ground for an entirely new interpretation.

As a study of patronage the dissertation is part of a broader and comparatively recent genre within Renaissance and Baroque art history. Although disparate in method, patronage studies reverse the traditional perspective of the artistic monograph while drawing increased attention to the role and function of architecture (and art) within the political economy of society at large. In part this is due to the recognition of the defining importance of the market, the fact that works were made according to parameters set by patrons, which determined not only what but often also how work was created. The shift to capital also expresses the semantic distinction between the creation and the production of art. Even the most cursory glance at the period reveals the ebullience of the visual arts, which in economic terms must be regarded as a function of a buoyant demand. In

19 The field is so diverse that it would be futile to attempt a bibliography in a footnote. A few studies of particular post-Tridentine patrons, however, deserve to be singled out. Clare Robertson, 'il Gran Cardinale'. Alessandro Farnese, Patron of the Arts, New Haven/London, 1992, is strictly empirical, concerned enough with the difficulty of simply identifying what Farnese spent money on, cautioning on page 5: "we do not yet know enough about the individuals concerned, about the mechanisms of their patronage, or about the factors that shaped their taste, to be able usefully to make generalisations about the behaviour of Renaissance or Baroque patrons as a group." (Robertson's view deliberately echoes Francis Haskell's prefatory disclaimers to the first edition [1962] of Patrons and Painters. A Study in the Relations Between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque, New Haven/London, 2nd. ed., 1980, viii: "Any attempt to 'explain' art in terms of patronage has been deliberately avoided. I...have tried to be severely empirical....nothing in my researches has convinced me of the existence of underlying laws which will be valid in all circumstances"). Pamela Jones, Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana: Art Patronage and Reform in 17th-Century Milan, Cambridge, 1993, although not concerned with architecture, is nevertheless an important study on the use of art by an ecclesiastical patron for liturgical reform. (See Walter Melion's review of both Robertson and Jones, Art Bulletin, 77 (1995), 325-9.) Zygmunt Wazbinski's Il Cardinale Francesco Maria del Monte, 1549-1626, 2 vols., Florence, 1994, is a dossier of a patron's activity, one whose character, like Robertson's study, is particularly associated with its subject being scattered over a vast and largely uncharted archival area. Outside Italy, Robert Berger's A Royal Passion: Louis XIV as Patron of Architecture, Cambridge University Press, 1994, links patronage to power and the growing aesthetic awareness of patrons in the seventeenth century. All students of artistic patronage owe a debt to the scholars of fifteenth century Florence, many of whom are especially concerned with integrating artistic patronage (mecenatismo) and political patronage in general (clientelismo): see, for example, Werner Gundersheimer's introductory essay in G. Lyttle and S. Orgel (eds.), Patronage in the Renaissance, Princeton, 1981; and the editorial introduction by Patricia Simons and Francis Kent in Patronage, Art, and Society in Renaissance Italy, Oxford, 1987.
particular, Richard Goldthwaite has demonstrated that the vigorous
demand by patrons for architecture developed an enthusiastic and literate
understanding of the practice, which in turn informed the architectural
imagery "supplied" by architects.\textsuperscript{20}

Nevertheless, in the case of Cardinal Borghese, despite the extensive
nature of both the architectural patronage and the archival sources, there is
no literary record of his views on architecture. Nor is there much written
evidence on the extent to which he was involved in the design process.
There are neither personal diaries nor letters relating to works in progress,
while accounts reveal little, being confined to itemisations of building
details. Even in the other areas of Scipione's artistic patronage there is little
literary evidence of his taste.\textsuperscript{21} Borghese is not unique in this respect: with
the exception of one or two letters, Clare Robertson found little in
Alessandro Farnese's correspondence that would indicate his actual views
on the arts he so prodigiously sponsored. Although Robertson demonstrates
that Farnese took a more active interest in architecture than the other arts,
she is unable to conclude anything very specific about his motives for
building.\textsuperscript{22} This confirms the widely-held view that patrons such as Farnese
had ill-defined taste, which gave way to a generalised appetite for grand and
imposing status symbols.

To some extent, however, such a view arises from a consideration of
taste according to criteria separate from political and other issues, not to
mention the exigencies of the commission itself. Moreover, one might ask if
it is appropriate to expect much information on the visual arts in the letter's
of a Roman cardinal. Borghese, at least, corresponded mostly with those

\textsuperscript{20}See especially Goldthwaite's \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence. An Economic and Social
History}, Baltimore, 1980; and \textit{Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300-1600}, Baltimore

\textsuperscript{21}See Borghese's correspondence with Bentivoglio regarding tapestries (below, ch. 1 n. 39 and
40).

\textsuperscript{22}Robertson, '\textit{Il Gran Cardinale}', 236-7.
outside Rome, with almost all missives composed by secretaries and limited to a specific, usually administrative, subject. Building, on the other hand, was mainly an urban activity, and the Cardinal rarely wrote letters to those who lived nearby. The lack of written evidence could even even be interpreted in reverse, indicative of an informal intimacy with the processes of building. All Scipione's architectural projects were in-house affairs, with his personal architectural and administrative staff contracting largely the same set of craftsmen for each project, and it would be perhaps redundant to expect any household memoranda that might formalise our perception of his involvement with architecture. We know at least that Scipione vetted designs.\textsuperscript{23} It can also be assumed that he kept himself informed about the state of building, both through discussions with the architect and via site visits. In regards to the original brief itself, many specific design issues, such as the incidence of inscriptions or the redisposition of an altar, could only have been determined by Borghese as patron. Finally, Scipione's interest in the state of works and long-standing association with his artists would conversely have been reflected in a refined sense of anticipation of what would be pleasing to the Cardinal. The legacy of these invisible processes is in fact the architecture itself, which when understood in the light of contemporary perceptions can speak eloquently in the absence of written record.

The concern with Scipione's life has meant immersion in his personal archive. This is split into two series. The Archivio Borghese contains the records of the family's household and proprietorial administration, including the Cardinal's registri dei mandati and the

\textsuperscript{23}Below, ch. 2 n. 61, ch. 4 n. 29. The following comments relate to aesthetic issues and public architecture; the patron's design input in relation to domestic architecture is a different matter. See Patricia Waddy, "The design and designers of Palazzo Barberini", \textit{Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians}, 35 (1976), 180-85.
architectural and artisanal *misure e stime*. The companion archive, the Fondo Borghese, contains the literary record, including the wealth of eulogies, poetry, and philosophical, astronomical, and medical treatises written for the Cardinal. The Fondo Borghese also contains Scipione's correspondence. Those by the Cardinal are available in chronologically arranged copies, those to him are more haphazardly arranged, partly by date and partly by author. Scipione was head of state for sixteen years and his letters intermingle his private interests with those of the papacy. The sheer mass of his correspondence is overwhelming and it is difficult to make discreet enquires: there are, for example, more than 2000 letters alone in the volume (I 432) covering the period January to June, 1618. After 1621 Scipione's epistolary range instantly contracts to personal and family matters, with some afterglow generated by the continuing communication with contacts made during the *nepote* years (although the remains of the post-nephew letters are problematic; see below, chapter 4). Apart from some of the nunciature correspondence, the vast bulk of this material remains unpublished and unsystematised.\(^{24}\) To some extent this has led to certain themes and subjects being pursued in particular, with a certain concentration on the letters of the period 1618-21, the pivotal years in Scipione's career.

As a major public figure, the Cardinal's biography is supplemented by a number of indirect sources, particularly the *relazioni* describing the activities of the Roman court. Some of these have been published, such as the diary of Giacinto Gigli, the letters of Fulvio Testi, or the reports of the Venetian ambassadors.\(^{25}\) The majority, however, exist only in manuscript, including the papal diaries and the variety of usually anonymous commentaries on the sacred college and its conclaves. The most important

\(^{24}\)For existing publications, see ch. 1 n. 21, below.

source are the *avvisi*, bound in the Urbinate codices (volumes 1073-1101 for 1605-31) of the Vatican Library. These were dispatches on the ceremonial life of Rome (and other cities) sent to the court of Urbino.²⁶ Described by Delumeau as the forerunner of the modern broadsheet, the *avvisi* offer concise (most are less than 200 words) descriptions of all the liturgical, diplomatic, and social events of the day.²⁷ Indefatigable and relatively objective, no single source gives a more complete picture of early seventeenth century Rome.

Given the importance of biography, the dissertation adopts a chronological structure. Each of the Cardinal’s ecclesiastical projects is considered in turn, primarily from the perspective of certain patronal themes. While many of the themes are relevant to more than one project, the need to avoid repetition has meant that for the most part commissions are considered independently and according to distinct imperatives. As a means of foregrounding my own interpretation and freeing the text of minutiae, the text is succeeded by a catalogue of Borghese’s church building. This presents in standardised format all the documents and published reconstructions of Scipione’s patronage, including a number of previously unexamined elements. The catalogue also discusses matters of attribution, profiling the relevant architects and identifying the various artisans (who are cross-referenced in appendix 1). As a convenient reference to the text, a second appendix provides a checklist of the Cardinal’s palaces and villas, indicating significant building and offering a brief guide to more detailed studies. The final section consists of transcriptions and translations of some of the longer documents referred to in the main text, including the portraits

²⁶Julius Orbaan, *Documenti sul barocco in Roma*, Rome, 1920, LIV-LXIV, discusses the independence (from Rome, not Urbino) and anonymity of the *avvisatore*.
of the Cardinal by the Venetian ambassadors and some extracts from a
diagnosis of Scipione made by his personal physician.

The very fact that such detailed and varied primary sources exist at all
reflects Scipione's historical importance. Accordingly, the first chapter
provides a background to the office that defined his status, namely, that of
cardinal-nephew. The chapter focuses in particular on the rationale of his
patronage at large, noting that the personalised character of papal politics in
the early seventeenth century is the initial and inescapable context for
viewing the highly personalised imagery of Scipione's architecture.
Chapter 1
SCIPIONE AND THE OFFICE OF CARDINAL-NEPHEW

Before considering the architecture, it will be worthwhile to examine the duties and historical significance of the cardinal-nephew, the position occupied by Scipione during the Borghese pontificate. This office defined his career: he was promoted to the sacred college in the first place so he might become nephew; the position provided the opportunities and the wealth on which his early patronage was based; its status shaped the context in which his building was perceived; its passing in 1621 would determine the last thirteen years of his life.

To some extent this is an expository chapter, synthesising the recent findings of economic and political historians and exemplified through original sources. The detail is intricate because the exact status of the nephew is complex. Moreover the privileges and responsibilities (including patronage) of the nephew must be understood in a governmental and historical context. As will be argued, the nephew is critical to the administrative centralisation of the papacy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, and Scipione is one of the pivotal figures in that process.

Of all contemporary European governments, the post Tridentine papacy had the most distinctively modern constitution. At the top was the pope, an elected official. His authority was presidential, devolved upon the two tiers of administration and legislature (the judiciary, with the exception of the appellate court, was part of civic government). The first was comprised of curial departments, such as camerlengo (administrator of the sacred college), treasury, datary, and so on. The second was composed of the
fifteen cardinalate congregations established in the sixteenth century, which united matters of universal spiritual (the Inquisition, Index, Tridentine decrees, etc.) and local temporal government (the grain reserve, defence, appellate court, etc.).¹ Most curial executive officers were selected from the college of cardinals, which in turn was supplied with well-performing members of the curia. Theoretically the sacred college had the equivalent stature of both council, in that its members served the legislative congregations, and senate, in that matters were decided in collegial consistory, with the pope of course having the power of veto.

Yet this constitutional modernity is an illusion, for it is a peculiar fact that just as the constitutional importance of the college of cardinals at the legislative level was established, its actual importance in determining policy declined.² Congregations in fact did little more than gather information, and this substantive work was mostly executed by members of the curia. Apart from the electoral role, the real corporate function of the college was as an advisory body.³ In this, however, the college was riven with factions. The broadest division was made by the creatures of a particular pontificate: Paul V, for example, raised sixty one to the college in ten rounds of promotions between 1605 and 1621.⁴ Equally significant were the loyalties of nationality,

¹Sixtus V formalised the number and jurisdictions of the congregations in the bull Immensa Aeterni Dei (1588). On the congregations, their origins and jurisdiction, see Niccolò Del Re, La curia romana. Lineamenti storico-giuridici, Rome, 1952, 12-22. Most of the congregations were suppressed in 1908. Besides the judiciary, the civic government encompassed most standard municipal issues (sanitation, city walls, etc.): see Laurie Nussdorfer, Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII, Princeton, 1992, 60-90. The most detailed account of the actual workings of papal government and the sacred college in the period is Pieter Rietbergen, "Pausen, Prelaten, Bureaucraten. Aspecten van de geschiedenis van het Pausschap en de Pauselijke Staat in de 17e Eeuw", doctoral dissertation, University of Nijmegen, 1983 (essays in Dutch and English; on the sacred college in particular, "De leden van het college van KardinaLEN (1593-1667): Senatoren of Bureaucraten?", 77-122).


³Giovanni Botero succinctly stated the principal tasks of cardinals as to elect the pope, to advise him, and to use their position for the propagation of the faith among the faithful, the heretics, and the infidels: Dell'Uffito del Cardinale, Rome, 1599, 1. On Botero, see below, ch. 2 n. 87.

⁴Wolfgang Reinhard proposes the general structural principle of one pope's creature clashing
making the college a veritable microcosm of international politics. Most cardinals were considered hardly more than lobbyists. Francesco Contarini, the Venetian ambassador to Rome (1607-09), observed they had little say in papal policy, mainly due to their perceived untrustworthiness, their divided loyalties, and their personal ambition. The factional politics of the college were most nakedly expressed during the conclaves, when the level of unseemly double-dealing shook the expectations of all who cherished exalted notions of ecclesiastical ethics. To many who knew it well, the Roman court was a cold and treacherous place, full of traps and dissimulation. The only cardinal the pope could rely upon unconditionally was usually the very first promotion - his own cardinal-nephew.

Such was the case with Paul V, who had been pope for just over two months when he called Scipione Caffarelli to Rome and made him cardinal on 18 July, 1605. In so doing, Paul invested Scipione with almost all the

with the creature of his predecessor, while allying themselves with those of their predecessor's predecessor, linking the succession of administrations in a chronological figure 8: Freunde und Kreaturen: 'Verflechtung' als Konzept zur Erforschung historischer Führungsgruppen Römische Oligarchie um 1600, Munich, 1979, 70-2; a view repeated in "Papal Power and Family Strategy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century", in R. Asch and A. Birke (eds.), Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: the Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, 1450-1650, Oxford, 1991, 352.

5“tutti li cardinali dipendono da principi, per favor dei quali sono assorti a tal dignità....Alcuni anco perchè ambiscono al pontificato non possono haver il consiglio libero e sincero.”: Nicolò Barozzi and Guglielmo Berchet (eds.), Lettere al senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo decimosettimo. Le relazioni della corte di Roma., Venice, 1877, voi. 1, 89.

6In one treatise (Cardinale Papabile) on the appropriate behaviour at the conclave of 1621, the author specifically reminded participants to conduct themselves with the dignity befitting a cardinal and to not allow factional allegiance to overly obstruct an orderly election: BAV Vat. Lat. 12175, 85r-91r.


8"Nostro Signore in fine di detto consistoro dichiarò Cardinale il Signore Caffarelli suo nipote per parte di sorella. Giovane di 25 anni [sic.]che per esser dotto, et accusatamato questa promozione fu approvata da tutto il sacro collegio, il quale per due sere fece fare pubbliche allegrezza, et in particolare gli ambasciatori da principi, et altri signori, et in somma tutta la città con li baroni, e gentil huomini, la maggior parte parenti del Papa, è per conseguenza del Nipote. Si compiacque Sua Beattitudine di dichiarare detto suo nipote cardinale prete per
courtly authority owing to himself; in its turn, the court acknowledged Scipione's arrival with public celebrations and personal gifts. With this appointment, Scipione became Paul's advocate and representative. As advocate, the nephew would be called upon to explain papal decisions to heads of state as well as functionaries. As representative, he would have an important role in papal diplomacy, whether as the first port of call for petitioners or as the host for Rome's official guests. Both these duties were species of mediation, the most commonly recognised feature of the nephew's office. Giovanni Mocenigo, the Venetian ambassador (1609-12), observed at first hand Cardinal Borghese's style:

he deals very cautiously with everything, and, while not promising anyone the Pope's good will, in a most humane fashion he at least satisfies each with good words....On account of this His Holiness loves him with extraordinary affection, for the Pope is naturally one who does not like anyone to do anything that might

esser in età 25 anni, e di più da si dovesse per l'avenne chiamare il Cardinale Borghese, e far la medissima arne come fa il Papa, senza metter nel sendo altra casa dell'arme de Caffarelli....": avviso of 23 July, 1605, Urb. Lat. 1073, 420v-421r. Scipione was in fact born on 1 September, 1577, a "hora 14 et minutis 13" : Biblio. Casanatense, Cod. 631, 136, a document first cited by D'Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma, 203 (V. Castronovo, "Borghese-Caffarelli, Scipione", DBI, Rome, 1970, vol. 12, 620, gave 1576 as his date of birth; Ringbeck, 19, citing the above manuscript, also misprints his date of birth as 1 September, 1576; Antinori, 3, noting the diverse estimate, cautiously describes the Cardinal in 1605 as "non ancora trentenne"). Other sources confirm 1 September, 1577, as his birth date: ASV FB IV 201, 56r; ASV FB IV 151, 9v. See also the Cardinal's detailed horoscope devised in 1629: ASV FB IV, 133, 15v. Scipione was thus twenty seven and three quarter years when he entered the sacred college.

A week after Scipione's election his pre-eminent status was signalled when three of the college's most important cardinals, including two former nepote, presented him with the elements of luxury transport. "Cardinale Acquaviva ha donato un bellissimo paro de cavalli al Cardinale Borghese, et Montalto gli fa far un bellissimo cocchio, et Cardinal Aldobrandini una carrozza...": avviso of 30 July, 1605, Urb. Lat. 1073, 417r. By November, when Borghese assumed the title of S. Crisogono, he was attracting a huge entourage. "Giovedì, mattina andò il Cardinale Borghese à pigliar il suo titolo di S. Grisogono, col più bello corteggio, che mai si sia vedeo, poichè ci erano 60 cocchi be pieni de prelati cosi fanno e li preti adular, chi dominar." : avviso of 27 November, 1605, Urb. Lat. 1073, 633r.

Cardinal Borghese was described as the "interpreter" of the pope's mind, a commonplace description of the deputy in charge of public relations: Battista Platina, Delle Vite de Pontefici, dal Salvator Nostro sino a Paolo II. Accresciuto con le historie de'Papi moderni da Sisto IV fino a Paolo V, con somma diligenza descritte da F. Onofrio Panvinio, Antonio Cicarelli, Giovanni Stringa, Venice, 1650, 872; also, Gregorio Leti, Il Nipotismo di Roma, vol. 1, 191.
be regarded as originating from any hand except his own and his particular decision.¹¹

No less significant to the nephew's mediacy to the pope was his political status as the Papal States' first minister. Since the mid-sixteenth century, the importance of the cardinal-nephew had grown in step with the development of the offices of superintendent and secretariat of state - indeed, since the time of Sixtus V the duties of the three were coterminous.¹² The Sopraintendente dello Stato Ecclesiastico was equivalent to the minister for the interior: as head of the Congregazione del Buon Governo he was responsible for overseeing the administration of municipal governments; he also controlled internal military matters, including the suppression of bandits, weapons' licences, and recruitment of soldiers.¹³ Conversely, the secretary of state was minister for the exterior, responsible for the implementation of the papacy's foreign policy and the maintenance of its international relations.

At this point it should be pointed out that the distinction between the two executive offices of superintendent and secretary of state is slightly artificial. In 1611, Girolamo Lunadoro wrote that the duties of the secretary

¹¹Barozzi and Berchet, Lettere...Roma, 97 (below, III.1.i).
¹²P. Richard, "Origines et développement de la Secrétairerie d'Etat Apostolique (1417-1823)", Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 11 (1910), 527-9. A brief by Paul IV of 15 July, 1555, one of the earliest documents to validate the vice-presidential authority of the cardinal-nephew, emphasised the position came "eo sanguinis vinculo quo conjunctissimi sumus": ASV Arm. XLIV, vol. IV, 100, quoted in Madeleine Laurain-Portemer, "Absolutisme et népotisme. La surintendance de l'état ecclésiastique", Bibliothèque de l'école des charles, 131 (1973), 490 n. 1. The position, however, was not always confined to a single cardinal. Clement VIII, for example, originally appointed two nephews (Cinzio and Pietro) to the role, neither of whom were yet in the sacred college: idem, 508. Laurain-Portemer divides the history of the institution into two phases, with Cardinal Borghese standing at the threshold of what she terms the classical era, when the constitutional boundaries of the office firmed: idem, 511-3.
(who was always the cardinal-nephew) included those, such as the authorisation of internal governing agencies, normally associated with the superintendent.14 This was inverted by a chirograph of 1632, which included in the universal authority of superintendent the use of any means necessary to maintain the papacy's external relations.15 Generally the two offices, perhaps because they worked through the same bank of secretaries and were united in the one person, were seen as being a function of each other.16 The distinction between the offices, however, is emphasised here as a point of government definition, one that indicates the domestic and foreign dimensions of the cardinal-nephew's affairs. It was a distinction, moreover, recognised by Paul V in his interim appointment between May and September, 1605 (when Scipione was named superintendent), of two cardinals to deal with state correspondence: the one, Cardinal de Camerino, to sign the papers of papal government; the other, Cardinal Valenti, to address the nuncios.17 It was also a distinction implicitly recognised in later definitions. A treatise (1623) on the office of nepote described the jurisdiction of the superintendent as those of "state matters...because he will have two main offices: the first, of overseeing all the negotiations that pass between the Apostolic See and Christian princes; the second, of managing all of the most important negotiations concerning the temporal government of the papal states."18 Whatever the definition, the crucial point is that by the

---

14"P(rim)o segretario [of the pope] quale è sempre il Card.l nepote, il quale ha molti segretarij sotto di se, et questo Card.le scrive lui, et sotto scrive le lettere d'ordine di Sua S.tà à tutti li Prin(c)ipi, munt(i) et altri et questo segna le patenti de molti governatori, potestà, barigelli, et altri offici(ali) dello stato eccl(sias)tico. Et con il med(ism)o card.le nepote tutti li SS.ri Amb.ri de Principi partendosi à negociare dalla S.tà sua, vanno à dar conto di quello hanno fatto à SS.ri Ill.ma come anco ci vanno tutti li ministri di Roma, il qual nipote suole havere titolo di sopraintendente g(e)n(ér)ale dello stato Eccl(sias)tico dato(g)li per breve di Sua S.tà come anco lì da il breve di segretario.:" BAV Reg. Lat. 389, "Relatione della Corte e Governo di Roma", 3r (a more clearly written, though later, version in ASV FB I 634; the treatise was later published as Girolamo Lundoro, Relatione della corte di Roma, Padua, 1640).


18"sopraintendenza, come si dice delle cose di stato...perché haverà due cariche principali.
beginning of the seventeenth century the cardinal-nephew was a type of lieutenant to the pope, his maintenance of civil issues allowing (at least in the public eye) the pontiff to concentrate on spiritual matters.

Almost all the nephew's duties of state were actually executed by an increasingly sophisticated secretariat. During the Borghese pontificate the secretariat was chiefly an office of correspondence, divided into two departments: that of instructions and reports in code (ciffre) to the papacy's foreign representatives; and that of diplomatic letters and acknowledgments (segretaria de complimenti).19 Like any government department, the secretariat was composed of numerous officials of varying rank, but all were functionaries of the cardinal-nephew, known as the secretarius in capite.20 Thus while nephew, Scipione was the signatory to the entire output of state correspondence, the sheer volume of which is astonishing.21


19Josef Semmler, Das Päpstliche Staatsssekretariat in den Pontifikaten Pauls V. und Gregors XV, 1605-1623, (Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte, 33. Supplementheft), Freiburg, 1969, 93-7. Semmler's study is primarily quantitative, providing an index to archival sources and personnel of the office during the first two decades of the seventeenth century. A recent review, with an important general guide to the archival indices in the Vatican, is provided by Manuela Belardini, "Del secretario e secretaria di Nostro Signore. Appunti per una ricerca sulle istituzioni diplomatiche della Santa Sede in età moderna", La carte e la storia, 2 (1996), 149-54. A decoded ciffra is transcribed below, III.2.

20Semmler, Das Päpstliche Staatsssekretariat, 49-50. Note that the title secretary of state appears in the late sixteenth century to distinguish any apostolic secretary not in the sacred college who worked principally on diplomatic matters (Richard, "La Secrétairerie d'État Apostolique", 731). In the text, however, the title refers to the secretarius in capite. As Lunadoro reported, "sono i secretarij di stato...in ogni modo dipendono dal S.re Card.le nepote...cose bene negoziato col papa con tutto cioè dal Card.le sud.o [the nephew] pigliano li ordine...": BAV Reg. Lat. 389, 4v.

21As signatory, all Cardinal Borghese's letters were copied into his personal registri; the Fondo Borghese also preserves most of the original incoming letters of state. Thus it is that a family archive is a source (there are also archives of 'Segreteria di Stato', 'Nunziature', and 'Secretaria Brevium') of state correspondence. Semmler, Das Päpstliche Staatsssekretariat, 55-88, identifies the main authors of the cardinal-nephew's department. A manuscript (BAV Barb. Lat. 5087, 123-137) detailing the main duties of the under-secretaries was published by Andreas Kraus, "Die Aufgaben eines Sekretärs zur Zeit Urbans. VIII. (1623)", Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte, 53 (1958), 89-92. The segretario de complementi was a haven in the curia for skilled writers, such as Lanfranco
Ultimately, however, Borghese was himself a functionary of the pope, executing rather than determining papal policy. This raises the issue of what were his actual powers. In a review article, Madeleine Laurain-Portemer takes issue with Wolfgang Reinhard's contention, advanced in *Papstfinanz*, that the powers of the cardinal-nephew were largely illusory. She argues instead that an illusion could hardly have justified the establishment of concrete institutions such as superintendent.22 Reinhard rightly countered that the pope's divestment of political authority was nevertheless symbolic: "The legal fictions of bombastic documents should not be taken at face value...The pope's role was stylized to such an extent that he needed a go-between for everyday business....It is not the [Latin papal] briefs, which are extremely ceremonious and almost devoid of content, but the letters [in Italian, signed by the cardinal-nephew] that carry the message [of papal policy], which therefore must not be misunderstood as the personal opinion of the cardinal-nephew."23 Yet Laurain-Portemer makes an important point, for the state institutions which the cardinal-nephew headed, by the very nature of bureaucracy, take on a life of their own - indeed, as we shall see, they eventually separate themselves from the structures of nepotism. Moreover, Reinhard's implication that the cardinal-nephew was virtually a political cypher because he neither wrote many letters himself, nor formed

Margotti (secretary 1605-11), whose letters were regarded as models of their kind, with a collection of them (unfortunately undated) later published under the title *Lettere scritte per lo più nei tempi di Paolo V a nome del sig. card. Borghese, raccolte e pubblic. da Pietro de Magistris de Caldèrola*, first published Rome, 1627; then Venice, 1633 and 1642, Bologna, 1661. Some of Borghese's nunciature correspondence has been published: Klaus Wittstadt (ed.), *Nuntius Attilio Amalteo* (1606 September - 1607 September), Munich, 1975, and Wolfgang Reinhard (ed.), *Nuntius Antonio Albergati* (1610 Mai - 1614 Mai), 2 vols., Munich, 1972. (these two works form parts IV and V of the series *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*); Lucienne van Meerbeeck (ed.), *Correspondance des Nonces Gesualdo, Morra, Sanseverino, avec la Secrétairerie d'Etat Pontificale* (1615-21), Rome/Brussels, 1937; and Luigi de Steffani (ed.), *La nunziatura di Francia del Cardinale Guido Bentivoglio. Lettere a Scipione Borghese*, 4 vols., Florence, 1863.


policy (which he says was made by the pope with the assistance of an unspecified [not, that is, the *segretarius in capite*] secretary of state), is to locate power in independence, a misplaced equation in any hierarchic managerial structure, let alone a monarchy. The cardinal-nephew’s power derived not from his personal opinions (if these can ever be known), or from his ability to act independently of the pope, but from his contribution to the state’s decision-making mechanism, from his supervision of its executive apparatus, and from his personal contact with its many important friends and enemies.

Moreover, as we shall see in relation to his efforts to secure tapestries from France, much of the state correspondence was obviously personalised to his particular needs. Outside personal matters, Scipione was able to use his position to influence papal policy. In 1620, for example, Scipione explicitly (and unconventionally) stressed his involvement in a case of particular interest to the king of Spain, namely the canonisation of the Spanish peasant Isidoro (c. 1080-1130), urging the Spanish nuncio to inform Phillip III "that the negotiations passed through my hands".24 Phillip was renowned for his devotion to Isidoro and he had first petitioned the Borghese for his canonisation two years earlier.25 Paul V, however, had

---

24 "Ha potuto sin’ora comprendere la M(aestà) di cotesto Re quanto sia grande l’affetto, che la Santità di N.ro S.re le porta, co’l testimone di tante gratie, che Sua B.ne le ha fatte. Ma nondimeno Sua S.tà, perseverando nella medesima benigna disposizione verso la Maestà Sua, ha risoluto di voler compiacerla, anche nella canonizzazione del Beato Isidoro, tanto desiderata da Sua Maestà; con tutto che Sua B.ne havesse fermamente determinato di non venir più a d altre canonizatione, doppo le due [Carlo Borromeo and Francesca Romana], che ha fatte, con applauso tanto generale, et havesse perciò data la negativa a diverse instanze grand.me per fondatori di religioni, e per altri Beati, fatte, e riterate particolarmente da i Padri Gesuiti. Di questa risoluzione di S. B.ne V. S. potrà dar conto alla M.tà Sua procurando a quest’effetto d’haver quanto p(rim)a l’audienza, nella qual’ella dovrà rappresentar tutte queste circostanze, che qualificano la grati, e mostrano chiaramente l’amor paterno di Sua San.tà verso la Maestà Sua. Con che a V. S. desidero piena contentezza. Dalla Villa di Frascati il 6 Ottobre 1620. Oltre a quello che V. S. dirà a S. M. dell’affetto di S. San.tà verso la M. tà Sua potrà insieme far un pieno testimonio del mio vivissimo desiderio di servirla, havendo io anco mostrato in queste occ(asio)ne, come benissimo sa il Duca d’Alburquerque [the ambassador to Rome], havendo voluto, ch’il neg(oti)o passasse p(er) mie mani": Borghese to the Spanish nuncio (Francesco Cennini), 6 October, 1620, ASV FB II 422,179r.

25 Phillip III to Marcantonio Borghese, 11 August, 1618, ASV FB I 974, 355r.
decided not to create any more new saints after Francesca Romana and Carlo Borromeo in 1610, this despite some intense lobbying by the Jesuits on behalf of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier. In now conceding to disregard his self-imposed moratorium on canonisations, Paul V signalled Rome's affection for Europe's most powerful state, a relationship whose cultivation, if not initiation, had in the main been the work of Scipione as secretary of state. No less importantly, it was Scipione who had been overseeing parallel negotiations to have Marcantonio Borghese made a grandee of the Spanish crown, and he obviously felt (correctly, as it happened) that Isidoro's elevation might speed the process of his cousin's ennoblement. Finally, Scipione may also have been looking to the future and his imminent position as a former cardinal-nephew, for Paul V was by this time aged and infirm, and the Cardinal perhaps thought that highlighting his role in the matter would reinforce Spanish support in the uncertain months ahead.

In sum, the role of Scipione in an incident as important as canonisation was complex and inextricably interwoven with papal, family, and personal interests - but it was no less significant for all this.

Much of the actual practice of government seems to have been an extension of personal relationships cultivated by Borghese. This is particularly apparent when examining the nephew's two most important political alliances: those with the legates and governors, and with foreign nuncios. Cardinal-legates and governors-general were the papacy's resident delegates within the various regions of the papal states, the former restricted to the more ancient or larger dominions, such as Avignon, Ferrara, Perugia, and Bologna, the latter curial appointees (who historically begin to supersede legates from the time of Clement VIII) operating both in all the other regions and within regions subdivided under legations. Leaving

---

26 Below, n. 73; III. 2.
27 Below, ch. 4 n. 21.
28 Rietbergen, "Pausen, Prelaten", 136-7; Ingo Stader, Herrschaft durch Verflechtung: Perugia
aside for now the governor, whose definition is legally more complicated, the authority of cardinal-legates was clear - they were the representatives of the pope in spiritualibus et in temporalibus. In the past this had provided scope for authority to be exercised semi-independently, particularly when the legate came from the area. By the late sixteenth century, however, legates were firmly under the control of the Sopraintendente dello Stato Ecclesiastico, that is the cardinal-nephew.²⁹ Rome's dominion over Bologna, for example, was maintained from 1614 to 1620 through the intimate contact between Borghese and the resident legate, Cardinal Luigi Capponi (1583-1653).³⁰ Personnel management and supervision of appointments at all levels of the city's civil and ecclesiastical service were largely functions of the integration of the cardinals' respective client networks.³¹ This was simply stated by Borghese when he notified Antonio Cicalotti of his appointment as vice-legate in 1617: "I have decided to grant the post to Your Lordship...no less out of respect of your merits than because I had to serve in this matter signor Cardinal Capponi".³² Capponi's work for the superintendent of state was driven by more than simple fidelity to the Holy See and was expressed in language that unambiguously


²⁹Indeed the cardinal-nephew himself traditionally held the legation to Avignon, along with the governorship of Fermo, offices which of course had to be sub-delegated: Del Re, La curia romana, 187-91; Reinhard, Papstfinanz, vol. 2, 379.


³¹The position of sacristan, for example, vacated in the church of San Petronio (Borghini to Capponi, 27 June, 1618, ASV FB II 432, 725r), received as close attention as did Dr. Vincenzo Croce for the University of Bologna's first chair of Medicine: "Porta con si tutti i numeri d'efficacia l'ordine, che da V. S. Illustrissima mi giunge, in servigio del Dottor Vincenzo Croce; mentre s'accompagna col testimonio della sua protettione. Io rappresentarò con ogni maggior vivezza questa parte, che rinchiuide in se l'altra [candidate for the position] della sufficienza di esso...." Capponi to Borghese, 22 September, 1618, ASV FB III 47a, 144r; responding to Borghese's original recommendation of 5 September, ASV FB II 488, 242r.

³²"A V. S. ho procurato volontieri il carico di cotesta Vicelegate non meno per rispetto de i suoi meriti, che per la certezza e havevo di servire in ciò il S.re Card. Capponi.... ", Borghese to Cicalotti, 8 July, 1617, ASV FB II 401, 509r.
personalised his service to Cardinal Borghese.33 His cooperation with the cardinal-nephew was a continuation of his own status as a Borghese creature; in fact he was thought to be so attached to Borghese that following the death of Paul V the Ludovisi felt it wise to remove him from Bologna to the Archbishopric of Ravenna.

As secretary of state Borghese developed similar relationships with the papal nuncios. Like the legate, the nuncio was invested with the authority of representing the pope.34 But while the nuncio represented the pope, he dealt with the nephew; as Guido Bentivoglio (1577-1644) explained of his nunciature in Brussels (1607-15), "I took briefs [that is, policy] from His Holiness Our Lord and letters [that is, specific instructions] from the Illustrious Cardinal Borghese."35 If the legate was an administrator, the nuncio was essentially a diplomat, an office that with the growing definition of states and politics of international alliance had become increasingly formalised by the early seventeenth century.36 Given the common interest of Catholicism and the universally recognised status of Rome as a mediator to the great powers, the papal nuncio was one of the most sophisticated of all ambassadors, skilled at insinuating himself into the channels of political gossip, gathering secrets and leaking information, false or otherwise. The

---

33 As, for example, the request that a certain Monsignor Scappi be made secretary of the congregation of bishops: "Truovò sempre la servitù mia alla benignità di V. S. III.ma libero ricorso, et però torna frequentemente à supplicarla." Capponi to Borghese, 29 August, 1629, ASV FB III 59b, 357r.
34 Giovanni Moroni, Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica, Venice, 1848, vol. 48, 151.
36 The first manual of ambassadorial behaviour was J. A. De Vera y Figueroa y Zuniga's El Embajador, Seville, 1620. Traiano Boccalini, however, had earlier wrote of the ambassador's role: "Gli ambasciatori non sono magistrati perché non hanno impero alcuno nello Stato ma però sono annoverarsi tra i principali ministri del Prencipe, per esser interpreti della mente d'i questo appresso gli altri Prencipi, e mezzani degli offici, de'negotii, e de' trattati ne' quali consiste alle volte la somma delle cose, il riposo del Prencipato, la salute de' popoli, e la reputazione del Soprano [sic.], stando alle volte nelle mani di questo la conclusione della pace, delle leghe, delle guerre, e la discrezione di adolcire ò d'inasprire la mente del Prencipe con chi vanno à negociare...." Letter to Signor Vitaliano of Genoa (c. 1603-10), in La Bilancia Politica, Castellana, 1678, vol. 2, 124.
nuncio’s chief virtue was prudence, a difficult entrustment considering the temporal, spiritual, and familial positions of the papacy did not always coincide.\textsuperscript{37} Nunciate duty was normally articulated as service to the papal family, one often rewarded with the red cap: when Bentivoglio learnt of his own elevation to the sacred college he lamented to a colleague in Madrid:

Oh the world and its vanities! I had scarcely received notice of my promotion to the cardinalate when the news arrived of the unexpected death of Pope Paul. Your eminence can well understand that the sorrow felt is a measure of my indebtedness. It is certain that I will hold myself obligated to his saintly memory, both for having adopted me in his service with such great confidence for so many years and for the remuneration he has granted with such benignity. I am ready to go quickly to Rome, for everything hangs on the next election. Therefore, I should attempt to arrive there in time to satisfy, as I must, the requirements both of being a good cardinal with the Holy See and a good servant of Cardinal Borghese. But the cold weather is sharp, the journey long, and my health delicate...\textsuperscript{38}

Such a letter hints at the extent to which state administration was conducted as family business. Much of the extraordinarily detailed nunciate correspondence sees Bentivoglio dealing with persons who are well or ill disposed not just to the Holy See, but to the house of Borghese. International politics were so personalised in the early seventeenth century

\textsuperscript{37}On conflicts of interest, see the discussion of the chinea incident, below.

\textsuperscript{38}"O Mondo! ò sue vanità! Apena hò ricevuto l’avviso della mia promotione al Cardinalato, che m’è sopragiunto quello dell’inaspettata morte di Papa Paolo. Ben può credere V. E. ch’è misura de gli obblighi io ne senta il dolore. E certo ch’io mi terrò non meno obligato sempre a quello santa memoria per havermi adoperato in suo servitio tanti anni con si gran confidenza, che per la remuneratione stessa, che me n’ha fatta poi godere si a pieno con tanta benignità. Di già veggo Roma tutta in moto per questo caso, e tutta pendente dalla nuova elettione. Così potessi giungerui a tempo ancor’io, per sodisfar, come debbo, e all’offitio di buon Cardinale con la Santa Sede, e a quello di buon servitore co’l Sig. Cardinal Borghese! Ma tuttavia il freddo è si aspro, il viaggio si lungo, e la mia complessione si tenue...": Bentivoglio to the Duke of Monteleone (Hettore Pignatello), 20 February, 1621, Raccolta di lettere., 340-41. See also Bentivoglio’s earlier thank-you letters to the Borghese, 31 January, 1621, in Bentivoglio, Raccolta di lettere, 171-2.
that this was mostly to everyone’s expectation. So, for example, it was natural for Borghese to occupy the papal nuncio with the task of hunting down tapestries for the Cardinal’s collection.\(^{39}\) It was also natural for Bentivoglio to convert the private into the public, using Borghese’s covetness as the basis for a diplomatic gift, thereby creating the possibility of an enhanced and personalised intimacy between Rome and Paris.\(^{40}\)

The entanglement of the two institutions, however, could also cause problems. One of Bentivoglio’s main tasks in Paris was to quell the French discontent over the Spanish influence with the Borghese family.\(^{41}\) Even he, however, could not always keep the peace. Such was the case in May, 1618, when Borghese instructed Bentivoglio to explain to the French court why Marcantonio Borghese would be presenting the chinea that year. The chinea was the white horse given each year on 28 June by the King of Naples (that

---

\(^{39}\)On 4 February, 1617, Borghese instructed Bentivoglio to look out for tapestries to add to his collection, adding that the Count of Saint-Paul was known to own some especially fine examples: Steffani, *La nunziatura*, vol. 1, n. 111, 136, and n. 113, 138. For six months the two discussed the possibility of buying works (idem, vol. 1 n. 149, 168-9; n. 242, 235-6; n. 274, 256; n. 379, 333; n. 452, 393-4).

\(^{40}\)Due di sono, il cavaliere di Vendome, parlando col Menocchio, ch’è molto suo intrinseco, della persona del marchese di Coeuvres e della sua andata a Roma, gli disse che avrebbe desiderato che suo zio portasse qualche bel presente, in nome di Sua Maestà, a V. S. illustissima...e che trattarono insieme di quel che potesse esser più conforme al gusto di Lei, cioè, o argentii o tapezzerie o qualche gioia. Il Menocchio medesimo m’ha dato parte di ciò; ed io in buon modo gli ho detto, che siccome V. S. Illustrissima non ha avuto gusto di mostrar mercenario affetto verso questa Corona, così non ricererà mai quegli onori che sian per venigli dalla mano del Re, o per via di presenti, o con qualche altra onorevole dimostrazione. Trattammo particolarmente di qualche bella tapezzeria; ed io dichiarai qual potrebbe essere stato, in questo genere, il gusto di V. S. Illustrissima. Bentivoglio to Borghese, 30 August, 1618, Steffani, *La nunziatura*, vol. 1, n. 548, 462-3. In fact, the gift might well have been the tapestry owned by the Count of Saint-Paul (which the nuncio’s agent, Mennochio, had convinced the Count to sell to Coeuvres: idem, vol. 2, n. 1031, 295), one of the works that had inspired the Cardinal’s initial enquiry fourteen months earlier. With this splendid and unique tapestry close at hand Scipione could barely contain himself: "confesso che le cose scrittemi da lei mi hanno messo in gran desiderio di questa tapezzeria." Borghese to Bentivoglio, 24 April, 1618, idem, vol. 2, n. 1117, 370.

\(^{41}\)Bentivoglio’s brief in Paris is detailed in Pastor, vol. 26, 35-6. The annoyance of the French crown at Borghese efforts to ingratiate themselves with the Spanish monarchy was a continuing theme of Bentivoglio’s nunciature. Bentivoglio was forever fending off French suspicions of favouritism shown to the Catholic king by Rome. A justified claim: Giovanni Mocenigo had observed in 1612 that although the pope professed neutrality between Spain and France, the Spanish king was the most esteemed figure in the Roman court: Barozzi and Berchet, *Lettere...Roma*, vol. 1, 102-5. Moreover, it was noted in Paris that Bentivoglio seemed forever in collusion with the Spanish ambassador to France: Barozzi and Berchet (eds.), *Relazioni...dagli ambasciatori Veneti...serie II, Francia*, Venice, 1859, vol. 2, 100.
is, Spain) to the pope as a sign of vassalage. It was normal for the crown to
delegate the presentation of the tribute to a Roman prince, but not for the
prince to be a member of the papal family.\textsuperscript{42} It is clear that Scipione felt this
an unwelcome honour, one perhaps impetuously accepted by the young
Marcantonio before he had consulted the pope.\textsuperscript{43} Yet having cultivated
intimacy with the king for so long, the Borghese were in no position to
refuse. Scipione’s pre-emptive letter to Bentivoglio assayed their
predicament:

It seemed to the prince that he had to follow the wish of His
Majesty, considering that for more than ten years he has had the
commendation of Calatrave [a Cistercian monastery in Castille]
and also possesses in the Kingdom of Naples the principality of
Sulmona. He also calculated that he would be unable to excuse
himself from the honour that His Majesty had deigned to offer
him without being highly discourteous. When this became
known, the archbishop of Lyon came to see me to enquire if I
wanted to persuade the prince to refuse to perform this act. I
replied that for my part I had never given any thought to procure
this demonstration from the king of Spain....[Moreover] His
Catholic Majesty had for his own reason already sought out the
prince with his letter and the prince had already made his promise,
[so that] he [Marcantonio] could hardly now excuse himself except
in the case of death or illness; besides which, it would have been
extremely impolite to reject the offer in any case. I added that in

\textsuperscript{42}In 1617 Count Colonna presented the tribute: Urb. Lat. 1085, 262r.
\textsuperscript{43}The Prince of Sulmona was originally approached directly by the king to present the tribute
on his behalf, explaining the reason as the unavailability of the ambassador, the Duke of
Alburquerque (being still in Madrid), and the ineligibility of Cardinal Borgia (being in
consistory): Phillip III to Marcantonio Borghese, 25 April, 1618, ASV FB I 974, 352v. The
matter was passed to Scipione, who wrote to the Spanish nuncio accepting the honour on the
Prince’s behalf: Borghese (per Prince of Sulmona) to Cennini, 28 May, 1618, ASV FB II 432,
611r. Three days before the prince wrote accepting the honour, Cardinal Borghese had briefed
the Spanish nuncio, hinting that the incident had been orchestrated by Cardinal Lerma as
part of his plan to be acknowledged by Rome as his Excellency (below, III.2): “la giudicato il
Principe di dovere accettar quest’honore e di rendersi humilis.e grate alla M.tà sua....Pensava il
Principe di ringratiar sopra il med(ism)o soggetto anche il S. Card.le di Lerma, ma s’è reputato esser meglio che l’ufficio sia fatto in voce da V. S. di che in la prego, non essendosi havuto per bene, che di palazzo di cominci a dar’a sua Sig.ria Ill.ma il titolo
d’Ecc(ellenz)a che pretende.” Borghese to Cennini, 25 May, 1618, ASV FB II 432, 586v.
itself the action is not in essence of any moment, although it seems something in appearance. At any rate, the prince has always accompanied the Spanish ambassadors in the calvacade (as he will have to do in presenting the chinea), just as all the other papal nephews have done. In short, he [Marcantonio] would serve His Most Christian Majesty with equal promptness if on any other time he were to deign to honour him with some similar commandment. I then concluded that the will of the prince must, in substance, be measured against that of Our Lord; and that His Holiness has made it known many times that for the common good he is well disposed towards the interests of His Most Christian Majesty.44

The French, however, felt that the pro-Spanish pretensions of the Borghese had blinded them from seeking a balanced foreign policy for the Holy See. For some time the French court had been involved with the papacy in an attempt to carve out a position of Catholic neutrality - the so-called Peace of Italy - by trying to balance Rome on an accord strung between the anti-Hapsburg stances of Venice, Savoy, and France, and the assertive stance of Phillip III.45 In part this was for self-preservation; Spain controlled Naples to

44"....Parve al Principe di dover conformarsi al gusto di Sua Maestà, considerando egli che già più di dieci anni ha l'abito di Calattrave con una commenda, e che possiede nel Regno d'Napoli il principato di Sulmona; e avendo, insieme, stimato che non avrebbe, senza mancamento e scortesia grande, potuto ricusar l'onor che a Sua Maestà è piaciuto di fargli, promise di servir la Maestà Sua in quest'azione. Pubblicatosi tutto questo, è poi venuto da me monsignor Arcivescovo di Lione, e mi ha ricercato ch'io voglia operare che il Principe ricusi di venire a quest'atto. Io gli ho risposto, dalla parte mia non si è pensato mai a procurare questa dimostrazione dal Re di Spagna....e che avendo S. M. Cattolica, di suo proprio motivo, ricercato con sue lettere il Principe, ed egli avendo già promesso, non potrebbe più ricusare se non in caso di morte o d'infermità; oltre che, sarebbe stato malissimo termine il dar la ripulsa ancora prima che precedesse la promessa. Ho soggiunto che l'azione, per sè stessa, non è d i alcun momento in essenza, benchè para qualche cosa in apparenza: e di più, il Principe in ogni modo è sempre andato ad accompagnare gli ambasciatori di Spagna nelle cavalcate, in quest'azione del presentar la chinea, come hanno usato di andarlo tutti gli altri nipoti di Papi; e che, insomma, con pari prontezza servirebbe S. M. Cristianissima, ogni volta che si degnasse di onorarla di qualche simile comandamento. Ho concluso infine, che la volontà del Principe deve, in sostanza, esser misurata da quella di Nostro Signore; e che la Santià Sua, con frequenti dimostrazioni, si fa conoscere per padre comune è benissimo disposto verso le cose di S. M. Cristianissima...": Borghese to Bentivoglio, 27 May, 1618, Steffani, La nunziatura, vol. 2, n. 1172, 425-6s.

45Raffaele Belvederi, Guido Bentivoglio e la politica europea del suo tempo, 1607-1621, Padua, 1962, 772-83.
the south and Lombardy to the north, while France was allied with Venice and Savoy, the two powers who controlled the trans-alpine ways. Rome was hemmed in and aware of the danger of central Italy once again becoming the theatre of conflict between the great powers. There was also the broader issue of Catholic solidarity, for the Dutch Republic's efforts to free themselves from Spanish dominion were dividing Europe and presented fertile ground for the spread of heresy. Now, with the chinera incident, the gulf between Borghese aspirations to Spanish nobility and outward papal neutrality had gaped too wide. Of course the pope was not neutral, but papal neutrality was an expected posture of diplomatic decorum. According to Bentivoglio, one of Louis XIII's ministers pointed out that Marcantonio would have had to have referred to the king as his lord (indeed he did utter the tribute in Spanish), and had concluded that "it was impossible for the world not to believe that the Holy See did not overly depend [on Spain]". In this case, what was so exasperating to the French court was the unseemly blurring of the normally observed diplomatic distinction between the incumbent family and the papal institution.

46 See the Venetian ambassador's comments, reported above, n. 41.

47 "...inferendo egli [Marquis of Puysieux - that is, Pierre Brulart] che...era come impossibile che il mondo non credesse che la Santa Sede non pendesse troppo da quella parte...Toccò Puysieux quel punto delle parole che doveva proferire il signor principe [Marcantonio] nel chiamare il Re di Spagna suo signore, e disse che, finalmente, quest'azione non si faceva se non dagli ambasciatori spagnoli, o da persone dipendentissime dalla Corona di Spagna....": Bentivoglio to Borghese, 18 July 1618, Steffani, La nunziatura, vol. 2, n. 1233, 485-7. The master of ceremonies recorded the event on 29 June. "Papa...recepìt solitimi et debitum feudum pro regno Neapolis et Siciliae a majestate Catholica rege Philippo III Hyspaniarum per manus excellentissimi domini Marci Antonii Burghesii nepotis papae...discessit [Marcantonio] a palatio illustrissimi domini cardinalis Borgiae, qui fungitur officio oratoris Hyspaniarum...et in consignando feudo papae praedictus excellentissimus dominus princeps Sulmonae locutus est lingua Hyspanica." ASV Misc. Arm. XII, t. 44, published in Orbaan, Documenti, 19. An avviso of 30 June, 1618, recorded the banquet afterwards, noting the ceremonial union of Spanish crown, Cardinal Borgia, and the Borghese: "Il banchetto fatto dal S. re Card.le Borgia e stato sontuosiss.o e ben servito et l'aparato pieno di trionfi vagli p. inventi.ni et per molti proportionati all'armi di S. S.tà et del Re Catt.lo, S.re Card.le Borgia, et Sig.re Principe di Sulmona,...": Urb. Lat. 1086, 253r.

48 Later, when the Duke of Lerma was granted the privilege of having his cardinal's hat sent to Madrid, Puysieux drew an uncharitable connection between the incident, the Borghese's desire to have Marcantonio made a grandee, and the appointment of a new nuncio to Madrid. "Egli [Puysieux] m'ha detto, in sostanza, che, dopo la proibizione d'una certa bolla di Sisto V,
It was not only state matters that Scipione dealt with as spokesman for the family. As the source closest to the seat of power, the office of cardinal-nephew had positioned him as the main patron of the family’s extensive client network. Thus in the registers of his state letters there is, alongside various state missives, an abundance of more mundane correspondence regarding gifts, favours, and other staple subjects of patronage. So, for example, we have Scipione promising to a certain Monsignor Stufa a favour in return for a painting he had been sent, or Cesare Alessi gifting thirty hens for no other reason than to prompt Cardinal Borghese’s reflection "on my devoted soul that accompanies the gift...and I hope that he will continue his happy patronage towards me." One notes the standard address to Borghese was as a traditional *padrone*, someone whose influence offered protection against misfortune and whose authority procured "those honours that with his liberal hand he dispenses to his devoted servants". "

Such honour was returned - his many interests throughout the papal states were looked after by clients with whom he had built long-term relationships. Within this network preferment to office was virtually a form of currency. When Alessandro Tanari, for example, who had earlier

---

non si sono più mandati cappelli; che questo è un favore straordinario che si fa non tanto a Lerma, quanto al Re di Spagna...e finalmente m’ha accennato, che questo nuovo Nunzio s’invia per procurar nuovi onori da quella parte al signor principe di Sulmona; avendo voluto, a mio giudizio, inferire che si procurerà che il signor principe sia dichiarato grande di Spagna....": Bentivoglio to Borghese, 29 August, 1618, Steffani, *La nunziatura*, vol. 2, n. 1324, 560. Borghese denied all charges: to Bentivoglio, 6 October, 1618, idem, vol. 3, n. 1433, 74-5. Yet it is true that the young Marcantonio had become the focus for the trading of honours. Still only seventeen, he was nevertheless considered by the king to be a convenient entrée to the pope. Shortly after the presentation, the king wrote to the prince (not, that is, to Scipione!) regarding the possibility of canonisation for Isidoro (above, n. 25). Marcantonio presented the chinea the following year as well; thereafter he was replaced by the Spanish ambassador, the Duke of Alburquerque: Borghese to Bentivoglio, 7 July, 1619, Steffani, vol. 3, 425, n. 1802.

49Borghese to Stufa, 25 October, 1608, ASV FB II 434, 762v.
50"...sperando, che V. S. Ill.ma habbia più da riflettere nell animo mio divoto, che l’accompagna, che nella piciolezza, che egli in se contiene. Se a questo per sua infinità benignità, com’io vivam(ente) la supplico, aggiungerà la continvazione verso di me del suo felicissimo patiocinio spero, che sia per rendermi tutta vita più degno delle sue gratie, le quale ambisco di riceveri nell’honore de suoi commandamenti....": Alessi to Borghese, 8 February, 1618, ASV FB III 44b, 75r. Borghese’s reply (conserverò per sempre la mia dispositione giovarle), 17 February, 1617, ASV FB II 432, 178v.
51Alessandro Tanari to Borghese, 10 September, 1616, ASV FB III 45b, 60r.
negotiated on the Cardinal's behalf in relation to the rebuilding of Bologna's metropolitan church, wrote requesting that he be considered for an unspecified position if in the unfortunate event the incumbent were to die, Borghese's reply was prompt and typical: "Your Lordship can surely expect from me every demonstration of affection in the events of his comfort and advancement. Therefore, be assured that I would remember your person if it happened that you were to write to me of what you may fear of Signor Seccadinari."52

Those familiar with Renaissance patronage will find nothing unusual here. Many recent students of patronage have stressed its dynamic nature, the way decisions were in reality the sub-legal fruits of the extended networks of friends and acquaintances stemming from family units.53 Power and influence were achieved not only through a direct exertion of wealth but by management of those myriad systems of clientage.54 Likewise, as Barbara Hallman has shown, it was also standard practice for cardinals to trade like secular patrons in sacred and civil offices - indeed, virtually all offices had a monetary value assigned to them by the datary.55 Nevertheless,

52 Può sicuramente aspettar da me V. S. ogni dimostrazione d'affetto nelle occasioni di suo commodo, et avanzamento. Si persuada perciò ch'io sia per haver mem[ori]a della sua persona, quando venga il caso, ch'ella mi scrive potersi temere del S.re Seccadinari." Borghese to Tanari, 28 September, 1616, ASV FB II 416, 18r; replying to letter cited above, n. 47. The office was possibly that of treasurer, granted to Tanari at the end of the Borghese pontificate: Borghese to Tanari, 3 November, 1620, ASV FB II 422, 253r. Tanari's earlier negotiations cited in Antinori, 315-323.


55 Barbara McClung Hallman, Italian Cardinals, Reform, and the Church as Property, 1492-1563, Berkeley, 1985, 98-100 and 131-145.
although Borghese's style of patronage while cardinal-nephew is unexceptional it is noteworthy for two reasons: first, because it contradicts the papacy's often declared (though perhaps never believed) image as an ecclesiastical corporation transcending local interests; second, because such patronage facilitated the institutional centralisation of the papacy after the Council of Trent.

The first point suggests the double nature of the cardinal-nephew, for if his political significance was as prime minister to the pope his social significance was as the principal broker of the papacy's client network. It should be emphasised that such a network was not simply the Borghese's own clients transferred onto the political scene; Capponi and Bentivoglio, for example, were both already in the system and would probably have moved up the curial ladder regardless of Borghese patronage. What is important is that the fluid curial networks, refigured but not reconstituted with each new pope, were supplemented by those of the incumbent administration and brokered by the cardinal-nephew as if they were extensions of family interests. Such a system gave symmetry to papal government. Just as the nephew's control over temporal government allowed the pope to concentrate on spiritual government, so the nephew's secular patronage permitted the pope to maintain a posture of disinterested commitment to the Holy See.56

The cardinal-nephew's prime-ministership to the pope was the typical executive configuration of the major European states in the first half of the seventeenth century. In Madrid the reign of Phillip III was conducted largely under the supervision of a committee of state, presided over by the Duke of Lerma, the de-facto ruler of the Spanish government; later Olivares

56Reinhard downplays the political significance of the cardinal-nephew in comparison to his importance "as a social substitute for the pope...his alter ego": "Papal Power and Family Strategy", 343.
had a similar role under Phillip IV. Likewise, in Paris before Richelieu there was the Duke of Luynes, adviser to Louis XIII; in London, the Duke of Buckingham had an extraordinary influence with James I and later Charles I. Like Borghese, these ministers held the position closest to their ruler, who in turn regarded them almost as their secretary; they exercised considerable control over appointments and were largely responsible for cultivating the patronage networks on which kingly rule depended. Apart from their contribution to the decision-making processes of government, all these men fulfilled the established courtly position of minister-favorite, the traditional focus of attention insulating the ruler from excessive demands. Mediation was the crucial function and Francis Bacon wrote of Buckingham in words that echo Mocenigo's assessment of Cardinal Borghese: "The whole kingdom hath cast their eye upon you as the new rising star, and no man thinks his business can prosper at Court unless he hath you for his good Angel or at least that you be not a Malus Genius against him." Note here the language which figures the earthly with the heavenly court, where an imposing divinity is softened by the humanity of intercessor saints.

57 Francesco Gómez di Sandoval y Rojas (made cardinal on 26 March, 1618, though he was never present at the Roman court) was described by Girolamo Soranzo, Venetian ambassador to Spain (1608-11), as the "assoluto signore di quel governo". Earlier Soranzo had noted the king "non è curioso del governo ma lo rimette sempre in mano del duca di Lerma": Barozzi and Berchet, Relazioni...Spagna, 456-8. Antonio Feros points out that Lerma also held the court position of sumiller de corps (groom of the stole), the head of the privy chamber and therefore the king's most intimate assistant: "Twin Souls: Monarchs and Favorites in Early Seventeenth-Century Spain", in R. Kagan and G. Parker (eds.), Spain, Europe, and the Atlantic World, Cambridge, 1995, 37.

58 On the influence of Luynes (whom the cardinal-nephew would address - not, that is, the king - when informing Paris of a new nuncio, saluting him as Gran Contestabile di Francia: Cardinal Ludovisi to Luynes, 9 March, 1621, ASV FB I 912, 175v-177v), see A. Lloyd Moote, Louis XIII, The Just, Berkeley, 1989, 97-115.


61 Quoted in Peck, Court Patronage, 50.
Yet although there are structural similarities between the minister-favourite and the cardinal-nephew there is one crucial difference. Borghese's contemporary prime ministers were not related to their ruler, which ultimately made them expendable. While the cardinal-nephew owed his position to his family and his tenure to the life of his uncle, minister-favourites had to rise through the ranks and submerge personal or family ambition under their loyalty to a hereditary monarch. Once in office, the minister-favourite suffered jealousies and plots, which might have been considered more treasonable had he been related to his sovereign. The early seventeenth century is littered with favourites who over-stepped their mark: Lerma's enemies used his relationship with a man accused of murder to drive the Duke from power, only six months after he had been made a cardinal; the influence of Luynes's predecessor, Concino Concini, with Louis XIII's mother, Maria de'Medici, so inflamed the young king that he had the Italian shot dead; and Charles I eventually abandoned Buckingham for impeachment on charges of corruption. Whatever the power of these figures at their height, their downfall was partly the result of the extent to which they remained outsiders. None had the cardinal-nephew's kinship to his ruler.

In this sense the pope and cardinal-nephew were a family team, united in their commitment to effective government and, no less importantly, to their family's prosperity. Indeed, in structural terms the nephew was a sort of conduit for the alienation of ecclesiastical wealth. Compared with families such as the Colonna or the Cornaro, the Borghese (like the Aldobrandini, the Ludovisi, and the Barberini) had virtually no physical presence in Rome or its environs before the ascension of Camillo to

---

the pontificate in 1605. They were neither noble nor accustomed to vast wealth and they did not have a long history of service in the church; indeed, the family (via Orazio, Camillo's elder brother) had only bought its way into the Roman curia sixteen years before. Once in the Holy See, Paul V lost no time in piling offices, benefices, and pensions on Scipione. By 1612 the Cardinal's combined income was around 148 000 scudi, which made him possibly the highest paid man in Europe. The following year, aided by massive papal loans, his income blew out to 666 534 scudi; in 1614 it increased to 755 559 scudi, an amount not much less than the annual interest on the public debt. The larger part of this, almost 920 000 scudi, was spent buying rural estates and farmhouses in the hills south of the city, along with the towns of Monte Compatri, Monte Porzio, Morlupo, Monte la Guardia, and Montefortino (now Artena). Within three years Scipione had become the largest land-holder in the regions south of Rome.

The land, of course, was intended for the family; when the Cardinal died in 1633 all of his property passed to his cousin Marcantonio (1601-58), named as the first heir of a primogenitive estate. Marcantonio had been long destined to head the secular arm of the family; at the age of seven he was granted the principality of Sulmona in the Abruzzo, at twelve he took


64 Enrico Stumpo, Il capitale finanziario a Roma fra cinque e seicento. Contributo alla storia della fiscalità pontificia in età moderna (1570-1660), Milan, 1985, 210-11.

65 In comparison, a doctor could expect 216 scudi per annum, a barber 60 scudi, a Swiss Guard soldier just 48 scudi: Stumpo, Il capitale finanziario, 40. Given that most income earners were supporting at least three or four other people, Stumpo estimates that Scipio's income of 160 000 scudi in 1620 (it was actually almost twice that much) could have supported over 10 000 people, or over one tenth of Rome's population.

66 Reinhardt, 57-9; Stumpo, Il capitale finanziario, 225.

67 Of the 1 973 036 scudi in total Scipione spent on real estate, almost 1 175 000 scudi, or roughly 60%, was outlaid between 1613 and 1615: see below, ch. 4 and II.9-10. A map of the Borghese holdings, 1605-20, is provided in Reinhard, Papstfinanz, vol. 1, 140-1.

possession of the family palace in the Campo Marzio, and at eighteen he was married to Camilla Orsini, from an old Roman family. The long-planned union with the Orsini consolidated the Borghese's aspirations to nobility, an essential requirement for any lasting prestige in Roman society. In fact, by 1618 the Orsini, despite their connections to the French crown (Camilla was Queen Marie de'Medici's second cousin), were considered almost too lowly and the pope had made a nearly disastrous attempt to arrange for Marcantonio to marry the daughter of the Spanish Prince of Venosa. Nevertheless, Spanish nobility was acquired by other means. In early 1618 Scipione began the negotiations with the Spanish court to have

---

69 The Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Mocenigo, observed in 1612 that "questo principe è carissimo ed amatissimo dal Pontefice, e nella persona sua sono riposte tutte le speranze della grandezza della casa Borghese". Mocenigo had noted immediately before that the pope's two-pronged strategy meant Scipione was granted all "le grandezza e ricchezza ecclesiastiche" and Marcantonio all "le entrate, beni e stati temporali...", Barozzi and Berchet, Lettere...Roma, vol. 1, 96; see G. De Caro, "Borghese, Marcantonio", DBI, Rome, 1970, vol. 12, 600-2.

70 The marriage agreement was signed on 5 August, 1612: De Caro, "Borghese, Marcantonio", DBI. The wedding itself had been planned since at least the beginning of 1618: see Cardinal Borghese's memorandum to the Florentine nuncio (undated but January 1618, ASV FB II 432, 67r-v). Another letter to the Florentine nuncio confirms the wedding date of October the following year (18 February, 1618, idem, 171r). Theodore Ameyden (1586-1656), a Dutchman at the papal Court, observed: "La nobiltà et honorevolezza di questa famiglia [the Borghese], apparisce da parentati che contrasse in Roma con famiglie principalissime Romane, avanti il Pontificato di Paulo, le quali non facilmente ammettono il forestiere se non porta nobiltà o vero grandezza dalla patria." Ameyden, La storia delle famiglie romane, ed. C. Bertini, Rome, 1910, v. 1, 172.

71 Gigli, Diario, 44, reported that when the Orsini learnt of the Borghese subterfuge they invented the face-saving story that their sister had decided to forgo marriage and enter a monastery instead. On 5 December, 1618, Bentivoglio had informed Borghese that the Orsini brothers felt that the pope and his cardinal-nephew were ready to concede everything to the Spanish, at the expense of the French crown to which the Orsini were devoted: "per tal rispetto principalmente, non lasicavano effettuare il matrimonio della loro sorella col principe..." (Steffani, La nunziatura, vol. 3, n. 1474, 111-13). Five months later a disgusted but not surprised Borghese wrote to Bentivoglio that the Orsini's behaviour had scandalized Rome (Borghese to Bentivoglio, 20 and 24 May, 1619, idem, vol. 3, n. 1707, 338-9, and n. 1713, 343). After some delicate negotiations (Bentivoglio to Borghese, 16 June, 1619, idem, vol. 3, n. 1729, 357-9, and n. 1742, 369-73) the Orsini conceded with the pope's forgiveness (idem, vol. 3, n. 1806, 427-8). The actual wedding took place on 20 October, 1619 (avviso of 23 October, 1619, Urb. Lat. 1087, 612v-613r). See Giovan Battista Chiodino, La Nobilità Burghesia Romana...Nelle Nozze dell'Illustriss. e Eccellentiss. Signori Principi di Sulmona, il Sig. Don Marco Antonio Burghesio e la Signora Donna Camilla Orsina..., Venice, 1620; Reinhard, "Ämterlaufbahn und Familienstatus", 410-23, traces the earlier negotiations between the Borghese and the Orsini.
Marcantonio made a grandee, the highest class of Spanish nobility. The long courtship of the Habsburg and the Borghese was eventually consummated when Phillip III granted the privilege at the very end of 1620, an event greeted with an extraordinary supplication by Scipione. By the time Paul V died in 1621 the efforts of his two nephews had established the basis of the largest patrimony in the history of central Italy, and the aristocratic status to match it.

Paul V's strategy of grooming two male members of his family to take advantage of his position was typical of papal families: one nephew drew wealth from the Church via his cardinal status, the other married into nobility and established the dynastic line. Many historians have commented on the way papal families after the Council of Trent employed ecclesiastical

---

72See below, III.2. The title of grandee was created by Charles V in 1520 to elevate those from the twenty or so families whose especially close relationship with the king distinguished them from the average aristocrat. The grandees were further divided into first, second, and third classes: Don Francesco Fernandez de Bethencourt, Historia genealogica y heraldica de monarquía espanyola, casa real y grandes de España, Madrid, 1900, voi. 2, 41-3.

73 Moltiplicando la M(aestá)V(ostra) tanto benignam(en)te le sue g(rand)ee verso noi, e questa casa, viene a mettere tutti in una perpetua obligat(io)ne di continovar la servita devot(io)ne che già le habbiamo dedicata, e sicuram(ente) V. M. può credere, che mai per niun tempo mancheremo al debito nostro con lei, et a quella vera osservanza, di che le siamo tenuti. Et essendosi hora inteso dal Duca di Alburquerque l'honor che V. M. si degna di voler fare a l Pr(enci)pe di Sulmona, mio cugino, con dichiarando Grande, io vengo a rendere a V. M. affettuosissime gr(ande) di questa sua benignissima dimostrat(io)ne stimata da noi infinitam(ente) e p(er) ogni rispetto; ma principalm(ente) e che potiamo interpretarla per molto qualificato, e part(icolar)e testimonio della sua humanissima volontà verso di noi. E supplicando V. M. a compiacersi di credere che non consentiremo, che niuno mai ci superi nel desider(o)lo, e nella prontezza di servirla, con le persone, e con tutto l'esser nostro, io qui per fine le bacio humiliss(imen)te le mani, augurandole dalla M. Divina ogni maggior accrescimento di prosperità, e grandezza.” Borghese to the Phillip III, 29 December, 1620, ASV FB II 422, 388v. Reinhard suggests the promotion on 29 July, 1619, of Phillip III's ten year old son, Femando, to the sacred college was the price of Marcantonio's ennoblement: “Amterlaufbahn und Familienstatus”, 426; "Papal Power and Family Strategy", 339. Certainly, the negotiations had been working both ways; on the 27 December, 1618, the king had written to Borghese presenting his son to the Church and enquiring about the possibility of procuring further honours: ASV FB I 974, 301v; also avviso of nuncio in Madrid (Zapata...mi fece una passata gagliarda sopra il cardinalato dell'Infante), 5 March, 1619, ASV FB I 959, 32r. The suspicion in Paris, however, was that the Duke of Lerma's earlier promotion to the college (on 26 March, 1618) was made to this end (above, n. 48). The crucial event may have been the pope's decision to proceed with Isidoro's canonisation in October 1620 (above, n. 23). The efforts of Francesco Cennini, the nuncio to Spain (1618-20) and long-time client of Scipione, earned him a cardinalate: Steffani, voi. 4, 517; G. De Caro, "Cennini, Francesco," DBI, voi. 23, 569-70.

74Pescosolido, Terra e nobilità, 13-23.
resources for the creation of aristocratic dynasties.\textsuperscript{75} This phenomenon was no secret to Borghese's contemporaries; an acute critic of Paul V observed the way he used the datary "to bring in by hooke and crook, huge summes of mony...all which he hath bestowed in buying Lands for his Nephew".\textsuperscript{76} In 1627 Pietro Contarini, while suggesting the money spent aggrandising papal families might be better employed for some public purpose, nevertheless marvelled at how the Peretti, Aldobrandini, Borghese, and Ludovisi were able to establish patrimonies rivalling those of kings, none of them taking longer than fifteen years.\textsuperscript{77} It is debatable how much such aggrandisement contributed to the very real economic, mostly debt-related, problems of the papacy in the early seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{78} There were undoubtably long

\textsuperscript{75}Peter Partner described the post-Tridentine papal families as "a class of merchant bankers who were entrenching themselves in the Roman countryside to become a monied and landed aristocracy...": "Papal Financial Policy in the Renaissance and Counter-Reformation", Past and Present, 88 (August, 1980), 61. Reinhard noted the similar strategies of enoblement pursued by such families: the palace in the city and the villa on the outskirts; the estates in the Alban Hills; the sumptuous family chapel ("Papal Power and Family Strategy", 334-9). Such views of the Counter Reformation papacy are sharper than the benign assessment of Pastor, but they are not all that different to those of the nineteenth century historian Leopold Von Ranke, who emphasised the securing of hereditary dignity by the popes and their nephews: The History of the Popes During the Last Four Centuries (1834), trans. M. Foster, London, 1913, vol. 2, 335-43.

\textsuperscript{76}The New Man, or, A supplication from an unknown person, a Roman Catholike unto James, the Monarch of Great Britaine..., trans. William Crashaw, London, 1622, 28-9.

\textsuperscript{77}Barozzi and Berchet, Lettere...Roma, vol. 1, 207.

\textsuperscript{78}Jean Delumeau has described the abortive attempts by the papacy, notably Sixtus V in regards to textiles, to establish industry in Rome: Vita economica, 133-7. Volker Reinhardt's study of corn and grain supply in the papal states shows about a 50% increase in bread prices between 1563 and 1630: Überleben in der frühneuzeitlichen Stadt. Annona und Getreiddeversorgung in Rom, 1563-1797, Tübingen, 1991, 54. Estimates of the papal debt vary, but in 1605 the capital (monti and uffici) stood at 12 242 000 scudi; in 1619, around 15 000 000 scudi: Stumpo, Il capitale, 225. Reinhard, Papstfinanz, vol. 2, 161-260, publishes the 1592 papal balance sheet, which indicates that normal tax income covered only a fraction of expenses, with much of it in any event alienated from the tax offices (the doganae, the salara, etc.) in the form of prescribed interest payments to various debt funds (monti). The balance sheet also indicates the extent to which the Apostolic See had come to rely on the trading of its offices. Elsewhere, Reinhard surveys the financial strategies of the papacy in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, "Finanza pontificia, sistema beneficiale e finanza statale nell'eta confessionale", H. Kellenbenz and P. Prodi (eds.), Fisco religione stato nell'eta confessionale. Atti della settimana di studio, 21-25 settembre, 1987. (Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico), Bologna, 1989, 459-504. Focusing on the 1624 balance sheet, Rietbergen analyses seventeenth century papal finance, and in particular the problem of debt, "Pausen, Prelaten", 159-240. In addition to monti, the spiraling public debt led Paul V to set up Rome's first deposit bank (Banco di Santo Spirito) in 1605, although the brief claimed it was established to help the poor: Michele Monaco, Le finanze pontificie al tempo
term structural faults - with virtually no industry there was little internal generation of wealth; such economies are always at the mercy of finance. Yet it could hardly have helped that so much of potentially public capital was sterilised in relatively non-productive land investment.

The papacy is normally characterised as a duality, its spiritual government over Roman Christendom independent of its temporal sovereignty over the papal states. Yet as argued, its identity should properly be understood as a triplicity - of god, the state, and the family - a too obvious fact revealed by any one of the ubiquitous papal coats of arms around Rome, where the keys to heaven's gates and tiara of earthly rule surmount the emblems of the family. The papacy was, in short, an impersonal, non-dynastic institution that operated as a family-based court. This is precisely why the issue of nepotism was so critical to contemporaries and why it was so focused upon the figure of the cardinal-nephew, for the burgeoning curial and patronal authority of the nepote, in real and symbolic terms, was wedged into the heart of the papacy's self-image.

The pope's loading of offices and influence on his cardinal-nephew exemplifies the origin of the word nepotismo, a term that has always had...

di Paolo V (1605-1621). La fondazione del primo banco pubblico in Roma (Banco di Santo Spirito), Lecce, 1974, esp. 127-149.


80 For the details of this type of land investment, which should be distinguished from agricultural investment, see below, I. 5. E. G. Hobsbawn, "The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th century", Past and Present, 5 (1954), 33-53, blamed Italy's decline on the squandering of capital on immobile investment such as land; Carlo Cipolla, "The Decline of Italy", in Cipolla (ed.), The Economic Decline of Empires, London, 1970, wondered if the "sterilization of capital" resulted from a contraction of investment opportunities elsewhere, a view with which Enrico Stumpo cautiously concurs, Il capitale finanziario, 276-8.

81 Ernst Kantorowicz expressed this duality with some compression. "Under the pontificalis maiestas of the pope, who was styled also 'Prince' and 'true emperor', the hierarchical apparatus of the Roman Church tended to become the perfect prototype of an absolute and rational monarchy on a mystical basis, while at the same time the State increasingly showed a tendency to become a quasi-church or a mystical corporation on a rational basis...": from, The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology, 3rd. ed. Princeton, 1973, 194, quoted in Prodi, The Papal Prince, 2.
negative connotations. While the pope's authority derived from the sacred college the nephew was not so accountable, his position essentially a happenstance of birth. Cardinal Borghese, in particular, was seen as anomalous - greedy, sensual, and lacking the gravity of his office. Yet although Cardinal Borghese's enrichment by the pope horrified some contemporaries, it was more as a matter of degree than of kind. Moreover, the almost total domination of the church by Italian families (especially from the papal states) meant that it was virtually impossible for the papacy to do business outside of the prevailing system of family-based patronage.

The important points are that the absolute power of the pope required an advisory trust-worthiness only a relative could offer, and that the nephew's duties required exceptional wealth and influence for effective execution.

In this sense, underlying social matrices of family and kinship were institutionalised into the forms of papal government.

Yet the institutional overlay had its own imperatives, not always harmonious with family values. As Barbara Hallman observes, contemporary Church reformers had a habit of seeing institutionalised corruption rather than socially structured institutions. Since nepotism

---


83 Hallman, Italian Cardinals, 95-7.

84 The Council of Trent had decreed that the pope should choose cardinals from all nations of Christendom. Yet of the 332 cardinals elected between 1566 and 1655, 258 (78%) were Italian and 116 (35%) were from the Papal States: John Broderick, "The Sacred College of Cardinals: Size and Geographical Composition (1099-1986)", Archivum Historiae Pontificiae, 25 (1987), 46-7. On the background to the Italianisation of the church, see Denys Hay, The Church in Italy in the Fifteenth Century, Cambridge, 1977, 46.

85 In the fifteenth century Aeneas Piccolomini (Pius II) had plainly stated the practical politics of running the papacy like any other government: "So what is wrong with a Roman pontiff having powerful sons, who are able to come to their father's aid against tyrants?...Or do we choose a defenceless man, who would be considered with more contempt than reverence by our rulers? There are no societies today which pay regard to virtue...Of course virtue is good, but for our purpose it matters greatly whether it resides in a powerful man or a poor one...I have learnt that virtue without power is ridiculous, and that a Roman pontiff without the patrimony of the Church is nothing but a slave of kings and princes." From Piccolomini's commentary on the Council of Basil (De gestis...), quoted in Prodi, The Papal Prince, 13-14.
involved the concentration of offices and benefices in individuals resident in Rome, it violated canon law regarding pluralism. The desire to suppress abuses, however, was directed more by an acknowledgment of seemliness, a recognition of the need to avoid providing evidence of scandal for the enemies of the church. At the final session of the Council of Trent (4 December, 1563) it was expressly forbidden for bishops to "augment and enrich their relatives and familiaris from the revenues of the church"; instead, one had to "put aside all human feelings towards brothers, nephews, and relatives according to flesh...[for this] has been the source of many evils in the Church." The decree did not, however, apply to the pope and thus its effect on papal government was to concentrate ecclesiastical wealth and so aid centralisation: given that the pope controlled the datary, the conferment of benefices became an even more effective means of maintaining subservience and ensuring the available wealth was not diluted among too many hands. Proper reform of nepotistic enrichment would have to await the second half of the seventeenth century, after five decades of abuse by the Borghese, Barberini, and Pamphili had brought the issue to boiling point. In 1655 Alexander VII instructed (unsuccessfully) his relatives to remain in Siena; in 1676 Innocent XI appointed a non-relative, Cardinal Cibo, as secretary of state; finally, in 1692

---

87 Laurain-Portemer, "Absolutisme et Népotisme", 489. Hallman also comments on the decree, noting that "the uncompromising language of the Tridentine decree weakens Wolfgang Reinhard's repeated assertion that nepotism was not scandalous to contemporaries but rather the accepted social norm." *Italian Cardinals*, 127.
88 Reinhard, noting the pope's complete control over the conferring of benefices, quotes the observation in 1664 of Francesco Ingoli, secretary of the Congregazione di Propaganda Fide: "Il Romano Pontefice può essere servito meglio di qualsivoglia Principe, se nell'eleggere i Ministri, starà avertito, e ciò perché hà modo di premiarli con beneficij Ecclesiastici, Pensioni, vescovati, e Cardinalati." "Finanza pontificia, sistema beneficiale", 475.
Innocent XII outlawed nepotism and abolished the position of cardinal-nephew with the bull, *Romanum Decet Pontificem*.90

The decline of the nephew was not simply a victory against what in retrospect was seen to be corrupt. Rather, as an historical phenomenon the office of cardinal-nephew had burnt itself out, no longer sufficiently useful to justify the criticism against it. During the sixteenth and early seventeenth century the nephew had been a pivotal agent in the papacy's centralisation, his administration of client networks part of a process of establishing officials at all levels of government throughout the papal states who were directly or unambiguously responsible to the pope. The nephew's brokerage of church offices, for example, meant that abbots or bishops no longer controlled appointments within their abbeys or dioceses, while his overseeing of municipal governments largely divested local lords of political power within their own feudal regions.91 As a result, the residual authority of provincial figures was subordinated, largely cooperatively, to the absolute authority of Rome. With centralisation came the clarification of international policy. At the same time, the family court structure administered by the nephew provided a framework of familiar ritual for the increasingly sophisticated and formalised sphere of foreign relations that flourished in a fragmenting western Europe. Though client networks were structured and articulated in traditional patronal terms by nephews such as Scipione, in historical terms this was as a transitional phase in the institutionalisation of a centralised bureaucracy. Capponi might have

90 *Ibid.*, 174-79. Roden noted the objections of the college to reform, citing Azzolino's argument that abolition would lead to greater evils - self interest would find other, uncontrolled, avenues.

pledged devotion to the Borghese, but he was soon won over by their successors with the archbishopric of Ravenna; Bentivoglio might have expressed his personal debt to Paul V and willingness to serve Scipione in the conclave, but he had his own cardinal career to think of and he was not about to become a recalcitrant element in the college. This is not to be cynical regarding the sincerity of the language of client debts, only to stress that in the long-term the cardinal-nephew's patronage was a model example of the critical interweaving of two of the three forms of legitimate authority as identified by Max Weber: the one, being the patrimonial type of traditional authority, which is personal and ultimately derived from the household of a chief; the other, being the bureaucratic subordination of legal authority, which is impersonal and based on a rational (thereby stigmatising relations of the former type as anomalous, irrational, or corrupt) fidelity to the state. In this sense, the superintendent and secretariat of state, the two main administrative organs of the papacy's political centralisation, would eventually detach themselves from the environment of familial patronage in which they were generated to become autonomous institutions of state. Thus the peculiar and contradictory nature of the development of

---

92 Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, New York, 1947 328-52. The transitional facet of the institution of cardinal-nephew emphasised in the text contradicts Peter Partner's view that the papal bureaucracy was purely patrimonial in Weberian terms, being no more than a function of papal absolutism: "Burocrazia e clientele nello stato della chiesa", in Fagiolo and Madonna (eds.), *Sisto V*, 131.


Weber is also behind Antoni Maczak's view that clientage in the early modern court was a softened form of feudal vassalage, symptomatic of the transition from medieval to early modern systems of gradated authority (although in central Italy the relevant heritage of patron/client networks is not the manor but the civic neighbourhood): "From Aristocratic Household to Princely Court. Restructuring Patronage in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", Asch and Birke (eds.), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility*, 316.

93 Hence the relevance of Laurain-Portemer in stressing the significance, contrary to Reinhard, of the sixteenth century establishment of the institutions of superintendent and secretariat of state, "fondre dans la masse du népotisme ": "Ministériat, Finances et Papauté", 402.
absolutism, where personalised service gives way to disinterested administrative duty.

The abolition of the cardinal-nephew parallels the fate of the first minister, a political species that disappears after around 1660.94 As discussed above, the first minister, like the nephew, was the political executive and social representative of his ruler. He was also, like the nephew, historically an agent of state centralisation. For Sharon Kettering the critical years of centralisation in France were effected by ministers such as Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert, who cultivated the monarchy's crucial vertical layers of clientage, all of which ascended to the king. Principally, it was Cardinal Richelieu, Scipione's younger colleague in the college, who first recognised the potential of clientage as a means of centralisation for France, and it was he who set in place the extensive system of royal patronage and created the permanent networks of ministerial and administrative clients, pervading all corners of the province.95 It is significant that it was a cardinal who did this for France, for Rome had been moving down these lines for over half a century. In co-opting both the higher clergy and aristocracy in the bonds of fidelity that bolstered centralisation, the Roman court in some ways anticipated the phenomenon observed by Norbert Elias in regard to the French monarchy under Louis XIV, where the development of absolutism resolved the residual political conflict between the authority of the sovereign and the aristocracy.96

The cardinal-nephew's agency of administrative centralisation was articulated in the environment of the longer term ideological centralisation of the papacy after the Great Schism (1378-1417). The struggle for sovereignty

within the church defined theology (and religious art) for more than two centuries. The papal humanist Juan de Torquemada (1388-1468), for example, had responded to conciliar theory deriving from the Schism by continually asserting that the papacy was the sole repository of ecclesiastical authority. Adapting Thomist theology, Torquemada stressed the inherently hierarchical nature of the Church, harmonious with the structure of the universe, from God to Jesus to Peter, thence to the world. In 1460 Pius II made the proposition virtually an article of faith when he declared that any appeal from a papal decision to a council was null and void and any appellant automatically ex-communicated. Much of the culture of the renaissance in Rome, not to mention the religious objections of Luther, is clarified by reference to the monarchic papist stance, in particular the emphasis on legitimacy (the laws of Moses and keys of Peter) and the historical pre-eminence granted to the city of Rome (the new Jerusalem).

The heritage of anti-conciliarism flourished at the Council of Trent, which not only endorsed the absolute authority of the pope, but also 'Romanised' worship by restructuring the principal liturgical texts of missal and breviary around the liturgical tradition of Rome. Such attitudes also informed the severely hierarchic theology of Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), the Church’s main polemicist at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In fact, fifteenth century anti-conciliarist views were refined and brought up to date during the Venetian interdict of 1606, when Bellarmine sharpened his skills against Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623). In the History of the Council of Trent, Sarpi argued the familiar conciliar position that a tyrannical and

98 Ibid., 160.
99 O’Malley explores the polemic aspect of Roman humanism in numerous studies, in particular, Giles of Viterbo on Church and Reform, A Study in Renaissance Thought, Leiden, 1968, and, "Man’s Dignity, God’s Love and the Destiny of Rome", Viator, 3 (1972), 389-416; see also Stinger, passim.
corrupt papacy had usurped the corporate authority of the church.\textsuperscript{101} Bellarmine, on the other hand, stressed the divine right of the pope, invoking the traditional argument that the earthly hierarchy was justified by the natural order of things:

That government is best which is most ordered; and it can be demonstrated that monarchy is more ordered than aristocracy or democracy....And order may be discerned not among equals but among those who are superior and inferior....For this reason there is the highest order in the Catholic church, where the people are subjected to the parish priests, the parish priests to the bishops, the bishops to the metropolitans, the metropolitans to the primates, the primates to the pope, the pope to God.\textsuperscript{102}

The idea of the world sub-ordinated to the pope combined with cosmological imagery, typical of centralised rule, to provide the ideological backbone to the patronal dynamics of the Roman court, sanctifying everyday service to its chief representative, the cardinal-nephew.\textsuperscript{103} This is

\textsuperscript{101}Paolo Sarpi, \textit{Istoria del concilio tridentino}, (first pub. 1619), ed. C. Vivanti, 2 vols., Turin, 1974. Nominally, the interdict, which extended from May 1606 to April 1607, was over the Republic making administrative and judicial decisions in clerical matters without respect to papal authority. The interdict is reproduced in English in David Chambers and Brian Pullan (eds.), \textit{Venice. A Documentary History, 1450-1630}, Oxford, 1992, 225-7. The incident polarises opinion. For Pastor, vol. 25, 111-216, writing from a Roman Catholic perspective, a beneficent Rome only reluctantly drew rank on a basically amoral Venice, a state Pastor managed to imply was both Byzantine and hetrodox in character. William Bouwsma, on the other hand, acknowledges a debt to Hans Baron in suggesting that the conflict embodied the fundamental contrast between despotic and libertarian states: \textit{Venice and the Defence of Republican Liberty. Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation}, Berkeley, 1968, 297ff.

\textsuperscript{102}From \textit{De potestate pontificis temporalis}, in \textit{Opera}, I, 253, quoted in Bouwsma, \textit{Venice and the Defence}, 319-20. By the early 1620s the doctrine of papal absolutism was a commonplace among virtually anyone writing in the ambit of the Roman court. Giulio Mancini (1588-1630) wrote: "Ed questo che s'è detto vediamo, che questo e uno stato assolutam.e monarchico regio, con aristocratico, e popolare, sotto il qual popol non sol si comprende la gente stationaria dì Roma, mà tutto il mondo per che al sommo suo monarco tut'til mondo è soggetto. Questo stato così fatto è et temporale, e spirituale." BAV Barb. Lat., 4315, \textit{Modo di governarsi et avanzarsi in Roma}, (c. 1623), 244r.

\textsuperscript{103}Clifford Geertz observed (admittedly with the focus on Java) solar or planetary imagery as a general topos of centric authority, the recurring idea of the ruler shining over his subjects who in turn are drawn in orbit around him: "Centres, Kings and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power", in J. Ben-David and T. N. Clark (eds.), \textit{Culture and its Creators}, Chicago, 1977, 158-60.
particularly apparent in the flourishing of the rituals of etiquette, where bearing was forever modified by the changing circumstances of patronal deference required - even a coach ride through Rome presented strictly observed situations of servility or assertiveness.\textsuperscript{104} Praise for the cardinal-nephew could thus be considered an exercise in worship, for the salutation of his patronal benignity was ultimately a type of thanks for divine plentitude. The figures of infinity and illumination are familiar to all students of courts, usually couched in terms of the Aristotelian ethics of liberality, emphasising not only the munificence of the patron (origin) but also the nobility of the complementary system of client and service (reception and return).\textsuperscript{105} A gift was more than a sign of affection, it was a dim reflection of the giver's devotion that, to paraphrase Alessi's letter to Borghese, \textit{the patron already contained within himself}.\textsuperscript{106} A treatise written to mark Scipione's protectorship over a Camaldolensian abbey, quickly became a celebration of the Borghese for uniting the world in harmony with their rule and an ode to Scipione, under whom "hundreds and thousands of

\textsuperscript{104}See Battista Ceci on coach-goers's courtesy, Urb. Lat. 837, \textit{Relationi delle qualità et Governo della Città di Roma et dello Stato ecclesiastico}, 438v-439r. The importance of deference and demeanour in an insulated community has been explored by Erving Goffman, "The Nature of Deference and Demeanour" \textit{American Anthropologist}, 58 (1956), 473-501; Elias, \textit{The Court Society}, esp. 110-116. Melissa Meriam Bullard points out that the social-hierarchy structured view of deference has become the norm in discussions of the Renaissance court, though she herself casts a more sceptical eye on the language of obsequiousness: "Heroes and their Workshops: Medici Patronage and the Problem of Shared Agency", \textit{Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies}, 24 (1994), 181-91. Yet Bullard's position mistakes the specific for the general. Obviously, individuals at court were not automatons and certain figures were indeed skilled in manipulating the language of deference for their own benefit. Moreover, the incongruity of some aspects of the social scales meant the chain of courtesy was not always logical. These phenomena, however, are variations within a hierarchic system, one recognised and expressed in terms of courtesy.


\textsuperscript{106}Above, n. 50. In the liberal language of the early modern court, gifts by clients to patrons returned the patronal favour to its source as a converted particle of its own splendour, mimicking the circuitry of love's liberal flow through the world, summed up by Ficino as a "continuous attraction (beginning from God, emanating to the World, and returning at last to God) which returns again, as if in a kind of circle, to the same place whence it issued": Marsilio Ficino, \textit{Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love}, trans. J. Sears, Dallas, 1985, 46. Linda Peck, in her study of patronage in Stuart England, emphasised the importance of gift-giving and recalled the familiar metaphor of the prince as fountain, "whence should flowe Pure silver-droppes in general": \textit{Court Patronage}, 1.
happy faces” are blessed to be counted among his favourites.\textsuperscript{107} For this abbot, the Cardinal’s patronage was like a revelation:

The Most Illustrious Signor Cardinal Borghese is our new and pure sun, more beautiful and resplendent than ever, crowned by the flaming rays of his rare virtue. He has been elected protector of the Camaldolensians not only to light up and illumine both ours and his faith, but more by his strength and by that of the invincible dragon to protect it, to disburden it, and to defend it from worries and from the sudden assaults of those who would want to molest it.\textsuperscript{108}

The cardinal-nephew attracted such images ultimately because he was the political and social representative of the pope, the representative, that is, of a spiritual monarch. But in contrast to the hereditary administration of a temporal monarchy, whose royal line would continue through the king’s heirs, the family administration of a papal monarchy was in office for a limited time - unlike a king, the pope would die. Nevertheless some pretence was made to maintain the pope’s memory after his death, his posthumous representation, as in life, being the duty of the nephew. It was Scipione who paid for the honours immediately after Paul’s death on 29 January, 1621, including the golden arms of the pope hung above the doors of the palaces in the Borgo and the Campo Marzio, and the painted "arms of death" hung in the churches of S. Crisogono, S. Maria sopra Minerva, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Gregorio, S. Sebastiano fuori le mura, and the church of


\textsuperscript{108}"L’Ill.mo Sig.re Car.le Borghese nuovo e puro sole più bello e risplendente che mai, coronato di fiammiggianti raggi delle sue rare virtù. Era stato eletto Protettore Camaldolesi non solo per risplendere, et illuminare la nostra, e sua Religione, ma di più ancora col suo fortissimo et invittissimo Drago protegerla, sollevarla, difenderla, da pensati, et improvissi assalti da chi molestare la volesse": ibid., 16v.
the Bergamaschi.109 It was Scipione again who, on the morning of the first annual commemoration of his uncle's demise, made the various charitable bequests on Paul's behalf.110 Most spectacularly, it was Scipione who commissioned the lavish bronze coloured catafalque that formed the centrepiece of the event.111 Although the proportions of the catafalque's dome suggested the papal crown, the ceremony was not a state funeral so much as a requiem for the family's former pre-eminence. Scipione choreographed the event as a memorial to the family and a reminder to its clients that the gratitude and honour owing to its name should not be forgotten. Indeed the funeral was concluded the following day with another more intimate service, at which four of Paul's most senior creatures (Barberini, Lante, Verallo, and Tonti) climbed the catafalque's stairs, surrounded the body of the prone Pontiff, and sung a requiem of extreme solemnity.112 Thereafter a service for Paul, presided over by Cardinal Borghese, was held in S. Maria Maggiore's Pauline chapel at the same time

109See the account of the painter Annibale Durante, 30 April, 1621, for work done for the Cardinal "doppo la morte della fel. mem.a di nostro sig.ro Papa Paolo V", ASV AB 4170.

110According to an avviso of 1 February, 1622, Scipione gave a total of 12 000 scudi in gifts to the poor, including granting fifty zitelle fifty scudi each: Urb. Lat. 1091, 94v. The dowering of young women was the standard act on such occasions, and Scipione himself would later leave a small sum to be distributed among zitelle after his own death: ASR Not. A. C., 368v. Although such a gesture was so common among Roman prelates that specialists barely regard it worthy of mention, it is important to recognise its origins were in family rather than ecclesiastical ritual; Piero de Medici, for example, had done something similar on behalf of his father Cosimo at his funeral in 1464: Sharon Strocchia, Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence, Baltimore/London, 1992, 183.

111The Cardinal's registro dei mandati for 1621-22 records the first payment for the catafalque of 200 scudi to the painter Annibale Durante on 8 February, 1621: ASV AB 7931, 86r, n. 69. The carpentry misura dated 22 August, 1622, was valued at 1674 scudi: ASV AB 4174. Durante's account for painting and gilding of 25 January, 1623, valued at 1421.62 scudi: ASV AB 4170. The young Gian Lorenzo Bernini was paid around 490 scudi for the sixteen life-size stucco figures that surrounded the monument: Olga Paris Berendson, "A note on Bernini's Sculptures for the the Catafalque of Pope Paul V", Marsyas, 8 (1959), 67-9. The misura for Soria's carpentry was signed by Scipione's house architect Sergio Venturi and Lelio Guidiccioni also mentions Venturi as the architect of the catafalque in his account of the funeral, Breve Racconto della trasportazione del corpo di papa Paolo V dalla basilica di S. Pietro a quella di S. Maria Maggiore, Rome, 1623, 14. (Guidiccione was later 'paid' by Cardinal Borghese for his funeral oration with a pension of 150 scudi per annum taken from St. Peter's, where Scipione was the arch priest: avviso of 16 February, 1622, Urb. Lat. 1091, 133v.) See also Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco and Silvia Caradini, L'effimero barocco: strutture della festa nella Roma del '600, Rome, 1977, vol. 1, 46-53; Ringbeck, 104-8.

112Guidiccioni, Breve Racconto, 19-20.
each year, taking its place with all the other nephew-driven memorial services that dotted Rome's ceremonial calendar.

This may be labouring the obvious, since as his uncle's nearest male relative, Scipione was inevitably responsible for all funeral arrangements. Yet the obvious is the just the point - the papacy operated as a family, self-renewed every eight years (the average term, 1572-1667) by the death of its leader. Pope and cardinal-nephew were a tight-knit team; when the pope stayed in the Vatican the Cardinal would reside in his palace on the Borgo; when Paul moved to the apostolic palace on the Quirinale, Scipione would follow to his own neighbouring garden palace. Moreover, as superintendent of state he was the only cardinal whose living arrangements, for himself and his household, would be paid for by the camera if the need arose for him to stay with the pope (as it would in the case of a dual audience for a new arrival, when the cardinal-nephew [and sometimes Marcantonio] was visited immediately after the kissing of the pope's feet).
The nephew's role also extended to hospitality. Matters relating to the sacred college, for example, such as a consistory, a meeting of one of its congregations, or a papal mass in the Sistine chapel, were usually concluded with a banquet organised by Cardinal Borghese, either at his palace in the Borgo or the rooms of the Vatican itself.\textsuperscript{116} The feasting of Roman prelates has traditionally been a ready target for satire by both contemporary critics and modern historians. Yet it is too reductive to simply refer to collegiate luxury, for the seemingly endless gormandising was not only associated with church ritual and was linked to Rome's status as a diplomatic city; indeed, by the early seventeenth century it was perhaps the most important centre of diplomacy in Europe.\textsuperscript{117} The city was forever alive with the coming and going of princes, ambassadors, and foreign courtiers, from the representatives of the kings of Spain and France to those of virtually all the continent's minor duchies and marquisates. Banquets, often magnificently staged with music and fireworks, were an integral part of the city's ceremonial diplomacy and the cardinal-nephew was expected to provide the setting. A foreign dignitary's round of engagements usually included a banquet staged by a local nobleman, another by a compatriot cardinal, and another by the cardinal-nephew on behalf of the Holy See. In addition, the cardinal-nephew was responsible for the entertainment of ambassadors. One example will suffice to give a sense of Scipione's style:


\textsuperscript{116}For example, "Quella medisma mattina Il Card. Borghese fece come è costume un banchetto nobilissimo à 25 Card.li della 31 che quella mattina furono in cappella, non havendo accettato di restare li altri, et fu per quest'apparecchiato nello studio di detto Ill.mo Borghese sotto la Gallaria Pontificia, et furono à tavola 26 perché ci mangio anco l'ecc.mo sig.r Fran. Borghese": avviso of 5 April, 1608, Urb. Lat. 1076, 234r.

On Sunday the ambassador of Spain with his familiars went, without announcement, to lunch at the vineyard of the Cardinal Borghese outside the Porta Pinciana, the palace of which has been judged the most beautiful and agreeable building of Rome. They stayed all day while the Cardinal sent them treats to eat, and he had his wine cellar opened for His Excellency.\footnote{118}

The 'offices of the table' were serious business, spawning a distinct literary genre and comprising a substantial section of a cardinal's activity and expense.\footnote{119} Diplomacy's imperatives were bolstered by the revival of Aristotelian ethics of spending in the fifteenth century; where largesse was regarded as a moral virtue of the rich, as it had been by Aristotle, it was natural to see their dining extravagance as an aspect of liberality.\footnote{120} Many

\footnote{118}"Domenica l'ambassadore di Spagna con la famiglia all'improviso se ne andò a pranzo alla Vigna di Cardinale Borghese fuori di Porta Pinciana, il palazzo della quale viene giudicata la più bella et intesa fabrica di Roma, et vi si trattenne tutto il giorno havendoli il Cardinale mandato alcuni regali di cose mangiative et fatto aprire la grotta dei vini per servitio di Sua Eccellenza la quale hier sera nel Palazzo fece recitare una commedia spagnola: avviso of 27 July, 1614, Urb. Lat. 1082, 401r-v. A later avviso of 1 October, 1623, when the Cardinal was courting the new administration, records the gardens as a site for the hunt. "Lo [Cardinal Barberini] condusse alla sua Vigna fuori di Porta Pinciana, dove gli fece vedere una bellissima caccia di lepri, et d'altri'animali, la quale fà similmente goduta dalli Card.li d'Este, et di Savoia...": Urb. Lat. 1093, 820r; on the etiquette of the hunt, see Vincenzo Giustiniani, "Discorso sopra la caccia", in Discorsi sulle arte sui mestieri, A. Banti (ed.), Florence, 1981, 81-98.


\footnote{120}...la hospitalità non è altro che quella larga liberalità con la quale la persona vuol ricevere in casa sua peregrini et stranieri e proveer loro di quelle cose che fanno lor bisogno per lo vitto, per lo riposo del corpo": Onofrio Zarribbini, Giardino amenissimo, Venice, 1587, 155, quoted by Lucinda M. C. Byatt, “The Concept of Hospitality in a Cardinal’s Household in Renaissance Rome”, Renaissance Studies, 2 (1988), 318. This philanthropic picture of hospitality actually declined in the sixteenth century and by the seventeenth century foreigners were advised to stay in a locanda (Antonio Adami, Il novitiato del maestro d i casa, Rome, 1636). Byatt defines the change in terms of "the dominance of spectacle and ceremony, the predominance of entertainments for peers and superiors, and the removal of the foreigner and pauper to the inns and hospices" (319-20). On earlier attempts to curtail banquet
recent historians have noted the financial burden this placed on cardinals, not all of whom were from wealthy families or stocked with benefices; the figure of the impoverished cardinal, unable to entertain or cultivate an image of luxury, was becoming increasingly common. In fact, Paolo Cortesi, in the chapter on the *famiglia* in *De Cardinalatu* (1510), had argued that cardinals' households should be supported by the camera of the sacred college to ensure that they led a life of appropriate magnificence and liberality.

A lack of funds was not an issue for a cardinal-nephew like Cardinal Borghese, whose immense personal wealth made him a model of extravagant hospitality. Scipione had a vice-regal duty to entertain and he did so with consummate style, having at his disposal the most impressive collection of art-stocked villas and gardens in Rome. His greatest legacy, the Villa Borghese, built when the demands of state banqueting were at their peak, was more than a sculpture gallery or summer palace for the Cardinal's purposeless hedonism. With its woods for the hunt, its groves, pergolas,

extravagance, see N. Zacour, "Papal Regulation of Cardinal's Households in the Fourteenth Century", *Speculum*, 50 (1975), 434-55.


The size of some of Scipione's banquets beggar description. The account, for example, for a summer banquet held in honour of the Duke of Savoy, included seven types of red meat; six kilos of parmesan, six kilos of butter, lard and ricotta; ten kilos of prosciutto, Bologna salami, and eleven kilos of Roman sausages; twenty six capons (castrated and fattened cock fowls), one hundred and twenty eight guinea fowls and chickens, eighty two pigions, and five hundred eggs; one hundred artichokes, sixty fresh fennel, and seventy white pears; a range of beverages and nine types of confectionary, including pear and almond tarts, *cannoli*, and *pane biccottato di Spagna*. The cost, for the food and transportation alone, was an astonishing 566 scudi: ASV AB 3498, *Quinternetto del banchetto fatto alla Villa di Porta Pinciana per Altissimo il Prencipe Somaso di Savoia li 25 Giugno anno* (1620).
fountains, and wine cantina, it was above all an entertainment venue without equal.\textsuperscript{124}

The villa on the Pincio was Scipione's grandest exercise in domestic building, but it by no means dominated his architectural interests. Outside the \textit{Fabrica di San Pietro}, the Cardinal was the largest employer in Rome's building industry, and the building industry was the city's major industry. Scipione had a number of architects in the household (\textit{architetti di casa}), men such as Giovanni Maria Bolin, Sergio Venturi, and Antonio de Battisti, not actually designers but supervisors of planning, costs, and payments. The architects contracted a fairly set group of builders, excavators, masons, carpenters, painters, and decorators. Although technically independent, many of the craftsmen, such as the builder Marcantonio Fontana or the gilder Annibale Durante, were almost permanently employed on the Cardinal's projects. The same team would also be employed for the Cardinal's ecclesiastical commissions, and it is important to see his private and public architecture as springing from the same source, differing but complementary manifestations of the single domestic industry.

The intimate association of magnificence with display will be examined further in the following chapter. To conclude here, it should be stressed that the magnificent splendour of great men ultimately illuminated the institutions they represented. The splendid building sponsored by Scipione clearly glorified him as a patron, but equally honored the Borghese family and the Roman church. The cardinal-nephew's artistic patronage, as indeed all his other public activities, resonated in relation to that of the pope's. In the case of Scipione's collecting, at least, they were hardly separate

\textsuperscript{124}Tracy Ehrlich, while acknowledging the villa as reception centre of power, does not, however, consider the state function of \textit{nepote} entertaining. Instead, she continues to see the Villa as a generalised expression of power and unadulterated luxury: "The Villa Borghese and the Rise of the Baroque Garden-Park", \textit{Landscape}, 32 n. 2 (1994), 12-14. In this she follows the earlier comments of Francis Haskell, \textit{Patrons and Painters. Art and Society in Baroque Italy}, New Haven and London, 1980, 28.
at all, for the unrivalled collections of precious objects that filled his palaces were partly accumulated as an extension of the papal will. Moreover, it was the pope who directed the Cardinal in his early architectural patronage, granting him the Roman commendations on condition that he complete the project for the oratories of S. Gregorio Magno begun by Cesare Baronio and restore the dilapidated basilica of S. Sebastiano. In fact Giovanni Baglione, at the end of his litany of Paul V's building projects, actually credited the pope with the restoration of S. Sebastiano, a church rebuilt "by his will and through the magnificence of the cardinal-nephew".

Like Sixtus V, on whom he consciously modelled himself, Paul was regarded as a great builder. Contemporary panegyrics stressed his agency: it was Paul's fountain on the Janiculum, Paul's chapel in S. Maria Maggiore, Paul's facade on S. Peter's, Paul's Palace on the Quirinale. One of the five relief panels on Paul's tomb (S. Maria Maggiore) depicts him as a sort of papal foreman, directing construction on the fortifications of Ferrara, an image that recalls Vasari's fresco of Paul III on the site of the new St. Peter's (c.1546, Palazzo Cancelleria). As in many images of Paul the diminutive figure of Scipione is close by, a pairing that suggests the Cardinal was the junior member of a Borghese partnership. Indeed their individual building projects echo and complement each other: while Paul was

125See the chirograph of 4 August, 1611, handing over six columns of white Brescia marble found in the foundations of a section of the Vatican palace demolished to make way for the new basilica: ASV FB I 27, 494v-495v. There are numerous other donations in this volume, including a lapis lazzuli encrusted clock (14 August, 1609, 436r); a treasure chest of goods from the Castel S. Angelo (26 August, 1609, 444v); a great "pilo grande di marmo" found in the foundations of the nave and facade of St. Peter's, "con historia intorno della vita d'Alessandro magno con cavalli et altri personi..." (16 April, 1610, 473r); and the four painted screens presented by the Japanese ambassador to the Holy See in 1616 (17 February, 1616, 563v). The Cardinal would also often receive confiscated goods, such as Cavalier D'Arpino's collection of paintings (below, 1.3, n. 22), or the some embroidered damasks seized by the customs officer in 1614 (ASV FB I 27, 540v).


127See the extracts from biographies of Paul V in Pastor, vol. 26, appendix 14, 481-97.

finishing Rome's premier basilica, Scipione was restoring the most neglected and remote of St. Peter's seven church colleagues; as Paul completed the gargantuan apostolic palace on the Quirinale, Scipione was building his own garden palace/summer banquet centre alongside it. When Scipione sold the Giardino in 1616 and turned his attention to financing the extension of the Villa Mondragone, it was not his intention to develop a personal retreat but to construct a villa suitable for state occasions, a more relaxed venue for papal business at the beginning of the spring and autumn seasons. Moreover, as I will discuss in the following chapter, the heraldry stamped on his church building projects highlighted both his personal status and his role as representative of the papal family. In short, Scipione's building while cardinal-nephew expressed not only his own splendour, but that of his family and the Holy See, the three identities united and monumentalised in what was regarded by many as the ideal index of virtue - ecclesiastical architecture.

\[129\] Although the villa was owned by Scipione, its extension was probably by papal order, as indicated by the donation of 22,000 scudi (6 June, 1617) from the papal camera, "in subventione expensarum fabricae, quam idem Scipio Card., iussu nostro sibi oretenus dato, inceperat et faciebat in sua villa Montis Draconis": F. Grossi-Gondi, La Villa dei Quintili e la Villa di Mondragone, Rome, 1901, 100; Scipione's villa-building is discussed further below, ch. 4.
Scipione's major public works while he was cardinal-nephew were the completion of the oratories of S. Gregorio Magno and the rebuilding of S. Sebastiano fuori le mura. Both projects were legacies of the renewed enthusiasm for the heritage of the primitive church, a popular and doctrinal movement expressed in sacred history, martyrology, archaeology, preaching, music, painting, and the restoration of churches. From the cathedral of S. Giovanni in Laterano to the comparatively humble SS. Nereo ed Achilleo, hardly a palaeo-Christian or medieval church in the city escaped some form of renovation or embellishment between 1550 and 1650. Initially these were modest affairs, projects whose understatement expressed the perceived simple humility of early Christian worship. But as the reform spirit cooled in the course of the seventeenth century, restorations grew more lavish, the architectural exemplars of purity attracting growingly confident and celebratory accretions. A restoration became the most prestigious form of building, a type of conspicuous piety appealing to any high profiled member of the sacred college. At the same time, renovation also became an increasingly conventional building project, one which normally fell within the proscriptions relating to maintenance of the church's commendation to a particular prelate.

The Oratories of S. Gregorio Magno

Before Scipione, the ancient monastery founded by St. Gregory the Great in the sixth century [fig. 1] had been commended to the revered church historian, Cardinal Cesare Baronio (1538-1607). In 1602 Baronio initiated the reconstruction of the three small chapels that form the oratory

1For the early history of the church and monastery, see below II.1.
complex beside the church [figs. 2-4]. The first chapel, dedicated to S. Barbara, was completed by 1604. According to Baronio's close reading of Diaconus's biography (c. 872-82) of Gregory, fragments of the existing structure were once part of a beggar's dining-hall. The humble function of the original structure was matched by the pronounced austerity of the reconstructed chapel, meant to evoke the simplicity of early Christian devotion.² This is seen in particular in the plain washed walls and medievalising exterior door, with its minimal classical articulation and cosmatesque tympanum.

When Baronio died on 30 June, 1607, the other two chapels, S. Andrea and S. Silvia, were about half-finished. The pope immediately commended the abbey to Cardinal Borghese, who entrusted the completion of the chapels' building and decoration to the papal architect, Flaminio Ponzio.³ The altarpieces of both chapels were already in place and the fairly slight payments by the Cardinal for muratore suggest that the walls had been built. Ponzio did, however, supervise the building of the central portico trabeated on four antique columns. He also oversaw the masonry detail of the two chapels, which conforms to that of S. Barbara, including the dentilation in the eaves and the beautiful travertine architraves of the doors [fig. 5]. Inside, both chapels were fitted with massive gilded timber ceilings and marble balustrades in front of the altars [figs. 6-7]. The window surrounds were also embellished with stucco decoration.

Building was finished by the middle of 1608 and on 15 November Cardinal Borghese went with a grand entourage to inspect the monastery.⁴ They would surely have been impressed, for the complex is one of the most successful ensembles of architecture and decoration of the period. Raised on a hill and symmetrically arranged on an unusual trapezoid plan, the chapels

³Below, II.1.
⁴Avviso of 15 November, 1608, Urb. Lat. 1076, 828r.
present a delicate profile uncharacteristic of Rome, with the fine mouldings, travertine architraves, and plain washed walls conveying an almost Attic balance. Inside there was also much to admire, with the fresco scheme, which in S. Andrea employs the conceit of hung tapestries, done under the direction of Guido Reni, the brilliant young painter whom Borghese had brought from Bologna specially for the project.

Yet despite the generally harmonious manner in which the project was completed by Scipione, his contemporaries could hardly have failed to note some discordance. The painted decorations in S. Andrea and S. Silva, for example, are far lighter and more sensuous than those of S. Barbara, executed under Baronio. Moreover, there is a marked difference in the imagery of the patron, one decisively signalled on the steps to the oratories' forecourt, which has flanking travertine plinths [fig. 8] bearing the now badly weathered arms of the Cardinal; at the rear, SCIPIO CARD. BURGHESIUS is inscribed in the architrave of the portal to the abbey garden [fig. 9]. Acknowledgment of Baronio's role is confined to dedicatory inscriptions in the portico and under the statues of S. Gregorio (in S. Barbara) and S. Silvia. Cardinal Borghese's identity, on the other hand, is

5Augusto Roca de Amicis was especially taken by this aspect of the oratory, its uncluttered masses and decorative simplicity "appiano coerenti alla forte personalità del committente [Baronio], al suo gusto per un purismo arcaizzante": "Studi su città", 25. On the decorative conventions of rural buildings, see below, ch.4.

6Carlo Cesare Malvasia, The Life of Guido Reni, trans. C. and R. Enggass, Penn. State, 1980, 49-51, who also notes the contrast between Reni's St. Andrew being led to Martyrdom and Domenichino's The Flagellation of St. Andrew, a contrast later taken to exemplify the two sides of art theory in the early seventeenth century, the one vibrant and emotive, the other restrained and intellectual. See also Stephen Pepper, Guido Reni, Oxford, 1984, 224. On illusionistic tapestries, a convention developed by the school of Raphael and recently adopted by Cavalier D'Arpino's fresco cycle in the Lateran transept and the extraordinary interior decoration of the church of Santa Susanna, see Ursula Reinhardt, "La tapisserie feinte, un genre de décoration du manierisme romain au XVIe siècle", Gazette des Beaux-arts, 84 (1974), 285-96.

7The portal, with a masonry oval breaking through the triangular pediment, is an early example of a type that would become common later in the century (for example, the flanking doors of Borromini's facade of the oratory of S. Filippo Neri). Antinori, 47-8, points out that this was the first time Scipione's name was realized in architecture.


While it was normal for patrons to identify themselves on their building projects, given the iconography and understated architectural style of these buildings, there is something jarring about the prominently featured emblems and inscriptions. This is mainly due to the contrast of patronal styles, for what had begun as a commission by an Oratorian ended as one by the cardinal-nephew, who chose not to follow the muted self-acknowledgment of his predecessor. Baronio's humility was that of a reformer dedicated to the purity of the early Church. The method of his renowned Annales Ecclesiasticae (c.1576-1606) had exemplified the two basic tenets of the Counter Reformation: namely, that contemporary orthodoxy should follow the orthodoxies of the early church as reconstructed from the

9"With the foundations of the oratory, which had been built by S. Gregorio, having been restored, Cardinal Scipione Borghese, priest of S. Crisogono and commendator of the monastery, preserved and adorned with diverse ornaments [the chapel], 1608."

10"Scipione Borghese, titular priest of S. Crisogono, cardinal of the Roman church and commendator of the monastery of S. Gregorio, adorned with additional paintings and panelled ceiling the oratory of S. Silvia, which had been built by Cesare Baronio, cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, 1609."
writings of the Latin church fathers; and that there was an irrefutable historical basis for the pre-eminence of Rome, sanctioned by both scripture and tradition.\textsuperscript{11} Baronio's reverence for sources extended to physical heritage and his guidebook to Christian Rome, written in collaboration with archaeologists such as Antonio Bosio, was intended to promote the spiritual immanence of devotional places.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, his restorations of churches were driven by a near historicist desire to recreate their original form. At SS. Nereo ed Achilleo [fig. 23], for example, Baronio was concerned to reinstate the early Christian disposition of the church, designing, for example, a chancel that looked not to contemporary solutions but to the disposition and elements of the altar precinct of old St. Peter's.\textsuperscript{13} This was more than propriety, for Baronio believed that the physical remains of churches themselves were testimony to providence, their antiquity a demonstration of the divine mission of the Holy Roman Church.\textsuperscript{14} Such an attitude is graphically clear in the account (c. 1606) of Baronio's passionately held and key position in the debate regarding the demolition of St. Peter's:

An act was passed in consistory for the demolition of the old Vatican basilica, so that it could be rebuilt to the plan and architecture of Michelangelo Buonarroti, an outstanding designer of buildings. This was passed as the great Julius [II] had wished...But Baronio fiercely and religiously rejected the idea, and other wise pious men felt sorry for those walls. [They] pointed out that these were the walls which the great and most pious Constantine had built in honour of the chief of the Apostles, after


\textsuperscript{12}On Bosio, see below, n. 37.


\textsuperscript{14}Carla Pisanello, "Il significato storico del patrimonio artistico negli 'Annales'", in
digging the foundations by hand; these were the walls which great
Theodosius, Honorius, Valentinianus, the Caroli, Ludovici,
Othos, and other Caesars and highest holy ones had strengthened
when they were shaky; these were the walls which so many kings,
bishops, leaders, and protectors had gazed upon and which
showed so many images as testimony to those who had died for
the truth. There with bowed heads they used to look at the awe­
inspiring high altar, emanating sanctity and religion, where the
holiest and most famous men had officiated with every ceremony.
These walls, these columns, these marble stones worn with the
footsteps of the pious, the sepulchral monuments of old saints and
Caesars, the tombs and relics of so great a building were to be razed
to the ground. Their words turned everyone to sighing and
sorrow; and this church we then destroyed with our own hands.15

If Baronio approached architectural restoration with a sense of
historical reverence, by comparison Borghese seems to have approached the
oratories of S. Gregorio in a spirit of celebration. Antinori has persuasively
demonstrated that this contrast is indicative of the eclipse of the Oratorian
influence within the sacred college, a casualty of the hardened political
environment of the Roman court in the wake of Venetian interdict.16 The

Borromeo, Baronio e l’arte, 334.
15“Actum in senatu de veteris Vaticanae basilicae demolitione utque ad normam et
architecturam Michaelis Angeli Bonarotae, eminentissimi quondam ingenii et egregii
moliotionum opificis reduceretur, sicut magnus Julianus placuerat omnibus assentientibus...Baronius
acriter et religiose repugnavit, et sapientes ac pii parietum illorum miserebantur, illos esse
memorantes, quos magnus Constantinus excelsissimae pietatis vel egesta humeris effossaque
manu humo construereat in honorem principis Apostolorum, quos Theodosius magnus, Honorius,
Valentiananus, quos Caroli, Ludovici, Othones, aliquem Caesares et Summi Divorum nutantes
firmarant, quos tot reges, antistites, duces praesulesque spectavissent, in quibus depictae
imagines quae defunctis ob veritatem testimoniun exhibuerant; proclinatis capitibus
spectabantur altaria illa verenda, in quibus sanctissimi viri et omni praecino celebratisse
litarant, sanctimoniam ac religionem spirantia, illi lateres, illae columnae, illa marmora tot
sanctorum vestigiis calcata, sepulchrales moles veterum Divorum ac Caesarem tumuli ac
reliquiae tantae molis proruerandi, in miserationem, tristitiam ac gemitum animos omnium
converterant: et ea tum basilica manibus nostris excindebatur”: BAV Barb. Lat. 2580, 2, quoted
16Antinori, 5-13. On the interdict, see above, ch. 1 n. 101. The effect the severe, literalist
papal position had on intellectual life in Rome is brilliantly illuminated by Richard
interdict of 1606 highlighted the ideological division that had been opening in the college itself between the older influence of the reform-minded Oratorians and the newly ascendant pro-Spanish elements. To the disgust of the Spanish Crown the eleventh volume of Baronio's _Annales_ (1605) included a refutation of the _Monarchia Sicilia_ (the legal justification of the Kingdom of Sicily as a papal legation), an affront that was in part responsible for Baronio's seemingly sure ascension to the Holy See being blocked in 1605.\(^1\) The comparatively moderate Oratorians, including the former cardinal-nephews Paolo Sfondrato and Pietro Aldobrandini, both former cardinal-nephews, were further isolated by the extreme, largely Jesuitical, juristic position adopted by the papacy in the conflict with Venice. According to Antinori, the Oratorian's cultural influence, marked by a love of poverty, conspicuously humble piety, and reverence for Christianity's physical legacies, declined in the pro-Spanish Borghese environment, where its essentialist implications were seen as dangerously close to the sentiments of the Protestant Reformers. In contrast, the conflict with Venice, the affirmation of Spain, and the triumph of the Jesuits (Loyola was beatified in 1609) contributed to a more affirmative and celebratory architectural (and artistic) style, which would soon develop the characteristic 'Catholic' features of the baroque, in contrast to architecture of northern Europe.\(^2\)

While Antinori argues his case convincingly, there are two main objections. Firstly, one wonders if it is appropriate to compare northern (Protestant) and southern (Catholic) architecture, with their different decorative and professional traditions. Secondly, it is doubtful if one can speak of an historic fracture rather than transition. As discussed below, the

---

1. Agostino Borromeo, "Il Cardinale Cesare Baronio e la Corona Spagnola", in R. de Maio, et. al. (eds.), _Baronio storico e la controriforma_ (Atti del convegno internazionale di studi) Sora, 1979, 55-166, esp. 121-63.

cultural language in which architectural restoration was articulated and perceived had been developing for over a generation, to the point where it activated a range of values almost impossible to separate from the conventions of the past. Borghese may well have approached the commission in a spirit of celebration, but he need not have had any particular proselytising intention that related to collegiate divisions. Indeed, this commission was in one sense no more than the culmination of an early stage of his career path. During his first six months in the sacred college Borghese had been granted numerous benefices, mostly deriving from bishoprics in southern Italy. By the middle of 1607 their accumulation had provided Scipione with the extensive income necessary to begin his career of cultural patronage. It seems no accident that it was not until such time that he was commended a property in Rome in need of attention, namely, S. Gregorio Magno.

In his first exercise in public building, Borghese might have felt the need to assert some concrete witness of his new identity. The avvisi suggest that from 1605 to 1608 Scipione's ceremonial presence in Rome had steadily grown in splendour. His more frequent banquets grew larger and he seemed...
to perform all his church duties accompanied by a great cortège.\textsuperscript{21} Meanwhile, he had begun to buy real estate and acquire art on a grand scale: in June 1607 Scipione managed to sequester Cavaliere D'Arpino's collection of 105 paintings;\textsuperscript{22} in December he paid 7000 scudi for the sculpture collection of the bankrupt Ceuli family;\textsuperscript{23} the following spring he secured Raphael's \textit{Deposition}, a work in whose earlier theft from the Franciscan church in Perugia he had been clearly complicit;\textsuperscript{24} one year later he purchased seventy one paintings from the near-bankrupt Cardinal Paolo Sfondrato.\textsuperscript{25} In short, Borghese was establishing both the bearing and the material attributes that would complement his status as Rome's premier cardinal.

A telling incident occurred just before the end of 1608, when Borghese, along with the pope and Cardinal Nazzaret, went on a tour of Rome's seven pilgrimage churches in a coach pulled by six horses.\textsuperscript{26} Much had changed since the sixteenth century, when the reform spirit of the Oratorians had encouraged popes, cardinals, and other dignitaries to visit the seven churches in a style of conspicuous piety. In deference to the

\textsuperscript{21}By all reports Scipione was virtually dumbstruck with gratitude when he first came to Rome. Pastor noted the avviso of 17 June 1605 that said Scipione "camina con molto riguardo" and was too frightened even to ask permission to summon his father from Nepi: Pastor, v. 26, 56. The Venetian ambassadors commented in their report of 1605 that Scipione seemed happy just to be in Rome and was careful not to overstep the mark: "...non ha si qui alcuna autorità, né ardisse aprir bocca, con tutto che de volontà del Papa ricevi tutti quelli honori, che sogliono i nepoti de'Papi Capi delle consulte et che hanno il governo in capite..." (below, III.1.1).

\textsuperscript{22}D'Arpino had been arrested with a room full of arquebuses, but was spared death following the intervention of Cardinal Borghese. As Soprintendente Generale dello Stato Pontificio (with jurisdiction over weapons' licences) Borghese may have used D'Arpino's weapons collection as a pretext to acquire the painter's coveted art works. In any event, on 4 May, 1607, D'Arpino gave his collection to the Apostolic Camera; on 30 July it passed to Scipione as a papal donation (ASV FB I 27, 336r-337r; H. Röttgens, \textit{Il Cavaliere D'Arpino. Roma, Palazzo Venezia, giugno-luglio, 1973}, Rome, 1973, 45-6).

\textsuperscript{23}Avvisi of 19 and 15 December, 1607, Urb. Lat. 1075, 797v and 807r; Kalveram, \textit{Die Antiken sammlung}, 7-10.

\textsuperscript{24}In late 1607 Borghese indicated to his agent in Perugia that he would like to acquire the painting. In March, 1608, it was taken from the church and transported to Borghese's palace; on 11 April a \textit{moto proprio} passed it as a papal donation to the Cardinal, much to the disgust of the Perugians: Paola della Pergola documents the incident, \textit{Galleria Borghese}, vol. 2, 196-213.

\textsuperscript{25}Avviso of 28 June, 1608, Urb. Lat. 1076, 469v.

\textsuperscript{26}Avviso of 31 December, 1608, Urb. Lat. 1076, 937v.
humble origins of the church, a coach was considered too extravagant even for high-ranking officials.27 Now, however, humility did reverence a disservice. It was not so much that the followers of Filippo Neri had been shunned in the Roman court, but that the spirit of their cultural innovations had been converted into more concrete, ceremonial, and affirmative expressions of piety. The enthusiasm for early Christianity and the conservation and embellishment of its remnants had become an activity of clerical prestige. Rather than exhausted, the Oratorian influence had hardened into display.

S. Sebastiano fuori le mura

At the very end of 1607, with building only just underway at S. Gregorio, Borghese began the restoration of S. Sebastiano fuori le mura, a church on the Appian way about two kilometres south of the city wall [fig. 10]. Built by Constantine, home to thousands of relics, the outermost stop on the venerable seven church circuit, S. Sebastiano was one of Rome's greatest treasures.28 It was, however, deserted and falling to ruin. Indeed, the commendation of the property to Scipione on 28 November, 1607, expressively specified that the church be restored.29 The wording of the commendation implies that this instruction was by the will of the pope and

---

27 Michel de Montaigne noted in his travel journal (1578-81) that Gregory XIV always took the same horse and made a show of turning down gilt spurs offered him by his groom: Complete Works, ed. and trans. D. Frame, London, 1957, 955. On the symbolism of the seven churches, see Alessandro Rinaldi, "La sette meraviglia della Roma cristiana. L'invenzione del Lafréry", in Fagiolo and Madonna (eds.), Roma Sancta, 269-274.

28 On the early history of the church, see below, II.2.

29 "Monsignore Capponi nostro Thesorie Generale Havendo la santa memoria di Sisto Quinto nostro Predecessore unito l'Abbazia di San Sebastiano fuor di Roma alle Catacombe reducendola à secularità alla Capella, e Sagrestia Pontificia, e dopo havendola noi disunita e redotta allo stato di prima e successivam data in commenda al Illustrissimo Cardinale Scipione Borghese nostro Nipote quale speriamo sia per restaurare detta Chiesa con parte dell'entrate di detta Abbazia, il che non seguirebbe, se fusse restata unita, come sopra, e però mancando alla detta Capella, e sacrestia l'assegnamento dell'entrate di detta abbazia per pagar il salario, e provisione dell' ministri di essa, e volendo noi in luogo di dette entrate darli altro assegnamenti...." ASR Camerale I: Giustificazioni di Tesoreria, busta 33, 18. Document discovered and partly published by Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 82-3, n.1; also in Antinori, 141.
when the Cardinal took possession of the church on 11 December, the papal
diarist made it clear that this was indeed the pope’s initiation:

In recognition of this [the poor condition of S. Sebastiano], the pious
and vigilant Paul V gave its care and administration to the
Reverend Cardinal Scipione Borghese, his nephew, so that he
might restore and embellish the church from its revenues and
benefices.\(^{30}\)

Thus this was a commission that expressed the wishes of the pope.
Perhaps he and Scipione had discussed the project when they visited the
fragile church three weeks earlier.\(^ {31} \) At the time the pope had a particular
interest in matters of early Christian celebration, having just commissioned
the installation of the famous icon of the Virgin and Child from S. Maria
Maggiore, believed to have been painted by St. Luke, in the Pauline Chapel.
For papal theologians, this image offered tangible evidence in support of
Maria Theotokos (Mary as mother of God), a doctrine that had come under
question by the recently enlivened Nestorian heresy. According to Steven
Ostrow, by enshrining the icon in Pompeo Targone’s Tabernacle of the
Virgin, Paul V triumphantly affirmed both the authenticity of the image
and the doctrine it implied.\(^ {32} \) So also would the cardinal-nephew’s first
independent building commission - the restoration of an ancient and relic-
rich church - grant further defence against all those who doubted the
physical foundations of Roman legitimacy.

\(^{30}\) “Card.lis Burghesius accepit possonem ecc.a S.ti Sebastiani, quo cum olim esset abbatia, a
fel. m.re Sixto Papa V cappella pontificio unita fuit....Quod intelligens pius et vigilantiss.
pastor Paulus V eam in pristinum restituit, eiusq. curam et administrat.em dedit p.to R. mo D.
Card.li Burghesio nepoti suo, ut ex eius fruitibus, et reddittibus ecc.am ipsam restauraret atq.
ornaret....” ASV FB I 721, 181r.

\(^{31}\) Avviso of 10 November, 1607, Urb. Lat. 1075, 722r.

For the first eighteen months building at the abbey was confined to the crypt and its surrounds inside the church. The crypt was the heart of the church's unrivalled collection of relics, and relics were the main reason for the fame of the church. Contemporary guidebooks paid S. Sebastiano's actual structure scant attention, regarding it as little more than a vessel for the treasures contained within and underneath. Onofrio Panvinio's account of S. Sebastiano, for example, in his guide to the seven churches of Rome, is dominated by a list of the principal relics, with only cursory information about the architecture of the church itself.33 This was also a feature of the entry on the church in the period's most popular pilgrim guide, *Le cose maravigliose*:

This church, at least a mile outside of Rome on the via Appia, was built by Saint Lucina. On the feast day of Saint Sebastian and on all the Sundays of May, there is a plenary remission of sins. In the catacomb, where there is a crypt which hid the bodies of Saints Peter and Paul, there are many more indulgences, as much as in the church of Saint Peter or that of Saint Paul. Every day there are 6046 years available, and many forty-year lots of indulgences, and the remission from a third part of all sins. And whoever celebrates or ventures to celebrate at the altar of Saint Sebastian, will free a soul from the penalty of Purgatory. In the cemetery of Calixtus, which is under the church [sic. - a misconception not corrected until later in the century], there is a plenary remission of sins, for there are [the relics] of 174,000 martyrs, among whom are eighteen pontiffs. In the church there is the body of St. Sebastian, the virgin Santa Lucina, and the martyr pope St. Stephen, as well as the stone formerly in the chapel of Domine Quo Vadis, on which Christ

---

stopped him who was fleeing. And there are an infinite number of other relics.34

As might be guessed from the above description, the cultural importance of relics in the period can barely be over-stressed. Their attraction was manifold. For the pilgrim, relics held their saint's superfluous merits, merits that could be purchased as indulgences, a doctrine that despite Lutheran attacks continued as one of the principal inspirations for popular devotion into the seventeenth century. For reformers such as Filippo Neri (1515-95), founder of the Oratorians, relics were instructive and exemplary. Neri had in fact based much of his early ministry around the promotion of relics, urging his followers to make physical contact with the very image of the primitive church.35 Such sentiments were memorably expressed by Gregory Martin, who wrote that relics stirred the often forgetful heart, reminding one "that Rome for three hundred yeares after Christ...was a boucherie and as it were a verie Shambles of Martyrising Christians and puttinge them to Death for confessing the name of Christ".36 For Roman scholars, relics in turn gathered an archaeological significance; Antonio Bosio's labours on the many sites that were springing up around the city would result in the vast illustrated volume on the sites and customs of early Christianity, Roma
sotterranea, eventually published in 1650. Finally, for the papacy all these interests were integral to the heritage of Christian Rome, which collectively offered the firmest basis for the Tridentine claim that Rome was the faith's true home and the pope its rightful protector.

The cultural primacy of relics was directly reflected by the initial focus on the precious crypt in Scipione's restoration [fig. 11]. According to the building accounts, initial work in the church consisted of vaulting the crypt, previously open to the nave. In addition, Scipione's builders constructed a new corridor to the crypt, beginning in the old ambulatory, lined with a succession of paintings executed under the supervision of Guido Reni. The renovation of the crypt explains the next element in the building chronology, the little facade attached to the old ambulatory behind the church [figs. 12-14]. In the seventeenth century, the normal approach to the church was from the rear, along the Via delle sette chiese linking S. Sebastiano with S. Paolo fuori le mura, a road laid in 1570 to aid orderly pilgrim movement. Coming along the street, the pilgrim would have encountered this small facade first and, at least while construction work was blocking the main entrance and nave, might well have been expected to enter by its modest central door. Later, when the restoration was complete, the rear facade would have been the exit for those who had made the round of the church's altars, catacomb, and crypt. Although the scale of the facade


38 Antinori, 62, points out the similarity of the facade to one of the entrances of Giacomo Della Porta's church of the three fountains (1599) and Carlo Lambardi's facade of S. Prisca (c.1600), but emphasises the Michelangelesque elements, such as the way the giant pilasters flanking the door break into the pediment above, or the association of the festoon in the pediment of the central portal with the tympanum of the Porta Pia. He makes an ambitious and daring claim that such features "costituiscono infatti la necessaria premessa storica alla genesi, che si produrrà più tardi in un mutato contesto culturale, delle novità plastiche e spaziali dell'architettura barocca, cortonesca ma soprattutto borrominiana."

39 Confirmed by Giovanni Baglione, who noted the door at the rear was the exit or entrance, to
may seem incongruous, its unrendered surface nevertheless quietly harmonises with the attached brick courses of the Constantinian ambulatory. This subtle theme is refined in the architrave, which is articulated not by travertine or plaster but by smaller and lighter coloured bricks. Finally, as with the oratories of S. Gregorio, the facade carries the clear stamp of its maker, with the Cardinal's name prominently inscribed above the door and that of his uncle in the frieze. In addition, the Borghese coat-of-arms (now missing) were hung in the tympanum and below the epitaph and their eagles are placed between the volutes of the Ionic capitals. Architecturally discreet, but firmly personalised towards its patron, the little facade embodies all the themes that would be more fully expressed in the restoration of the church itself.

Today the rear facade is neglected and disused, while the crypt is inaccessible. The church itself now dominates, conveying the mistaken impression that Borghese's intervention was primarily concerned with the architecture of the original basilica. Work on the interior was in fact limited to remodelling the nave, which had been closed off from the aisles and ambulatory in the twelfth or thirteenth century [figs. 15-16]. The walls were redressed in stuccoed masonry, designed as an austere blend of flat pilaster bands, string courses, arches, and blank panels organised into nine irregular bays. The central theme is the three wide, arched altar recesses [fig. 17], although on both sides one of the altars has been replaced (by the chapel of relics in 1625 and, opposite, the chapel of St. Sebastian in 1672). Despite these additions, the white stucco walls managed to avoid major alterations, including the gilding or marbling popular later in the century, and the interior represents, like the oratory of S. Gregorio, an excellent example of the early century's delicate style. In fact the only expensive detailing was the

40Antinori, 81-93, describes the interior decoration in some detail.
balustrade in front of the high altar chapel and the four identical marble doors (one of which was removed, c. 1706, to make way for the Albani chapel) in the corners of the nave [fig. 18], each with the inscription in the lintel SCIPIO. CARD. BURGHESIUS. The finely carved aedicules, with segmental pediments broken by garlanded seraphims and little Borghese dragons in the 'ears', are more elaborate versions of the door to the facciatella, as well as the windows that would soon be built on the upper floor of the main facade.

Cardinal Borghese's interventions transformed the interior of S. Sebastiano into an unencumbered rectangular hall, with the altar precinct separated as a distinct unit at the end of the nave. As Milton Lewine demonstrated in his ground-breaking 1960 doctoral dissertation, such a space had become typical of Roman church interiors since the 1530s. In the middle decades of the sixteenth century, Roman architects developed a particularly utilitarian type of church plan, one independent of the Renaissance design principles exemplified by Bramante and Michelangelo. Especially noteworthy was the emphasis on the nave at the expense of the high altar chapel, as seen at S. Giovanni Decollato (architect unknown, completed c.1550), S. Spirito in Sassia (Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, c.1545-53) and S. Maria in Trivio (Jacopo del Duca, 1575).

Lewine related such designs to the atmosphere of Rome after the Sack of 1527, when an increasingly populist clergy advocated frequent preaching and attendance at mass as the most effective way of achieving moral reform. In this regard the Jesuits were instrumental. Arriving in Rome in 1538, the order established by Ignatius Loyola had taken as its principal pastoral charge the ministry of the Word. Seeing themselves as descendants of the

---


42 Lewine, "Roman Architectural Practice", 21-4.
medieval mendicant orders, the Jesuits sought to evangelise Scripture through teaching, publication, sacred lecture, and above all preaching. In fact, preaching was organised on an almost continual basis, in the open air, in schools, in established churches, and, eventually, in their own new foundations.43 The Jesuits had a buoyant effect on Rome's religious life and the many assembly hall church interiors that soon emerged were specifically designed to cope with the growing congregations.44 It was largely these principles of church design that were later codified by Carlo Borromeo in his "Instructions on the Building and Furnishing of Churches" (1575) and which were also to inform the designs of the huge churches built by the congregational orders in the last quarter of the sixteenth and first quarter of the seventeenth century.45 Although regular preaching was not part of the daily calendar of S. Sebastiano, the church attracted a large pilgrim congregation. Mindful of Sixtus V's criticism that the dimensions of the church were "too modest for proper pontifical celebration", the internal restoration can partly be seen as an attempt to bring the church in line with contemporary standards of ecclesiastical amenity.46

So too the interior's dominant feature, the polychromatic coffered timber ceiling [fig. 19], followed the conventions of recent church

44Lewine, "Roman Architectural Practice", 24-5. As was so often the case, existing practice was later codified by the Council of Trent. A decree of the fifth council dealt with the institution of lectures on Holy Scripture and asserted the primary importance of sacred oratory. Preaching, based solely on the teachings of Jesus and the Gospels, received strong encouragement: Frederick McGinness, "Preaching Ideals and Practice in Counter-Reformation Rome", The Sixteenth Century Journal, 11 (Summer 1980), 111.
46Sixtus V declared in part VI of the bull Egregia populi romani (13 February,1586): "The church of S. Sebastiano, antique and sacred, is not sufficiently venerable to justify its great distance away, and its dimensions are too modest for proper pontifical celebration" (quoted in Gamrath, Roma Sancta, 136).
architecture developed in relation to preaching. Unlike the ribbed vaults of northern churches, or the barrel vaulted halls of ancient Rome, early Christian basilicas were unvaulted and normally covered with open timber truss roofs. Some of these remain, such as S. Lorenzo fuori le mura or S. Pudenziana. Most, however, succumbed to the fashion that emerged in the late fifteenth century of sealing the roof with a timber soffit. This practice was mainly associated with the recognition of the acoustic benefits provided by a soffit, particularly relevant in relation to the music and preaching of churches. Because ceilings were installed in existing churches, however, some confusion arose over their significance. Carlo Borromeo, for example, mistakenly thought the ceiling a characteristic feature of early Christian churches, asserting that "symbolic meaning induces the construction of trabeated roofs for churches". Although most new churches from the time of the Gesù (1570) were vaulted, timber ceilings continued to be added to existing churches throughout the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century. In fact, Cardinal Farnese's famous letter (1568) of instruction to Vignola reveals that the Jesuits originally felt a barrel vault would cause the voice to "resound unintelligibly because of the echo" and therefore wanted a flat ceiling "on account of the preaching". Coffering also was thought to have an acoustic function, although at S. Sebastiano the cassettoni are actually very shallow, quite unlike the heavily carved and embossed coffers of the ceiling's stylistic model in S. Susanna [fig. 20].

47 Probably the two most notable Renaissance ceilings in early Christian churches are those of S. Maria Maggiore (1492-1503) and S. Giovanni in Laterano (1562-67). For a survey of ceiling styles, see Alfredo Paolucci, "Soffitti in legno di chiese Romane", Roma, 8 (1930), 521-30.

48 Alberti, for example, had asserted that a timber ceiling was appropriate wherever preaching, singing, or debating were to be heard, as it resonated sound: On the Art of Building in Ten Books, trans J. Rykwert, N. Leach, R. Tavernor, Cambridge Mass./London, 1988, bk. 5, ch. 9, 131, and bk. 7, ch. 3, 191. See also the memorandum of Francesco Giorgi (1535) on Francesca della Vigna, Venice, who recommended the ceiling be covered with as many squares as possible, "because they will be very convenient for preaching". Published in Rudolf Wittkower, Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism, London, 3rd. ed. 1962, 160-1. Ringbeck, 50-4, considers the development of ceilings in relation to S. Crisogono.

49 Voelker, "Borromeo's 'Instructiones'", 85-6.

The final element of the interior is the high altar chapel at the head of the nave, a domed Greek-cross structure dominated by a splendid green porphyry columned altar tabernacle [figs. 21-22].\(^{51}\) The altar supports Innocenzo Tacconi's *Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John*, a painting conforming with Borromeo's recommendation that the crucifixion be represented in every main chapel of a church.\(^{52}\) The striking overall feature of the chapel is its simplicity. Raised just three steps from the nave, the chapel's lucid plan affords barely any room for an attendant clergy. Space was not a problem: the front of the precinct could have been brought forward or the ambulatory wall pierced to enable the chancel to extend at the rear. Such a minimal space was in fact typical of contemporary design. As Lewine observed, in contrast to the traditional presbyters' chancel of a longitudinal church in the Middle Ages or Renaissance, Roman altar precincts from at least the mid-sixteenth century are marked by their open and shallow disposition. To some extent this simplicity was due to the increased importance the church fathers attached to an unimpeded view of the host from any point in the church.\(^{53}\) This does not, however, explain the diminution of the chancel area. Recommendations regarding the ideal Christian chancel are similarly uninformative. Although Borromeo advocated a vaulted high altar chapel raised three steps from the nave, as one finds in S. Sebastiano, he also suggested a clergy's choir separate from the standing place of the people.\(^{54}\) In Rome the model of the early Christian chancel was an even more elevated area, with a free-standing altar table covered by a ciborium in front of an unconcealed choir, as one finds in the old St. Peter's, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Paolo fuori le mura, S. Lorenzo fuori le

---

\(^{51}\)The altar is similar Pompeo Targone's *Tabernacle of the Virgin* in S. Maria Maggiore's Pauline chapel, as well as to an unexecuted design by Maderno for the altar of the Rusticucci chapel in the Gesù (c.1594): Hibbard, *Carlo Maderno*, 110 and plate 3.

\(^{52}\)Voelker, "Borromeo's 'Instructiones'", 145.

\(^{53}\)Ibid., 133.

\(^{54}\)Ibid., 124-5, 145, 153.
mura, S. Giovanni in Laterano, and S. Prassede, among others. In fact it was such an arrangement that Cardinal Baronio reinstated when he restored SS. Nereo ed Achilleo [fig. 23] and S. Cesareo de'Appia.

Although Lewine's thesis provides the basic interpretative framework, generalisations on post-Tridentine altar-precint design must await further research, particularly in relation to liturgical variations. One line of enquiry, however, might be to focus on the amplified sense of congregational unity in the later sixteenth century. As already noted, reform orders such as the Jesuits or the Oratorians were remarkable for their encouragement both of an active participation of the clergy in the life of the laity and of a more active involvement of lay people in clerical rituals. Moreover, although the Council of Trent preserved the procedures of the medieval liturgy, these were in contrast to rituals explored in the spirit of early Christian exemplars. Gregory Martin, for example, marvelled at the way Roman priests learned from "children, nature, custome, and tradition" so as to imitate the "grave sinceritie of the old primitive Church". At the

55In a relatively recent survey, Niels Rasmussen, after noting the lack of information regarding parish celebrations (rather than the highly ceremonial papal masses or special events such as canonisations), was forced to conclude that "the observation made by Klauser remains valid: 'we still lack a history of church building viewed as buildings constructed for the liturgy'. "Liturgy and Liturgical Arts", in J. O'Malley (ed.), Catholicism in Early Modern History. A Guide to Research, St Louis, 1988, vol. 2, 286, referring to Theodor Klauser, A Short History of the Western Liturgy, trans J. Halliburton, London, 5th ed. 1969, 140. One might also stress the differing requirements of individual orders.

56This would be the reverse of the medieval period, where the development of the Schola Cantorum in the twelfth century had articulated the growing divisions between the monastic prelates (the canons, who claimed apostolic descendancy), the secular presbyters, and the lay worshippers: Elaine de Benedictus, "The Schola Cantorum in Rome during the High Middle Ages", PhD Disss, Bryn Mawr College, 1983, 169-70. The argument in the text also contradicts Paul Frankl's influential view that the "architecture of this period [1550-1700] reflects the increased significance of the liturgy [and] the subordination of the laity to the clergy": Principles of Architectural History. The Four Phases of Architectural Style, 1420-1900, trans. and ed. J. F. O'Gorman, Cambridge Mass., 1968, 170. Frankl's thesis was mistakenly conceived, for there is no indicative correlation between an increase in the significance of the liturgy in relation to the layout of a church and the subordination of the laity to the clergy; where and how the clergy sat has nothing essential to do with understanding the structure of the Mass (which was actually unaltered by the Council of Trent), only with the hierarchies in the total congregation.

same time, he noted how Roman congregations flocked around the priest at Mass, enlivening the ceremony with their spontaneous enthusiasm.\(^5\)\(^8\)

Although Martin's observations were likely idealised, the images of unstructured worship are instructive. Moreover, such reformist images were shared by pilgrims who, as the Turners observed, were little concerned with stately hierarchies and whose dramatic increase in the later sixteenth century might well have influenced the Counter-Reformation's characteristic style of conspicuous piety.\(^5\)\(^9\) In this sense the simplicity of S. Sebastiano's high altar chapel may have expressed an ideal of congregational communality. Yet this as well had its limits: delineated by a few steps and protected by a balustrade, the chapel was not for everyone to enter. Here too, one notes the transformation, or ossification, in the early seventeenth century of reformatory rituals; just as loosely structured patterns of behaviour became formalised as procedure, so spaces were shaped into areas of sharply defined significance.\(^6\)\(^0\)

The final element of the restoration was the building of new facade [fig. 24], which replaced an existing lean-to portico erected in the late twelfth

\(^{58}\)Martin, *Roma Sancta*, 60. Martin wrote: "[When the people hear the signal for the beginning of Mass] they goe flocking by and by round about the priest, attending upon him, blessing with him, answering him, bowing with him, lifting up their hartes with his prayers and ceremonies, and wholy occupied in harkening to him, and onely attent to the holy mysteries and blessed wordes of the masse..." (idem, 61-2). On medieval liturgy, see Klauser, *A Short History*, 125ff.

\(^{59}\)A good index of pilgrimage is the number during a Jubilee year. From around 100 000 to 200 000 in the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, the figures jump dramatically to about 400 000 in 1575 and 536 000 in 1600: Delumeau, *Vita economica*, 46-7. On the importance of pilgrims to Rome, see the essays in part II of Fagiolo and Madonna, *Roma Sancta*; Paolo Brezzi, "Holy Years in the Economic Life of the City of Rome", *Journal of European Economic History*, 4 (1975), 673-90. Victor and Edith Turner discuss pilgrimage as a liminal ritual, focusing participants on the "virgin radiance" of the religion rather than its ceremonious symbols. Especially interesting is the Turners' discussion of the relationship of pilgrimage and penance: *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: anthropological perspectives*, New York, 1978, 193-95. The concept of liminality derives from Adolf van Gennup, who identified the limin or margin as the liberated period in a rite of passage, existing between the separation from one social structure and the reaggregation to another. It is often associated with travel of various sorts, particularly pilgrimage: see Victor Turner's *The Ritual Process. Structure and Anti-Structure*, Chicago, 1969, for fuller discussion of liminality and communitas.

\(^{60}\)These comments are indebted to Richard Ingersoll, "The Ritual Use of Public Space in Renaissance Rome", PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1985, esp. 455-8.
The new facade is actually a three dimensional structure in its own right, with the free-standing arcade of the lower-level forming a narthex portico. This is a point of some significance, for while the portico was alien to churches built *ex novo*, it was becoming standard for restorations at the time, including, apart from S. Sebastiano, that of S. Anastasia (1598-1618), S. Francesca Romana (1612-15), S. Bartolomeo all’Isola (1624-5), S. Bibiana (1624-6), and S. Crisogono (1626). The portico was supported by theory: Borromeo had recommended the use of porticos, while those who had favoured Palladio’s design for the facade of San Petronio in Bologna noted that most of the exemplary antique basilicas of Rome, such as St. Peter’s, S. Paolo fuori le mura, and S. Giovanni

---

61 Ringbeck, 132, considers the facade in some detail, placing it among the originators of the Baroque facade-type, but also describes it as a "Musterbeispiel für di retardierende Strömung im frühen Seicento". A drawing by Giovanni Mola of S. Sebastiano’s facade is supposedly a copy after Ponzio’s original design, though it depicts a considerably more decorated facade than that built: Milan, Raccolta Bertarelli, Cod. Martinelli, VII, f. 27., published by K. Noehles (ed.), *Breve racconto delle miglior opere d’architettura, scultura et pittura fatte in Roma et alcuni fuor di Roma descritto da Giovanni Battista Mola l’anno 1663*, Berlin, 1966, pl. 4. Noehles attributes this to the conservative Giovanni Vasanzio taking over and completing the facade following the death of Ponzio in April, 1613. Ringbeck, 131-2, cautiously accepts this interpretation, though suggests the changes may have been the choice of Cardinal Borghese. The major *miseur e stime* for the facade, however, was made before Ponzio’s death and Vasanzio actually had little opportunity to make design alterations. According to Antinori, 111, the drawing was possibly a variant by Ponzio, (the scale is slightly different from the actual facade), possibly reviewed by Scipione, with some additional elaborations by Mola.

62 The paired column arcade is similar to that in the courtyard of the Palazzo Borghese, the final wing of which was built by Ponzio following Vignola’s original system: Hibbard, *The Architecture of the Palazzo Borghese*, 22-4 and 54. Northern precedents for the motif include the courtyard of the Palazzo Marini in Milan, designed by Galeazzo Alessi (begun 1558), and the courtyard of the Collegio Borromeo in Pavia, designed by Pellegrino Pellegrini (1564). Antinori, 116, also cites the portico of the Cathedral in Acqui (1606, Lorenzo Binago) as an important precedent.

63 The portico added to S. Anastasia was destroyed by a storm in 1634; it is shown on Maggi’s map, Stefano Borsi, *Roma di Urbano VIII. La pianta di Giovanni Maggi*, 1625, Rome, 1990, 70 (thanks to Fabio Barry for pointing out the early date of S. Anastasia’s portico). S. Francesca Romana (formerly S. Maria Nova, built c. 847-55) was restored by Cardinal Paolo Sfondrato under the direction Carlo Lombardo following the canonisation of Francesca Romana in 1608. Restoration work was begun by at least 1612 (the date on ceiling) and finished by 11 March, 1615, when an avviso noted "la chiesa di S. Maria Nuova in Campo Vaccino di novo ornate con soffitta messa a ora et un facciata della chiesa alla moderna dal Cardinale Santa Cecilia": Orbaan, *Documenti sul baroco*, 231; also Baglione, 166; existing literature on the church focuses on the medieval structure. The portico of S. Bartolomeo all’Isola was probably built 1624-5 after a design by Martino Longhi the Elder (d. 1591) and financed by Cardinal Gabriele de Treio, completing restoration work begun in the 1580s: P. A. Sisti, *La basilica di S. Bartolomeo all’Isola Tiberina*, Rome, 1976, 5-6.
in Laterano, had porticos.\textsuperscript{64} The revival of the portico has been interpreted as an issue of typology.\textsuperscript{65} According to George Bauer, by the early seventeenth century the three-bayed narthex facade represented the archetype of the Christian church front. Such an archetype suggests an orthodoxy in architectural design, comparable to the early Christian and Roman orthodoxy in the Tridentine polemic of ecclesiastical legitimacy.\textsuperscript{66}

Focusing on S. Bibiana, Bauer suggests that the design is composed of carefully selected elements of cultural significance, including the antique triumphal arch, which provided the triple bays, and Michelangelo's project for the facade of S. Lorenzo in Florence, which provided the "typologically necessary portico."\textsuperscript{67}

One should be careful, however, not to over-emphasise the programmatic nature of restoration design. Firstly, a new portico was invariably a replacement for a pre-existing portico. (In fact, all of Rome's seven major basilicas had porticos in the sixteenth century [fig. 29] and all, except S. Maria Maggiore and S. Giovanni in Laterano, had enclosed

\begin{footnotes}

65Frances Huemer was one of the first to contend that the facade of restored churches assumed the character of the original basilica: "A Study of Roman Architectural Decoration of the Seventeenth Century", PhD Diss., New York University, 1959, 59, n. 40. According to Roca de Amicis, "Studi su Città", 24-30, the portico "deve essere indubbiamente correlato a quella corrente culturale controriformista che ravvisava nelle testimonianze paleocristiane (il periodo dei martirii) un esempio da imitare, etico ancor prima che estetico." (24). Gaetano Miarelli Mariani stresses that the use of the portico was done in full cognisance of its palaeo-Christian allusions: "Il 'Cristianesimo Primitivo' nella riforma cattolica e alcune incidenze sui monumenti del passato", in Spagnesi, L'architettura a Roma e in Italia , 147-51.


67Bauer writes that "this method of structuring the central bays was itself widely used in monuments based on the triumphal arch...for example in the tomb monuments of the Medici popes in S. Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, by Antonio da Sangallo": "Gian Lorenzo Bernini", 35 and 136 n. 47. The authorities sent mixed signals on the triumphal arch allusion: Alberti's facade of S. Andrea might have been exemplary but Borromeo, for one, thought pagan forms inappropriate in an ecclesiastical setting, suggesting the entrance doors to a church "should be square, like the ancient basilicas, not arched like city gates": Voelker, "Borromeo's 'Instructiones'", 97.
\end{footnotes}
atriums.) Moreover, while the portico as a building element was considered typical of ancient and medieval basilicas, it is difficult to believe that the stylistic character of a facade such as that of S. Sebastiano, or for that matter of S. Bibiana, to which Bauer principally refers, could have been considered by anyone as archetypal of early Christianity. What is more striking is the way the portico was incorporated into the existing aedicular design conventions of the contemporary facade. With the exception of the later single storey portico of S. Crisogono, the narthex was generally inserted within the prevailing double height facade of three bays, whether it was the equal-storey type as at S. Sebastiano, or the "volute" type as at the later S. Francesca Romana.  

Nevertheless, the portico does have obvious historical connotations. Indeed Antinori noted that the four red granite columns of S. Sebastiano's original portico were reused in the new portico, augmented by two additional grey granite columns placed together under the central arch. The reuse of columns was normal practice; what is noteworthy is that the existing four medieval Ionic capitals, with their restrained neo-antique design, were used as the models for the new capitals, placed atop the central grey columns and side piers [fig. 28]. Such archaising Ionic capitals, which also feature on the pilasters within the narthex, contrast significantly to the

68 Anthony Blunt regarded the S. Sebastiano facade as an example of an idiom distinct from that of the Gesù which was to become dominant later in the seventeenth century: Anthony Blunt, "Roman Baroque Architecture: The Other Side of the Medal", Art History, 3 (1980), 66. Blunt, however, over-generalised. The Gesù facade-type cited by Blunt, with a wide lower level united by giant volutes to a narrow upper level, actually screens an interior consisting of nave and aisles or nave and lateral chapels. On one level, the silhouette of the facade quite simply expresses the structure of the front elevation, with nave and aisles or lateral chapels (the wide lower storey), clerestory above the nave (narrower second storey), and aisle roofs skillioned halfway up the clerestory walls (the giant volutes). These elements, with the exception of the volutes, were already present in the twelfth century facade of San Miniato al Monte in Florence. This articulation of internal space is also the case with the two equal storey facade such as that of S. Sebastiano, whose interior is basically a rectangular hall.

69 Antinori, 117-118 and 187 (doc. 22).

70 Krautheimer noted Roman workshops in the twelfth century began to resist the ancient spoils, producing instead their own refined Ionic capitals, usually adapted from classical models. Compare the Ionic capitals of the narthex of SS. Giovanni e Paolo (1154): Krautheimer, Rome. Profile of a City, 312-1308, Princeton, 1980, 181-2.
normal garlanded Ionic capitals of the period (as seen, for example, on the rear facade of S. Sebastiano). Together these portico capitals are keys to the antiquity of the church, indicating its venerable status. Their context, however, is now in a renewed decorative environment, and it is this contrast that illuminates the important distinction between an historic restoration and a contemporary renovation.

The Nature of Restoration and the Cardinal's Magnificence

'To restore' is a temporal verb. In a restoration, an agent in the present acts upon an object from the past, vesting it with form thought to be lost or revealing in it a past concealed. Understanding the meaning of restoration in an historical sense therefore depends on setting it within the context of contemporary conceptualisations of past and present. Current conservation methodology is confined to revealing a past concealed, defining restoration as "returning the existing fabric of a place...to a known earlier state...without the introduction of new material". In this modern definition, the purpose of restoration is to conserve cultural (historic, social, aesthetic) significance, conceived purely in terms of original physical fabric. Such an idea rests upon a clear sense of the past's discontinuity with the present, in itself symptomatic of the modernist tendency to objectify the past in relation to the subjective present. It is a prevailing characteristic of modern restoration that in the process of restoring a building its life in the present must end, for what is being conserved is the material legacy of a significance contained within precise historical boundaries.

72This idea may be seen in the context of a rationalist historical viewpoint, succinctly expressed by Geoffrey Elton: 'He [the historian] cannot escape the first condition of his enterprise, which is that the matter he investigates has a dead reality independent of the enquiry...Just because historical matter is in the past, is gone, irrecoverable and unrepeateable, its objective reality is guaranteed: it is beyond being altered for any purpose whatsoever" (The Practice of History, London, 1969, 73).
This is in striking contrast to the idea of restoration in the seventeenth century.\(^{73}\) Whereas modern restoration depends upon a material localisation of a past whose dead reality is thought to be assured, earlier attitudes enlisted a significantly multi-dimensional view of history. Such a view was activated by the persistence of an idealism that gave a living reality to the fundamental values of history. This is particularly apparent when considering the reform mentality of the post-Renaissance Roman church. As John O'Malley observed, reformers invariably articulated their desire for ecclesiastical renewal within an overarching sense of decline from the primitive perfection of the Apostolic church.\(^{74}\) The corollary to this was the golden age of the early church, the age that issued those values whose real substance was invulnerable to change. As O'Malley observed, the style of reform (political, social, religious, cultural, or artistic) appropriate to such an idealist view of history is not expressed in terms of progress but in terms of recovering, rejuvenating, reviving, or restoring what once existed in manifest glory but whose outward dignity has since been sullied by the accidents of fortune.\(^{75}\) As a principle of reform, this was encapsulated in Giles of Viterbo's famous dictum (1512): "men must be changed by religion, not religion by men".\(^{76}\)

Such sentiment was at the heart of the intellectual environment of the Council of Trent, which asserted both the principle and the doctrine of

\(^{73}\)Jennifer Montagu discusses this issue in relation to sculpture, noting that restoration was three faced: straight, where the original fragment was set in a recreated whole; modernised, where the fragment was the basis for a new creation; and converted, where the fragment was the basis for a symbolically charged thematic transformation, especially that illustrating the passage from pagan to Christian. *Roman Baroque Sculpture. The Industry of Art*, New Haven/London, 1989, 151-55.


\(^{75}\)O'Malley, "Reform, Historical Consciousness", 593.

the Roman church to be absolute and perfect. Yet while the atemporal reality of institution and doctrine were inviolable, church practice, which is to say human morality, was ever declining; thus the task of reform was to restore practice and ensure the proper celebration of doctrine. Cesare Ripa would allegorise this concept as an old woman with pruning blade, "which clearly signifies reform, in that trees can be reformed when the limbs have grown too large by cutting away the superabundance, granting the trunk renewed vigour". So also reform divests religion of its rank overgrowth of historical practice, allowing its doctrinal and institutional body to spring forth new life.

The reform aims of the post-Tridentine church extended beyond doctrine to the substantial primacy of the city of Rome itself. This idea owed much to the vision of the city expressed by medieval guidebooks, such as the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, as a vessel of sacred sites, a sort of holy urban reliquary. Later, Renaissance humanists such as Flavio Biondo emphasised that the papacy had succeeded the Roman Empire, so that the world continued in its "sweet subjection" to Rome. *Roma caput mundi* was a commonplace that retained its potency, encapsulating the image of the imperial and sacred city, which combined the historic authority of pre-Christian Rome with the scriptural authority of Petrine succession (Matthew, 16: 15-19). In the later sixteenth century, partly in response to the Lutheran attacks on Rome as a modern Babylon, the idea of sacred Rome was reaffirmed more forcefully than ever before.

---

77 O'Malley, "Reform, Historical Consciousness", 581-3. Unsurprisingly, the Protestants shared the same rhetoric of reform. John Calvin claimed that all his efforts were no more than attempts "to restore the native purity from which they [the sacraments] had degenerated, and so enable them to resume their dignity." From *Reply to Sadoletto* (1540), in Hans Hillerbrand (ed.), *The Protestant Reformation*, New York, 1968, 160.


80 Paolo Brezzi, "Tra condanne ed esaltzioni. I giudizi sulla città di Roma nel Quattrocento e
Jubilee engraving [fig. 29], for example, depicts the city as a sort of paradisiacal field for pilgrims, filing in blissful serenity to and from the basilical grottos of the seven churches. Sixtus V's later Bull of 1586 (Egregia popoli romani) refers to the number seven as a synonym for the whole church, with the unity of the modern Roman seven church circuit taken as a symbol of the ideal unity of the early church. In short, Rome's sanctity was almost beyond words, being both the concrete exemplification of the heavenly city and the urban expression of the Church's identification with the mystical body of Christ.

Eternal Rome was intimately wedded to the everlasting church; but if the Roman Church was eternal, Urbs Roma itself was subject to decay. Rome the eternal city vested with diverse garments was a poetic topos, the civic soul reincarnated through history, the "Alma Città, cui'l sempiterno Dio/Allhor che vesti di fragil carne". Just as doctrine needed to be preserved by restoring practice, so essential Rome had to be conserved by tending to its manifest form. It was largely in these terms that the restoration of S. Sebastiano, a church central to the symbolic identity of Rome, was interpreted by contemporaries. A guidebook of 1616 described the restoration thus:

82Gamrath, Roma Sancta, 133-8.
83The image of civitas sancta in the later sixteenth century, with particular attention to Lelio Pellegrini's funeral oration for Sistus V, is explored by Frederick J. McGinness, Right Thinking and Sacred Oratory in Counter-Reformation Rome, Princeton, 1995, 167-73.
84From A Roma by Rinaldo Corso, the dedication poem to Onofrio Panvinio, Le sette chiese principali di Roma, Rome, 1570. In this Rome exemplified the general poetic, derived from Tasso, of rovina, the melancholy contemplation of fallen glories: Giacomo Jori, "Poesia lirica 'Marinista' e 'Antimarinista', tra classicismo e barocco. Gabriello Chiabrera", in Enrico Malato (ed.), La fine del cinquecento e il seicento, (Storia della letteratura italiana, vol. 5), Rome, 1997, 654-5. In Girolamo Preti's (1582-1626) sonnet "Ruine di Roma Antica" there are two Romes. One, the great city of history, the other a city of ruins and sparse earth, the city (in an ironic reversal) the degraded world now inhabits. "Roma in Roma non è. Vulcano e Marte/la grandezza di Roma a Roma han tolta, struggendo l'opre e di natura e d'arte./Voltò sopra il mondo, e'n polve è volta;/e tra queste ruine a terra isparte/in se stessa cadeo morta e sepolta": in Lucio Felici (ed.), Poesia italiana del seicento, Milan, 1978, 72.
today this church has been almost completely remade anew by the illustrious Cardinal Borghese, nephew of our lord Pope Paul V. As it [S. Sebastiano] was of great antiquity but in ruinous condition, he [Scipione] totally restored it with great expense...and he embellished the church with a beautiful tribune and high altar, where there are four columns of the finest value and marble ornaments of exquisite craftsmanship. He also made a very rich ceiling in the church, a new portico at the front, and increased the altars to seven.85

Although the church is here described as completely remade and totally restored, the terms are not interchangeable. The first phrase refers to the physical fabric of the church and to the agency of Cardinal Borghese, thus indicating that the church was substantially remodelled in a contemporary idiom. The second phrase, on the other hand, follows reference to the antiquity of S. Sebastiano and its previous ruin, thereby indicating that the church's symbolic identity, born in the past but neglected for years, had been reinstated in new and appropriately elegant form. The present had restored what time had taken from the antique structure, but its essential identity as an early Christian church remained. Indeed, this identity was now honoured and adorned with form appropriate to its sanctity. Succeeding guidebooks would characterise the restored S. Sebastiano in similar terms, adding a few lines to the pre-existing description of the church as reliquary to explain its present appearance - "renovated, embellished, and remade by

85"Questa chiesa hoggidi è quasi di nuovo rifatta tutta dall'illustissimo Cardinale Borghese, nipote di N. S. Papa Paolo V, perché essendo dall'antichità sua mal ridotta, l'ha totalmente restaurata con molta sua spesa...e ha ornata chiesa d'una bellissima tribuna con l'altare maggiore, dove sono messe quattro colonne di gran valor, con ornamenti di marmi di bellissimo lavoro, e ha fatta una soffitta molto ricca in detta chiesa, con un nuovo porticale avanti d'essa, e ha accresciuti li altari in detta chiesa al numero di sette": Le nuove et antiche meraviglie dell'Alma Città di Roma, Rome, 1616, 24, quoted in Orbaan, Documenti, 337.
Scipione in the beautiful form that is now seen”, as Matteo Greuter described it.⁸⁶ A visitor today might be struck by how little remains of the ancient church and how firmly its character seems rooted in the seventeenth century. Yet the contemporary pilgrim, seeing the church through a grid of categories forged by a centuries-old guidebook tradition, might well have viewed the changes that shaped its current appearance as a sort of marvellous addendum, the latest manifestation of a living and intrinsic sacred reality [fig. 30].

The gleaming new fabric might also have provided the contemporary visitor cause for reflection on the responsibilities of custodianship. Civic restoration was regarded by Roman prelates as an aspect of their pastoral duties. Giovanni Botero (1544-1617), in his Dell’uffitio del cardinale (1599), stressed that a cardinal’s main duty, after electing and advising the pope, was to promote the faith.⁸⁷ For this charge a cardinal had at his disposal the 'manual arts', those

three noble and intelligent arts [which] are necessary and useful for the ornamentation of the faith and for the internal well-being of the faithful. They are architecture, sculpture, and painting: without them churches and sacred places can neither be built as required nor ornamented. Architecture is the most useful....And because we all

---


⁸⁷Botero trained as a Jesuit (he left the order in 1581), and worked mainly in the ecclesiastical courts of Rome and Milan: Luigi Firpo, "Botero, Giovanni", DBI, Rome, 1971, vol. 13, 352-62.
delight in novelty and pleasing things, so it happens that in building new churches the old are ignored. [Yet] these old churches are the mothers of Christian piety, nurturers of devotion, masters of the rites, conservators of the bodies of saints, memorials of antique piety. Therefore it is more noble, pious, and worthy to mend an old church than to build a new one.88

It is likely that Botero echoed the Oratorian position in regard to restoration: in the Annales, for example, Baronio had suggested it was better to renovate old churches than to construct new ones, for restored churches are found wherever scripture is observed.89 Nevertheless, Botero went further, reminding cardinals that "it is not enough to build and adorn churches, for it is also necessary to honour and sanctify them".90 In short, for Botero a restoration was an act of affirmation, by and for the faithful, that both celebrated and promoted the ideology of the present.

'Ideology' is of course an anachronism, but I use it deliberately to indicate the way Botero viewed material piety within the broader context of actions and beliefs that constitute the body politic. In his influential treatise, Della ragione di stato (first published 1589), Botero discussed the concept of state in remarkably pragmatic terms. Like earlier writers, he limited himself to the notion of a ruler's dominion (the collection of subjects and goods), but he largely emptied the concept of legal justification, which had so

88...tre arti manuali, ma nobili, e piene d'ingegno, che sono necessarie, non chè gioevoli per l'ornamento della religione, e per l'intertenimento spirituale de i fedeli. Queste sono l'architettura, la scoltura, e la pittura: senza le quali le chiese e i luoghi sacri non si possono ne fabricare come conviene, ne ornare. L'architettura delle fabbriche sacre tanto sarà migliore...E perché comunemente noi siamo vaghi di novità, e di cose liete, ne aviene, che per fabricar chiese nuove, si trascurano le vecchie. Le quali chiese vecchie sono le madri della pietà Christiana, balìe della divotione, maestre de i riti, conservatrici di i corpi santi, testificatrici della pietà antica. Onde molto più pia opera si deve stimare il racconciar una chiesa antica, che il fabricare una nuova": Giovanni Botero, Dell'uffitio del Cardinale, Rome, 1599, bk. 1, 29-30 (emphasis added).
89Pisanello, "Il significato", 340, citing Baronio, Ann. VIII, 149-150.
90"Ma non basta fabricare, e adornar le chiese, bisogna anco honorarle, e sanctificarle", Botero, Dell'uffitio, 36.
exercised earlier writers such as Machiavelli. For Botero, the 'reason of state' encompassed little else other than the state's amplification and conservation. Amplification was a military matter, but conservation rested on the maintenance of internal peace. To this end the ruler's principal tools were justice, benevolence, religion, and lavish public works (grandezza). The last two were thought to have an especially pacifying effect, particularly when united to conventional piety, and the ruler should not hesitate in "using magnificence in building churches. And it is thought worthier for a Christian prince to restore antique churches than to erect new ones, because reparation will always be a work of piety, but building anew often gives rise to or harbours vanity." In a companion volume on the magnificence of cities, Botero demonstrated the value of monuments. Rome's pre-eminence among the cities of the world derived from its never-ending display, from the way its custodians assumed responsibility for her physical heritage, unceasingly striving to adorn, augment, and sanctify her urban elements.
Botero's casual evocation of magnificence is interesting and was almost certainly meant in a specific ethical sense. Aristotle, who himself took a remarkably instrumental position toward morality, had defined magnificence as a species of liberality (that is, of spending), consisting especially of "services paid to the gods - votive offerings, buildings and sacrifices...and all objects of public-spirited ambition". Magnificence was a well-established virtue of classical patronage, but like so much else disappeared from the patronal vocabulary in the Middle Ages, either forgotten or displaced by the rise of Christian ideals of humility. Moreover, its revival in the Renaissance had initially stood ill beside, not to say contradicted, popular Franciscan ideals of poverty.

By the seventeenth century, however, magnificence was a commonplace virtue of wealthy men, including rich prelates; one of Cardinal Borghese's own philosophers embellished Aristotle's recommendations in the following terms:

...[Magnificence] does not try to do the job in hand with the least expense possible, but rather it tries to create great and glorious works which move to wonder those who regard them. Magnificence can indeed be seen in those works that are done in honour of God and the adornment of cities...It is not a virtue of poor men, or of the middle-class, but of the rich and the great.

---

preclare appartenenti, parte al culto Divino, parte al maneggio civile, non vi spendesse gran parte dell'entrate della Chiesa?": Ibid., 366.


97"La magnificenza è una virtù nello spendere, come la liberalità, ma nelle spese affetta una certa grandezza, e non procura con la manco spesa, che si può, far quello, che ha alle mani, mà di far opere grandi, e gloriose, che movan, chi le vede, à meraviglia. Si vede veramente la magnificenza in quell'opra, che si fanno in honor di Dio, e in ornamento delle Città...Et non è virtù da huomini poveri, ò di mediocre stato, mà da ricchi, e da grandi." ASV FB IV 16, *Della filosofia morale d'Aristotele, da Panfilo Persico* (no date), 15r.
Some economic historians have read magnificence as a negative economic sign, citing Post-Tridentine Rome as a striking incidence of a shrinking economic base supporting a high level of conspicuous cultural spending (which would embrace magnificence).\textsuperscript{98} Certainly the economy of early seventeenth century Rome - with a moribund industry, creeping inflation, spiralling public debt, and a stagnant (in the 1630s a falling) taxable population - was a model of ill-health.\textsuperscript{99} Yet although there might have been few dynamic opportunities for capital, such an economically determinist equation begins from a faulty, or perhaps simply anachronistic, premise, for there is no evidence that conspicuous spending on buildings and art was ever conceived as an investment choice shaped by other profit-making alternatives.\textsuperscript{100} Moreover, magnificence had originally re-entered the cultural language of patronage as a virtue relevant not to economy but to government, the ethical rationale for the display of power.\textsuperscript{101} Display was

\textsuperscript{98} E. G. Hobsbawn, "The General Crisis", 42-3, included the excessive spending on building within the category of immobile investment. The survey article by Judith Brown points out that some economic historians, such as Robert Lopez and Harry Miskimin, regard the Renaissance itself as the beginning of the long depression, the necessary reverse of the most creative era of European history: "Prosperity or Hard Times in Renaissance Italy?", \textit{Renaissance Quarterly}, 42 (1989), 761-780. Peter Burke inverted the emphases, stressing how magnificence was a type of investment in itself, both in the building and craft sectors and in the general patrimony of the State: "Investment and Culture in three Seventeenth Century Cities: Rome, Amsterdam, Paris", \textit{Journal of European Economic History}, 7, 1978, 311-36. Elsewhere, however, Burke cautiously implies a link between magnificence and economic decline: "Conspicuous Consumption in Seventeenth Century Italy", in his \textit{The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy. Essays on Perception and Communication}, Cambridge, 1987, 132-149.

\textsuperscript{99} See above, ch. 1, n. 78.

\textsuperscript{100} Richard Goldthwaite avoids some of the pitfalls of the economic perspective by focusing on cultural spending as a function of demand rather than opportunity cost: \textit{Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300-1600}, Baltimore and London, 1993, passim.

central to Renaissance culture, particularly in relation to princely or absolutist government, for impressing an image of majesty was thought to be as effective as more conventional methods of coercion in sustaining obedience among subjects.\textsuperscript{102} This was an idea with a peculiar relevance to the ecclesiastical government of Rome, where magnificence could be interpreted as external devotion, so absorbing traditional censures against acquisition and ostentation. According to one sixteenth century papal apologist, magnificence was the best way to promote piety:

...where there is a rich display of sacred things, there is an observance of sacred things, where piety, religion, and sacred rites are performed with sacred pomp, the people, discerning these things, venerate and admire them...unless you have the ability to lavishly adorn and render churches and other sacred areas splendid, there will be no priests, and sacred places will be deserted and fall into rubble.\textsuperscript{103}

The agent of magnificence was of course the rich, powerful man. Indeed, with the revival of magnificence building had become a mark of hierarchical system's more mechanical imperatives regarding a ruler's duty to support those whose welfare depended upon his lavish spending and in the process maintaining his position by being the object of others' service and production: "The Patronage of Ercole I D'Este", \textit{The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies}, 6 (1976), 2-5. According to this reasoning magnificence is little more than an embroidering of the patronal model as a closed system of exchange, where wealth (payment) descends from donor (the patron) to client (the artist), and prestige ascends from client to donor. Such syllogistic symmetry, however, has only limited value, for it implies prestige is in the possession of the client just as wealth is in the possession of the donor. On the contrary, prestige is created in the process of the transaction, arising out of work or service being performed and accepted. That it can also be gained by the client by being involved in successful transactions is a subsidiary issue, relating to differentiation in the market.

\textsuperscript{102}Such an attitude would be definitively summed up during the reign of Louis XIV, whose magnificence, noted Jaques Bousset, was "not less necessary [than those of arms] to sustain majesty in the eyes of the people...[God] wished the courts of kings to shine with magnificence in order to impress upon the people a certain attitude of respect...": from \textit{Politics Derived from the Words of Holy Scripture} (1677-9), quoted in Robert Berger, \textit{A Royal Passion. Louis XIV as Patron of Architecture}, Cambridge, 1994, 184-5.

individual greatness, a virtuous deed of the active life that stood alongside
the more conventional Christian actions in encomia of great men. One
particularly striking legacy of this are the personalised inscriptions that
feature on almost every public monument built from the early sixteenth
century. Ultimately based on established practices in private chapels and
mausolea, inscriptorial style was well established by the end of the
Quattrocento. Here the figure of Alberti is crucial. While his study of
Roman monuments inspired him to incorporate the model of the
triumphal arch into the facade of S. Francesco in Rimini, it also lead him to
adopt the style of frieze inscription on the Pantheon (M[ARCUS] AGRIPPA
SIGISMUNDUS PANDULFUS MALATESTA PANDULFI F. V. FECIT
ANNO GRATAE MCCCCL. Alberti again followed the example of the
Pantheon when he designed the facade of S. Maria Novella [fig. 31],
maintaining the inscription (IOHANNES ORICELLARIUS PAU[LI] F[ILIUS]
AN[NO] SAL[UTIS] MCCCCLXX) in the frieze under the giant pediment,
despite the fact that the pediment was not the roof of a single storey portico
but the crowning element of a more conventional two storey screen facade.
Roman architects, who adopted the practice soon after Alberti, corrected the
incongruous placing of the inscription on the screen facade by lowering it
into the central position of the main frieze, thereby establishing the
convention that would last more than two centuries. Possibly the first
example of this type was Cardinal de Estouteville's inscription on the facade
of the church he built for the Agostinians in Rome [fig. 32] during his
protectorship of the order: GUILLERMVS DE ESTOVTEVILLA EPISC(IPUS)

104As far as I am aware, this was the first time since antiquity such an inscription had appeared on a church facade. Note also that Cosimo de Medici's palle were prominently placed in the courtyard of Badia of Fiesole (1450s): E. H. Gombrich, "The Early Medici as Patrons of Art", 40.
OSTIEN(SIENS) CAR(DINALIS) ROTHOMAGEN(SIS) S(ACRAE) R(OMANAE) E(CCLESIAE) CAMERARIVS FECIT M CCCCLXXXIII.105

The elaboration of clerical office in the above inscription was to prove especially influential for later Roman builders. Neither Sigismondo Malatesta nor Giovanni Rucellai were churchmen (in fact Malatesta was famously consigned to hell while still alive) but Roman prelates would soon exemplify the practice. By the later sixteenth century such inscriptions on church facades had become standard and had been accorded much more prominence, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese's dedication on the Gesù (1570) being the most notable example. Moreover, inscriptions were no longer confined to the frieze or some prominently placed tablet in the interior. At S. Susanna [fig. 33], an antique church restored by Cardinal Rusticucci (1589-1603), the Cardinal's name not only appears on the frieze inscription (whose wording is so arranged that RUSTICUCIUS wholly occupies the central projecting bay, just as FARNESIUS had done on the Gesù and, most famously, PAULUS V BURGHESIUS ROMANUS would do at St. Peter's) but also above the doors flanking the facade [fig. 34].106 Inside, HIERONIMUS CARD. RUSTICUCIUS is inscribed on the architraves of the side doors [fig. 35] and in the keystone of the proscenium arch [fig. 36].

Flaminio Ponzio succeeded Maderno as architect for the nuns of S. Susanna and it seems he adopted the elements of the church's patronal imagery when he went on to restore the church of S. Sebastiano for Cardinal Borghese. If anything, however, the patronal inscriptions are even more prolific in S. Sebastiano: on the front (SCIPIO CARDINALIS BURGHESIUS S[ANCTAE] R[OMANAE] E(CCLESIAE) MAIOR PENITENTIARIUS AN. DOM. MDCXII)107 and rear facades; above all the

105 Margherita Breccia Fratadocchi, S. Agostino in Roma. Arte, storia, documenti, Rome, 1979, 141-2. (Thanks to Fabio Barry for pointing out to me this inscription).
106 Hibbard, Carlo Maderno, 112-4, documents S. Susanna's restoration.
107 Scipione was made Grand Penitentiary on 9 January, 1610, following the death of Cinzio Aldobrandini: Urb Lat. 1078, 24v. The office was one of the four principal appointments in the
internal [figs. 18 and 37] and external doors; and at the base of the lantern in
the dome of the high altar chapel (S[ANCTUS] MARTYRI SEBASTIANO
SCIPIO CARD. BURGHESIUS A. D. MDCIX). The Borghese arms mounted
on escutcheons are likewise liberally distributed: on the front and rear
facades; above the main interior door, above the central side altars, and on
the keystone of the prosenium arch;\textsuperscript{108} on two of the central axis panels of
the ceiling; and all along the corridor to the reconstructed crypt. Moreover,
the dragon and eagle emblems of Borghese are actually interwoven with
the architectural detail. In part this followed the practice of private palaces,
but it also recalled certain ecclesiastical examples, such as S. Maria Novella
[fig. 31], whose frieze is defined by the Rucellai family sails. No church,
however, had ever been so thoroughly covered in patronal symbols. One
notes in particular the eagles incorporated into the stucco surrounds of the
clerestory windows, or the dragons in the 'ears' of the interior marble doors
and the portal to the \textit{facciatella}. But most striking are the eagles slyly curling
their wings into the otherwise typically turn-of-the-century festooned
voluttes of the rear facade's Ionic capitals [fig. 14]. (Here Ponzio anticipated
his colleague, Carlo Maderno, who would later (c. 1613) alter his initial
design for the Ionic capitals of the Porta Santa in the portico of St. Peter's to
include the Borghese dragons, much in the manner of Ponzio.\textsuperscript{109}) With
this incorporation of the patron's symbols into the architectural vocabulary,
rather than simply their application onto surfaces, display goes beyond

\textsuperscript{108}Antinori notes in particular that the two central side altars were dedicated to saints
recently canonized by Paul V, S. Francesca Romana (1608) and S. Carlo Borromeo (1610). The
Borghese arms above these two altars, along with the arms on the prosenium arch and the
internal facade, make cross axes, "\textit{che ordina e struttura l'ambiente, è ancorato visivamente
da ogni parte ai simboli della committenza Borghese, ulteriormente riproposti poi lungo la
diretrice centrale del soffitto}" (89).

\textsuperscript{109}Hibbard, \textit{Carlo Maderno}, 162 and pl 63a-d.
simple ascription, setting the trend for the century's increasingly emblematic (even metonymic) style of ornament.\textsuperscript{110}

The inscriptorial and emblematic prominence of Scipione in S. Sebastiano is remarkable, even by contemporary standards. It would certainly have been due to the express wishes of the Cardinal, an unmistakable indication of an unprecedented patronal presence. Despite the humility associated with the conventions of restoration, Scipione impressed on S. Sebastiano a stamp of magnificence, one fitting of a cardinal-nephew. The major inscription on the internal facade wall sets all this display into its proper sacred context:

\textbf{SCIPIO CARDINALIS BURGHESIUS  \\
MAIOR POENITENTIARIUS  \\
HUIUS ECCELESIAE  \\
COMMENDATARIUS  \\
PAULI V PONTIFICIS MAXIMI  \\
NEPOS  \\
INCLYTI MARTYRIS ECCLESIAEQ DEFENSORIS  \\
BASILICAM VETUSTATE COLLABENTAM  \\
RESTITUIT AUXIT ORNAVIT  \\
ANNO DOMINI MDCXII.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{110}Alberto White contends that the facade's Ionic capitals have a metaphorical, Michelangelesque quality, a willingness to contest the rule that looks forward to Borromini and Cortona: "Note sugli interventi di Flaminio Ponzio in S. Sebastiano fuori le mura", \textit{Opus. Quaderno di storia dell'architettura e restauro}, 2 (1990), 81-2. Antinori, 67, n. 91, notes the heraldic figures in the Onorio Longhi's volutes on the small entrance facade to the vigna Altemps, though it is worth pointing out this is a secular building. In fact the incorporation of family arms into the decoration of capitals first appeared on fifteenth century Florentine palaces (although the Medici balls are in the capitals of the church at Bosco ai Frati): Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 86.

\textsuperscript{111}Hibbard, \textit{Carlo Maderno}, 162 and pl 63a-d.

\textsuperscript{111}"Cardinal Scipione Borghese, Grand Penitentiary, commendator, nephew of Pope Paul V, restored, amplified, and ornamented the basilica of the celebrated martyr and defender of the Church, which was falling to ruin due to its age, in the year of our lord 1612."
Saving Rome’s collapsing churches had long been a praiseworthy activity associated with popes.\textsuperscript{112} Since the early sixteenth century it had also become a central part of the cardinalate ministry, one that Giovanni Botero would eventually elevate above almost all other duties of the office. In this respect Cardinal Borghese could be seen as a physician, tending the venerable but ruined old church back to life. In a poem celebrating Borghese’s art gallery, Scipione Francucci would write that the Cardinal himself had dressed the walls of the noble temple of S. Sebastiano in marble, decorated like gold.\textsuperscript{113} Inaccurate (the walls were plastered) poetic flattery, perhaps, but the agent of the restoration was the Cardinal and the hyperbole does at least evoke the spirit of magnificence that inspired the work. The doctrine of magnificence itself, however, implicitly harnessed personal splendour to a deeper social obligation, in this case the need to contribute to the glorification of the Christian city risen on the ruins of the old empire.\textsuperscript{114} In this sense, Borghese’s restoration of S. Sebastiano - in its beautiful modern form, in the unmistakable imagery of its patron, and through the web of values by which restoration itself was conceptualised - could be described as a work uniting disparate virtues; a work, that is, of magnificent piety.

\textsuperscript{112}In the fifteenth century, Vespasiano da Bisticci, for example, had praised Pope Nicholas V for his building (\textit{Le vite}, ed. A. Greco, Florence, 1970, vol. 1, 71), but barely mentioned architecture in his lives of various cardinals. See also John McMannamon, “The Ideal Renaissance Pope: Funeral Oratory from the Papal Court”, \textit{Archivium Historiae Pontificiae}, 14 (1976), 50.

\textsuperscript{113}“...a le mura al tetto/Vestir di marmi, et illustrar pur d’oro”: ASV FB IV 102, \textit{La Galleria del Cardinale Scipione Borghese...Scipione Francucci}, (1613), stanza 62.

\textsuperscript{114}If the idea of Rome in ruins was a poetic topos (above, n. 84), so was its counterpart, the making of a new Rome from the rubble of the old, one expressed by Francesco delle Valle’s sonnet \textit{Le nuove fabriche di Roma sotto Paolo V}. “Già cede il tempo e coronata sporge/ d’avrei tetti ogni monte al ciel la cima,/ ed a l’altera maestà di prima/ de le ruine sue Roma risorge./ Ogni machina antica a l’aure sorge,/ quant’in terra giacea s’erge e sublima,/ e ciò che de l’età ròse la lima,/ ristorato dal ferro omai si scorge./ Gli ampi spazi non copre inutil soma,/ ma l’adornan le fonti e inondan l’acque,/ e fatta sopra Roma è nova Roma/ Oh valor del gran Paolo! Ella, che giacque/ nel furor de’suoi figli estinta e doma,/ sott’un gran figlio in pace a l/ fin rinacue.” From Benedetto Croce (ed.), \textit{Lirici marinisti}, Bari, 1910, 44.
Afterword: Restoration as Property Management

On a purely administrative level, the restoration of S. Sebastiano had resulted from its commendatory conditions; when work drew to a close Cardinal Borghese retreated and the Cistercian brothers resumed responsibility for the abbey. The Cardinal was left free to collect his annuity, though he did have to pay for reparations to the church structure, the bell tower, and the altarpieces, as well as provide an annual sum of money for the candles, lamp oil, wine, and so on needed for Mass. No longer required to finance major work, Borghese became the commendator in absentis, consigning the monastery for a limited time (pro tempore) to his majordomo, Pietro Camporio. Camporio's jurisdiction covered the church and all the buildings around it but excluded its neighbouring gardens and vineyards. These last, income-generating, elements were leased to a certain Bartolino for five years. Bartolino's obligations included paying alms to the brothers of the church, consisting of the frutti of two trees and a thousand faggots. Bartolino also had to ensure the good maintenance of the vineyard, with regular propagation of suckers and new plants.

In fulfilling his commendatory duties by repairing the church, Cardinal Borghese had converted a run-down property into a going

115ASR Congregazione Religiose, Cistercenzi in S. Sebastiano fuori le mura, busta 1, n. 3, Memoria delle cose necessarie per i Padri di S. Bernardo per metterle a S. Bastiano (unfol.).
116Ibid., b.1 n. 1, Instrumento d'assegnatione del Mon(aste)ro fatta dall E.mo Signore Cardinale Borghese:... (Part of the instruction is published by Antinori, 222-3.) Borghese's account book of July 1616 records that Camporio (who would enter the sacred college in September of that year) had been replaced by Fabio Palemonio, as mastro di casa entrusted with the responsibility of collecting the 600 scudi per annum from S. Sebastiano: Reinhard, Papstefinanz, vol. 2, 353.
117Here the Instrument, after detailing the rent conditions, switches from Latin to Italian to explain Bartolino's obligations: "...In primus detto Bartolino promette e si obliga di detta vigna ogn'anno mettere venticinque opere di propagine a sue spese. Item promette parimente dare alli RR. Padri di detta chiesa di San Sebastiano per elmosina di frutti di due arbori ad eletzione del Signore Maestro di Casa dell'Illustrissimo Signore Cardinale Borghese, et anco un migliaro di fascine l'anno senza poter di mandare difalco alcuno del detto afitto. Item che sia obliga...come promette detta vigna, e canneti lavorarli...diligentemente e fare li lavori soliti e consueti a suoi tempi e piantare arbori da frutti nelli luoghi dove mancaranno i vecchi, et anco insitare tutti gl'arbori, che gli saranno ordinati dal Signore Maestri di Casa, et anco pianture, et allevare a sue spese piante nuove, che le saranno conseguate dal detto Signore Maestro di Casa parimente a tutte sue spese...".
Scipione spent more than 27,000 scudi at S. Sebastiano, which would seem to compare unfavourably with the 600 scudi per annum he received as a benefice. Yet this outlay must be seen in the context of what he received for his other commendations: in 1614 alone, for example, he earned more than 75,000 scudi in commendatorial annuities. This point is worth emphasising, for Scipione was not prepared to accept unconditionally a commendation if the cost of building-work was too high. In fact, he had earlier renounced his archbishopric of Bologna, assigned in October, 1610, for this very reason. As expected, Borghese had pledged his substantial benefice of 12,000 per annum to the Bolognese Fabrica of the cathedral of S. Pietro, as well as sending Carlo Maderno and Flaminio Ponzio to the city to make plans for the church's completion. When, however, it was reported to the Cardinal that the four year cost estimate had increased from 48,000 to 120,000 he promptly resigned his post. Borghese nevertheless managed to turn the incident to his own advantage, holding onto the frutti riservati from the bishopric and publicly announcing that the renunciation was due to his inability to observe the Tridentine policy regarding the residency of bishops.

A Roman commendation, however, was a different matter. Moreover, by ensuring the administration of S. Sebastiano (and S. Gregorio Magno) was by his own nominee, and letting out only the vineyard,
Cardinal Borghese made an exception to his normal method of managing his benefices. According to his account book of 1616, each of his other twenty-five commendations were let out on a more or less long-term basis. Santa Maria di Caramagna in Turin, for example, was granted on a nine-year lease to Fabritio Dentis for 1600 scudi per annum. Of this the Cardinal had to reserve fifty scudi a year for the upkeep of the church and 500 scudi for Cardinal Bevilaqua's pension, leaving a net income of 1050 scudi a year.\footnote{Reinhard, Papstfinanz, vol. 2, 346.}

This was standard practice; virtually any form of church property could be leased, usually to a local merchant for nine years. The lease may have been to raise a quick lump sum for its beneficiary, but normally it was simply the result of the beneficiary being unable to administer his benefice.\footnote{Cardinal Accolti, for example, was imprisoned for the bad治理 of Ancona in 1535 and could only pay his huge fine of 70,000 ducats by immediately leasing his monasteries S. Bartolomeo and S. Benedetto in Salerno, along with the entire archbishopric of Ravenna: Hallman, Italian Cardinals, 70.} "Benefice farming" was occasionally censured; in 1555, for example, Paul IV tried to outlaw rentals of church property for terms of more than three years.\footnote{Ibid., 78.}

The practice also highlighted the violation of canon law regarding pluralism, defined as the holding of incompatible benefices, something that the authors of the Consilium (1537) had condemned, but which was essentially left unchecked by the Council of Trent. The only exception was the censuring of multiple bishoprics, for the Council had insisted on residency, a requirement that, as noted, Cardinal Borghese had taken a year to observe.\footnote{Ibid., 78.}

The argument for pluralism was well versed: the concentration of wealth in the hands of leading Roman cardinals was the only way they could live in a style appropriate to their office and engage in the magnificent spending that would ornament the Church's civic heart.\footnote{Paolo Sarpi reported some of the more disingenuous arguments regarding residency at the Council of Trent (September-December, 1546) by Spanish and Roman-based bishops: Istoria del Concilio Tridentino, ed. C. Vivanti, Turin, 1974, vol. 1, 364-5.}
the Roman Church, Barbara Hallman concluded her brilliant study with masterful understatement: "The realities of the time, then, deflected the reform efforts of the cardinals away from material matters, and focussed them upon things spiritual: the delineation of correct doctrine and the repression of error, the education of priests and the propagation of correct doctrine, personal piety and charitable works, and the glorification of the true faith....Finally, to celebrate the Holy Mother Church, they patronized the construction and embellishment of the churches, and fountains that transformed the face of the eternal city in the years following the last sessions of the Council of Trent ". Italian Cardinals, 168.
Chapter 3
FROM PAPAL NEPHEW TO PRIVATE CARDINAL, 1618-27.

Between 1614 and 1618, Cardinal Borghese did not commission any ecclesiastical architecture. Thereafter, however, he maintained a continuous involvement in public building. These sixteen years of patronage can be unequally divided in two, the first period indicative of Borghese's changing status from *nepote* to private cardinal, the second coinciding with escalating ill-health and gradual retirement from public life. In terms of the first period, the restoration of S. Crisogono is the defining project: the installation of its ceiling initiates Borghese's return to building while its eventual comprehensive transformation over the next eleven years provides the most perfect record of the Cardinal's position in the Roman court. Because of the complexity of S. Crisogono's building history it will be best to consider it in its entirety. For this reason, I will first examine the more minor project of these transitional years, namely the Caffarelli chapel.

The Caffarelli Chapel

The redecoration of the Caffarelli chapel in S. Maria sopra Minerva [fig. 38], begun by at least the middle of 1620, is the least known of all Borghese's ecclesiastical commissions. 1 Although there are some archival and literary clues, it is unknown when the commission began. Nevertheless, it seems certain that the initial focus of the project was the wall monument [fig. 39] commemorating Scipione's father, Francesco Caffarelli (1542-1615). Centrally placed against the chapel's side wall, the memorial consists of a funerary inscription on black marble surrounded by a broken aedicule featuring the Caffarelli coat of arms.

1Below, II. 4.
Soon after the installation of the memorial, the chapel was graced with a new altar, a segmental pedimented structure supported on Corinthian columns. The altar shows a particularly elegant use of coloured marble, with the yellow columns contrasting with the green fascia surrounding the altar painting, and in fact was partly assembled out of antique columns the Cardinal had bought specially for the chapel. As a design the altar is of a conventional type, whose precedents include the Peretti Chapel in S. Susanna (Domenico Fontana, 1595) and which would continue to typify altar design through the 1620s. Nevertheless, the sharply broken pediment is a noteworthy feature and may have been designed in relation to the now filled-in lunette window above. This window was the chapel's original light source and the break in the pediment would have enabled light to leak down more directly to the altar underneath. The opening, however, was replaced by the windows in the side lunettes during the renovation of the chapel following its rededication to St. Louis Beltran in 1670. It is unclear exactly how much Cardinal Borghese's original decorative scheme was obscured by this later intervention. The present altarpiece by Baciccio, at least, dates from the 1670 renovation. The documents show that the altar originally supported a painting of the Virgin and Child with St. Dominic by the Cavalier d'Arpino, a long-term protégé of Scipione. D'Arpino also painted the two symmetrically arranged figures in the lunettes above. As these figures flank the original window it is possible that their composition was integrated with that of the altarpiece below, perhaps in terms of ascension or coronation. Unfortunately, the altarpiece is lost and known only from the record of its payments and a cursory description by Baglione, who notes the saint kneeling before the Virgin.

For our purposes, however, the very fact of the chapel's commission is significant. On the one hand it would seem unremarkable, for Scipione did no more than what might be expected of any son. Yet Scipione was no
longer his father's heir, having renounced his paternal name when he was raised to the sacred college by his maternal uncle, Paul V, in the process reassigning his estate from the Caffarelli to the Borghese. The pope's enrichment of Scipione would have been for little purpose if the wealth did not end in the hands of the Borghese family. Indeed a papal moto proprio of 1613 severed Scipione's legal ties to the Caffarelli, specifically freeing him from filial duties to his father (exemptio ex potestate paterna). In this respect it is notable that the Cardinal highlighted his status as the Borghese nepote in the chapel: first, in the funerary inscription, which lauds Francesco as the pope's brother-in-law, emphasising in bold letters his association with the Borghese (FRANCISCO CAFARELLO ROMANO HORTENSIAE BURGHSIAE PAULI PONT. MAX. SORORIS VIRO); second, on the altar-plinths, both of which bear Borghese arms surrounded by cardinal's cap. The chapel is testament to an unusual situation. A man's funerary chapel was always due to the endowment of the son or nearest male relative. As such, one expects it to be executed in the name of the deceased's family. Scipione, however, had become papal nephew from his mother's side, not the father's as was normally the case. Thus Francesco was forced to share space in the Caffarelli chapel with the family of his wife, Hortensia, a distinctive indication of the unique ability of the papacy to absorb the priority of the patrilineal bond.

Borghese's association with the papacy in fact ended while the chapel was being decorated, an event that lent a distinctly dramatic air to his other project at the time, the ceiling of S. Crisogono.

---

2Scipione did, however, inherit 517 scudi from Francesco: Reinhardt, 105 n. 96.  
3Reinhard, Papstfinanz, vol. 1, 26, citing ASV Sec. Brev. 597, 32.
The Ceiling of S. Crisogono

On 9 December, 1617, an avviso recorded a ceremony held in S. Maria in Trastevere to bless the new ceiling paid for by Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini [fig. 41]. In the twelfth century interior, an illustrious crowd saw one of the most brilliant soffits that had yet been installed in Rome's old churches, with an extraordinary system of star shaped coffering surrounding Domenichino's Assumption of the Virgin, painted as if one were really underneath (sotto in su) Mary rising to heaven [fig. 42]. Near the internal facade, an inscription records the Cardinal's dedication of the ceiling to the Virgin: DEI MATRI VIRGINIQ MARIAE IN CAELUM ASSUMPTAE PETRUS CARD. ALDOBRANDINUS S[ANCTAE] R[OMANAE] E[CCLESIAE] CAMER A. D. MDCXVII.5

As discussed in the previous chapter, by the early seventeenth century the heavily coffered timber ceiling was a standard addition to the open truss roof of earlier basilicas. Although it was generally installed for acoustic reasons, its expense had grown out of proportion to its function. That is to say, such ceilings had become one of the principal foci of a church's physical beauty, their burnished splendour a symbol of divine majesty. A ceiling also proved an ideal vehicle for the glory of the patron, its vast surface a virtual hoarding for his name and family coat of arms. Such was the case for Aldobrandini. As titular priest of the church, the Cardinal had not offered to pay for the ceiling but instead had made a conditional donation of 7000 scudi to be used for its construction.6 Setting the budget before the design

4"Giovedì in S. Maria in Trastevere si scoprì la soffitta nuova fatta fare dal Card. Aldobrandini con spesa di 17 000 scudi [sic.] et con solenne cerimonia vi fu benedetta l’immagine dell’Assunta che vi deve esser posta in mezzo al che intervenne il med(isimo)o Card.le Aldobrandini con li Card.li Delfino, Gernasio, et Saresio, et circa 40 prelati...": Urb. Lat. 1085, 484r.
5"The virgin Mary mother of god to heaven assumed. Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, Camerlengo of the Holy Roman Church, year of our lord, 1617."
6The pledge was drawn up by Aldobrandini's majordomo, and is interesting for its specification of cost and the disclaimer regarding unforseen difficulties. "L’intenzione nostra
highlights his patronage as a public gesture. 7000 scudi was a huge amount of money to work with (in comparison, the ceiling of S. Sebastiano had cost around 1700 scudi), allowing an uninhibited use of the most expensive material - gold. The extravagance carried a clear message. Aldobrandini, formerly cardinal-nephew to Clement VIII, had been an outsider to the Roman court since 1605. Shunted from power and shunned in official circles, soon after Paul V's election he had transferred to his archbishopric of Ravenna, only rarely returning to the city. Though for some time a persona non grata in Rome, Aldobrandini did manage to maintain his creatures in the college. The ceiling in S. Maria in Trastevere was thus a timely reminder of the incumbent camerlengo's still potent magnificence.

Aldobrandini's patronal re-emergence had a special relevance for Cardinal Borghese. As his successor as cardinal-nephew, Scipione was the focus of Aldobrandini's resentment regarding his family's usurpation in Rome. Such resentment was normal, as were college disputes in general.

Pietro and Scipione had early fought openly over a collection of books that Aldobrandini claimed had been given to him by Clement VIII, but which Borghese claimed were rightfully his as the incumbent cardinal-nephew: avvisi of the 17 and 18 December, 1605, reported in Pastor, vol. 25, 57. Domenico Cecchini (1588-1656) recorded in his autobiography the difficulties of Aldobrandini (and himself) when the Borghese came to power. "Era appena passato un anno del nuovo pontificato, quando il cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, secondo il solito della corte di Roma, cominciò a vedere, che il premio di haver tirato il cardinal Borghese [Camillo] al pontificato non consisteva in haver da esso delle gratie, ma più che ordinario del Papa per benemerito contro di lui concepito....che diffusasi [the Pope's ire] anco contro li partiali e seguaci della casa Aldobrandini, oprò, che cessati li favori e le gratie che da me e da mio fratello si solevano ricevere dal cardinal Borghese [Scipione], con segni più che apparenti di alienazione d'animo e mala volontà." BAV Barb. Lat. 4864, 7-8, quoted in Reinhard, Freunde und Kreaturen, 65. Cf. the Ferrara legate's letter to Borghese of 2 August, 1608, detailing Aldobrandini's mischief-making with the court of Savoy, ASV FB I 835, 31r-35r.

On 7 December, 1616, for example, Borghese wrote to Bentivoglio in Paris complaining that
The long-running rift between Scipione and Pietro, however, was unusually vigorous. It was also irresolvable, despite at least one attempt at reconciliation. Apart from smarting at the personal disrespect Pietro felt had been shown him by Scipione, he also suspected that the Borghese were using their influence with Rome’s taxation officers in an attempt to undermine financially the Aldobrandini family. That the animosity remained deep-seated as late as 1618 is indicated by Scipione’s encoded instructions of 27 May that year to his Spanish agent, Monsignor Stufa, regarding an impending meeting with the Duke of Alburquerque, soon to arrive in Rome as the new Spanish ambassador. Cardinal Borghese urged Stufa not to let the Duke be persuaded by the malignant environment of the Roman court or by the evil opinions that circulated about the city. In particular:

...it is necessary that he prepare himself not to believe the malicious suggestions that will be made to him on his arrival here, and especially those coming from Cardinal Aldobrandini and others, who are poorly disposed towards us; they have no reason for their ill will toward us other than their antagonism to this family, and always give disrespect to Our Lord so as to make life unpleasant for His Holiness. Your Lordship must also tell the Duke that Aldobrandino will try every means possible to win him over for himself, and have close contact with him....

the bad offices of Cardinals Orsini, Delfino, and Aldobrandini were affecting the attitude of the new French ambassador, Marquis Trinel: Steffani, La nunziatura, vol. 1, lett. 48, 59; Bentivoglio’s reply, 27 January, 1617, idem, lett. 49, 59-60; also Borghese to Bentivoglio, 11 February, 1617, idem, lett. 112, 137. Indeed, Borghese’s feud with Aldobrandini in these years was matched by the dispute with the Orsini: above, I.2 n. 71.

An avviso of 29 July, 1615, records that Cardinal Aldobrandini and his nephews met and made peace with Paul, Scipione, and Marcantonio Borghese: Urb. Lat. 1083, 394r. On 8 March, 1617, Borghese took the conciliatory step of attending the memorial service for Clement VIII held in the St. Peter’s Clementine chapel: Urb. Lat. 1085, 109r.

This suspicion was reported by Urban VIII’s biographer, Andrea Nicoletti, in the context of Scipione’s later clash by Ludovico Ludovisi: below, n. 34.

Below, III.2. An earlier letter of 15 September, 1616, sent by the Bishop of Vesto, an agent for the Cardinal in Madrid, was only partly encoded, with the decoding of the crucial words written by Borghese’s secretary above the symbols. Included was a section on the bad offices of Cardinal Aldobrandini, known simply as 303: ASV FB III 45b, 29r-31v. The Borghese/Aldobrandini feud came to an end with the next generation when in 1638
Borghese's sensitivity to Aldobrandini is remarkable, especially considering the outwardly settled nature of his own incumbency. By 1618 he had been fourteen years in office, his public career set on the course determined by his bi-annual trips with the pope to the Villa Mondragone, the varied demands of his ecclesiastical posts, and the occasional consistorial or diplomatic banquet. In marked contrast to his first six or seven years in the college, by this period the *avvisi* do not record him much at all, which suggests either that his profile had receded, or, less probably given the indefatigability of the Urbinate scribes, was so routine as to be no longer noteworthy. At this stage, Scipione was actually immersed in his duties as secretary of state, the work increasingly delicate due to Rome's position as neutral arbiter of the Catholic nations in the lead-in to the Thirty Years War.

As mentioned, in terms of his architectural patronage, Borghese had spent virtually nothing on public building for over four years. Instead, almost all of his immense income was deployed in the augmentation and consolidation of personal assets. Land was the main component of the Cardinal's estate and he made the majority of the large acquisitions in the hills south of Rome in the two years following the completion of S. Sebastiano. In addition, he spent huge sums on the continuation of building at his private palaces on the Quirinale (the *Giardino*) and the Pincio, the latter destined to house the Cardinal's unrivalled collection of ancient and modern art. From 1616, he also began extensions to the Villa Mondragone near Frascati, bought a few years before. In fact this period of

Marcantonio Borghese's son, Paolo, married Olympia Aldobrandini.

12 The final payments for S. Sebastiano continued for four years, amounting to just under 1400 scudi. His income (bolstered by a sale of some minor holdings in 1614) for the same period was close to 1 500 000 scudi: based on Reinhardt's figures, 55-63.

13 Above, I.2 n. 59.

14 Laura Marcucci, "Villa Mondragone a Frascati", Quaderni dell'istituto di storia dell'architettura, 27 (1982), 119. The villa replaced the *Giardino* in the Cardinal's enthusiasms, for he sold the latter to the Duke Altemps (the vendor of the Frascati villa) in May 1616. According to Antinori, 354-62, Borghese's sale of the *Giardino* was part of a
acquisition and domestic consolidation is a pivotal point in the structure of Borghese's cardinalate career: following the campaign of early Christian restoration and preceding the more wide-ranging activity of the Cardinal's post-nephew years, it gives his patronage an interesting asymmetry, one pivoting on a mid-career period of private expansion, 1614-18.

Yet Aldobrandini's gesture at his titular church in Trastevere was obviously noted by Borghese. Not to be outdone, just under five months after his predecessor's ceiling was unveiled, Scipione began payments in late April, 1618, for the fortification of the walls of his own titular church of S. Crisogono, in preparation to receive a new timber soffit in the nave and transept. Like the nearby S. Maria in Trastevere, S. Crisogono is an early twelfth century basilica with magnificent cosmatesque pavement, granite colonnades, and raised transept and apse. The new ceiling commissioned by Borghese was clearly intended to match the one just revealed in the Marian church [figs. 43-46]. Like the earlier ceiling, the amount of gold in S. Crisogono is striking. The cost was commensurate: more than 11,000 scudi in total, with almost 6000 scudi expended on the gilding alone. This was even more than Aldobrandini spent (although the ceiling in S. Maria is slightly smaller), a minor though significant fact given the origin of the commission in patronal rivalry. Indeed, Denis Mahon noted that Guercino's painting of S. Crisogono in Glory in the central panel of the ceiling was done sotto in su like Domenichino's Assumption of the Virgin, and he suggested that Guercino deliberately set himself in competition with Domenichino's earlier work. Perhaps, however, the competitiveness stemmed from the patron himself, for Borghese was fond of an artistic paragone - but he was also determined not to be outdone by his own competitor in Aldobrandini.

rationalisation of his assets after their rapid expansion over the preceding years.

15 The building chronology is outlined below II.3.

16 Denis Mahon, Studies in Seicento Art and Theory, London, 1947, 80-81; also, Ringbeck, 54, who notes the stylistic similarity of the ceilings and their paintings.
Although Borghese's original intention in S. Crisogono was limited to a new ceiling, its installation generated some additional work. In particular, the ceiling's great weight necessitated the buttressing of the clerestory and aisle walls, while its darkening effect on the interior resulted in the clerestory's refenestration, with larger squared openings replacing the original round-headed windows [figs. 47-48].¹⁷ Such strengthening and/or refenestrating of the clerestory was a typical by-product of inserting a massive timber ceiling in a medieval church. At S. Sebastiano, for example, the installation of the ceiling led to the insertion of large new rectangular windows, positioned to align with the interior articulation of bays [fig. 25]. In the restoration of S. Francesca Romana (1611-15), the raised aisle roofs function to buttress a clerestory now required to support the additional weight of a new ceiling [figs. 49-50].¹⁸ In fact, at S. Maria in Trastevere the new ceiling initially almost destroyed the clerestory, before its walls were rebuilt a few years later.¹⁹ Unfortunately, Aldobrandini's interventions in the clerestory were obliterated by a restoration in 1870, but an earlier view by Letarouilly (1857) shows proscenium arch and square-headed windows surrounded by heraldic stucco decoration, similar to the extant additions in S. Crisogono (before the marbling of the clerestory in the late nineteenth century) [figs. 51-52]. In short, a new timber soffit was rarely a discrete addition, but rather the crowning feature of a whole new upper region in the church.

Such was the case in S. Crisogono. When the ceiling was finally uncovered on 26 November, 1622, it would have been difficult to ignore the striking resemblance between S. Crisogono and S. Maria in Trastevere,

¹⁷Filippo De Rossi noted that Borghese commissioned "un bellissimo soffitto indorato, e essendo oscura [the interior of S. Crisogono], la fece comparire, aprendoci a i fianchi finestre con debita proportione": Ritratto di Roma Moderna, Rome, 1645, 75. See the misura e stima of 4 September, 1619 (ASV AB 4174), cited below, II.3.
¹⁸Above, ch. 2 n.63, for references to S. Francesca.
¹⁹An inscription (1620) in the sacristy notes Aldobrandini's intervention to restore the crumbling walls of the church.
particularly in the stark contrast between the lower level and the gleaming, patronally encrusted additions of the upper walls and ceiling. By this time, however, Borghese's comparison with Aldobrandini had lost much of its urgency, since Borghese had himself become a former cardinal-nephew. What had begun as a commission by a man secure at the top of society, reached its completion under the patronage of one struggling to maintain his balance in the shifting structure of the papal court. Significantly, it was in the wake of this turbulent period that the building work at S. Crisogono developed into a full-scale restoration.

The Disenfranchised Nephew

On 29 January, 1621, Paul V died in bed. The end had been some time coming. In September, Fulvio Testi had reported not only the pope's poor condition but also Scipione's preparation for the anticipated conclave, attempting to bolster his faction with some last minute promotions to the college. In this context, Borghese's unusual postscript the following month to the Spanish nuncio regarding the canonisation of Isidoro may have been an attempt to cultivate or confirm favour with the Spanish faction. The eventual conclave of 1621, however, was singularly unsuccessful for Scipione, with support for his nomination of Pietro Campori (Borghese's former majordomo) abandoned at the crucial moment by some of his closest allies.

After his initial elevation to the college, the death of Paul was the defining moment of Borghese's career. With his protector gone, Scipione

20 Avviso of 26 November, 1622, Urb. Lat. 1092, 422r, quoted in Ringbeck, 39 n. 21.
21 Avviso of 30 January, 1621, Urb. Lat. 1089, 87r-v. An avviso a week later noted Paul was given a week-long wake in St. Peter's, before being placed in a niche near the Cappella Gregoriana (idem, 102v).
22 Testi to Cesare D'Este, 30 September, 1620, in Testi, Lettere, 18. Borghese would also write to the nuncios in Madrid and Paris, urging them to return to Rome to grant him added support: Borghese to Bentivoglio, 26 January, 1621, Steffani, La nunziatura, vol. 4, n. 2633, 551-2.
23 Above, ch. 1 n. 24.
24 ASV Arch. Boncompagni-Ludovisi, 895, n. 7; also, Pastor, v. 27, 30-40.
would have to face life as just another cardinal, divested of the privileges and authority that accompanied the position of cardinal-nephew. Sixteen years was a long time in office, but there is little sense that Borghese was relieved to be free of its onerous duties. The public record on the transference of power is typically inscrutable: his letters, for example, to various heads of state immediately after Paul's death were no more than formulaic notes of gratitude for past support and requests for future goodwill. Even after the distrastrous conclave, Borghese's behaviour was impeccable, gracious in defeat and diligent in his felicitations. The obsequious phrasing (even by contemporary epistolary standards) of Borghese's post-election letter of congratulation to the new pope's sister-in-law, the Countessa Lavinia Ludovisi, is graphic indication of how quickly his status in the Roman court had changed:

I could barely desire anything more suited to my happiness than the prospect of dedicating my service to you, this now being the case following the assumption to the Pontificate of Our Lord, His Holiness Gregory XV, which occurred yesterday evening with great rejoicing on my part. And there is nothing I could have done that would have pleased me more, or cheered me so thoroughly, than to represent to you this happy event. I hope that the position of my letter is greeted by you with immediate affection, [and I assure you] that I will always maintain my efforts to serve you. I pray, meanwhile, that you begin to instruct me, for you have total authority over me and my possessions; when you please yourself to do this, I will esteem myself singularly favoured....

---

25 Reinhardt, 136.
26 On 5 February, 1621, to the Grand Duke and Duchess of Tuscany (ASV FB II 422, 488r-v and 490r); 10 February, 1621, to the King of Spain (idem, 492v); and on 13 February, 1621, to the Duke of Parma (idem, 495r) and the Duke of Modena (idem, 496r).
27 "Per venire a dedicarmi servire a V.a non haurei potuto desiderar soggetto alcuno di mia maggior contentezza, che questo dell'assuntione della S. tà di N. S.re Papa Gregorio decimoquinto al Pontificato, seguita hiersera, con giubileo mio tanto grande, che non ho potuto contenermi di rappresentarne, come fa vivamente quella parte, ch'io posso a V(ostr)a e rallegrarmi efficacissim(ente) con lei di questo felicissimo avvenimento. Voglio sperar, che l'ufficio di questa mia lettera, sia per esser aggradito da V(ostr)a, insieme con l'affettuosa prontezza, che per ogni tempo conserverò di servirla; pregandola intanto a voler dar principio
Yet Scipione's benignity concealed a delicate position. With state protection gone, he actually feared for the safety of his property and during the conclave he hired soldiers to circle the Villa Mondragone.\textsuperscript{28} (The vacant see was a dangerous time for papal relatives, when a carnival-like anarchy combined with a release of popular frustrations with the previous administration. Scipione's travails, however, would seem nothing compared to those of the Barberini nephews: Cardinal Antonio the younger, for example had to flee Rome in the dead of night disguised as a barrel-maker.\textsuperscript{29}) After the election Scipione retreated to the Frascati villa; his claimed ill-health might well have been mixed with a certain abashment.\textsuperscript{30} Thereafter, he endured something of a backlash, his enemies finally granted the opportunity to openly vent years of accumulated resentment. Cardinal Orsini, for example, a long-term antagonist despite his sister's marriage to Marcantonio Borghese, noted that the "whole world was weary of the amiable but empty promises of the pope's nephew''.\textsuperscript{31} Writing during the Ludovisi pontificate, the caustic and dismissive view of the Venetian ambassador, Renier Zeno, has subsequently been favoured by some historians over other milder assessments: "Borghese...is not held in that high repute that usually follows

\textsuperscript{28} F. Grossi-Gondi, \textit{La Villa dei Quintili}, 111. Scipione took the same measures during the conclave of 1623.

\textsuperscript{29} See the contemporary account of Barberini's escape, \textit{La mal consigliata fuga del Cardinal Antonio Barberini Fuga}, widely circulated after 1645. (Thanks to Karin Wolfe, who refers to a copy preserved in BAV Barb. Lat. 5393; see also, Laurie Nussdorfer, "The Vacant See: Ritual and Protest in Early Modern Rome", \textit{Sixteenth Century Journal}, 28 (1987), 173-190.)

\textsuperscript{30} See the copy of a letter to an unnamed colleague of 9 June, 1621, ASR, Miscellanea Famiglie XX, Borghese (Caffarelli), b. 190, 70.

\textsuperscript{31} BAV Barb. Lat. 4676, 2, quoted in Pastor, vol. 26, 375.
the cardinal-nephews of popes that have lived for any length of time. This results as much from his lack of spirit as from the still recent memory that the court derived little profit from his government, and did not find him liberal except with a few of his closest associates".32

Life under the Ludovisi was not easy for Borghese. Contemporary reports have him quiet, timidly deporting himself in acknowledgment of Rome's new masters.33 In many ways his relationship with the new cardinal-nephew, Ludovico, echoed the situation between himself and Cardinal Aldobrandini years before. Indeed Scipione may even have been repaying old debts incurred with the Aldobrandini, who had united themselves to the Ludovisi through the marriage of Giorgio Aldobrandini and Ippolita Ludovisi and by the promotion to the sacred college of Ippolito Aldobrandini. The Aldobrandini were still furious over Scipione's ill-treatment to Pietro (who had died on the night of Gregory XV's election), as well as for the perception that the Borghese had intended to ruin their family.34 Maffeo Barberini's biographer records how in the midst of Gregory's pontificate the previous Roman tax officer, Pier Marino Scirocco, whose office had been so unforgiving to the Aldobrandini, was arrested and

32See below, III.1.3. Those citing Zeno include Haskell, Patrons and Painters, 27; the influence of the negative assessment is noted by Antinori, 25 n. 76, who suggests Zeno's view was clouded by an ethical distaste for hedonism.

33 Cardinal Mellino's biographer recorded how at one stage a group of disgruntled cardinals met in secrecy at Scipione's palace to discuss the difficulties of the incumbent administration: Decio Memmoli, Vita dell'eminentissimo Signor Cardinale Giovanni Garzia Meliino Romano, Rome, 1644, 41.

34 The entire incident is explored by D'Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma, 286-300, who quotes at length the account of Andrea Nicoletti, "Vita di Urbano VIII", BAV Barb. Lat., 546ff. In the light of the animosity and the significance of Aldobrandini's promotion, note Ludovisi's cruelly ironic acknowledgement of a coach gifted by Borghese: "Il cocchio nobilissimo che V. S. III.ma si è degnata di farmi presentare stà mattina, direi che fosse un eccesso della benignità sua, se io non la riconoscessi come infinità per tante altre dimontrationi fattoni. Il renderne grata a V. S. III.ma sarebbe un'atto, che non havrebbe mai termine quando mi volessi consentire delle sole parole: ma io aspetterò del continuo non meno l'opportunità che'l modo di servirla in fatti, e la supplicherò perciò a volersi del continuo non meno l'opportunity che'l modo di servirla in fatti, e la supplicherò perciò a volersi dell'humillisma mia servitù. E massima(men)te ch'io opero starà anche più atta a farlo nell avvenire. Poiché N. S. h à deliberato nel concist(ero) di dimattina di promovere del Cardinalato Monsre l'Arcivo di Capoa, Mons.re Datario, Mons.re Boncompagni, et il Hippolito Aldobrandini, i quali per cortesia loro so che saranno tutti uniti meco nel servire V. Ill.ma...18 April, 1622." ASV FB I 961, 14r.
sentence to a public whipping and ten years gaol in Civitavecchia. The flogging of a former public servant would have been humiliation for Borghese and it was only after a last-minute plea by his majordomo (and, according to D'Onofrio, the donation to Ludovico of Bernini's recently finished *Pluto and Proserpina*) that Scirocco was spared the lash. Yet he was still imprisoned, and his lengthy procession through the city streets to gaol was so humiliating that, as was remarked in an *avviso*, he might just as well have been flogged.

Ludovico also attempted to excell Scipione in artistic patronage. Just as the ceilings of the two churches in Trastevere had expressed the competition between the then cardinal-nephew and his predecessor, so Cardinal Ludovisi would express his own rivalry with Borghese by having Guercino paint the *Aurora* on the ceiling of his casino. This duplicated Borghese's commission seven years before to Guido Reni to paint the same subject on the ceiling of the casino in his *Giardino*. At times it must have appeared that Ludovisi was shadowing Borghese, establishing as he did a villa near the Porta Pinciana, acquiring from the Borghese the Villa Gallio in Frascati, and wooing Borghese's Bolognese ally, Cardinal Luigi Capponi, with the archbishopric of Ravenna (following Aldobrandini's death). Apart from

---

35 D'Onofrio, *Roma vista da Roma*, 296. Ludovisi clearly had a taste for irony. Nicoletti records the actual crime of Scirocco as "nel lasciar l'ufficio di fiscale non havea consegnato a l successore un certo processo compilato sopra alcuni libelli, ò pasquinate fatte contro Papa Paulo"! (idem).

36 Ibid, 300. D'Onofrio, 277-8, explores Bernini's sculpture for Scipione in these years in the light of Paul's death, arguing that the small bust of the Pontiff was made posthumously (not in 1618 as previously thought) for Scipione as a memorandum. Similarly, Matthias Winner suggests the cropped laurel tree at the back of the *Pluto and Proserpina* may relate to a theme of renewal, alluding to Scipione's own mourning at the loss of Paul V: "Bernini the Sculptor and the Classical Heritage in Early Years: Praxiteles', Bernini's, and Lanfranco's *Pluto and Proserpina*, Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte, 22 (1985), 196-7. Angela Negro also notes that the theme of life's impermanence in the same sculptor's *Apollo and Daphne* may have had a bitter moral, given Scipione's declining fortunes under the Ludovisi: *Il giardino dipinto*, 115.


38 Pastor, vol. 27, 57-59. Carolyn Harwood Wood describes the acquisition on the Pincio as part of the campaign to establish Ludovisi primacy in Rome: "The Indian Summer of Bolognese Painting: Gregory XV (1621-23) and Ludovisi Art Patronage in Rome", PhD Diss., University
their antagonism, the two were contrasting personalities: Borghese had the charm of a hedonist and the exuberant caution of a bureaucrat; Ludovisi, on the other hand, was noted for his ardour and youthful enthusiasm for work. In one anonymous profile of the sacred college, c. 1623, the two were cast as model opposites. Although created equal,

Ludovisi is quicker than Borghese in gaining honours, while Borghese is more intemperate in the sense of his greediness. They are equal in the desire to acquire and to possess, but Ludovisi is driven by ambition, Borghese by stupidity; Ludovisi professes a certain learnedness, Borghese affects an excessive courtliness. Borghese is more timorous of public odium, while Ludovisi is untouched by love. The one is too facile, the other too severe.39

Without his uncle, Scipione had become a disenfranchised nephew - once the pope's first minister, now an almost powerless object of derision. This was a figure common enough to have been lampooned by Traiano Boccalini (1556-1613), the pre-eminent political satirist of the early seicento. In the second volume (1613) of the Ragguali di Parnasso, Boccalini introduces the nephew of the Prince of Laconia, who finds things are to take a turn for the worse following the death of his uncle, because "for those who have tasted the sweetness of rule the division from it is worse than the separation of the soul from the body".40 Out of pity for the nephew, Apollo

39"Più rapido Ludovisio dalla dolcezza della lode, più intemperante Borghese nel senso delle sue cupidità. Pari il desiderio dell’acquistare, e dell’havere, mà nell’uno per ambizione, e nell’altro per imbecilità, nell’uno professione di sapienza, nell’altro ostentazione di cortesia. Più timoroso Borghese dell’odio publico, e Ludovisi più incurioso dell’amore, nell’uno natura più facile, nell’altro più severa...": ASV Archivio Boncompagni-Ludovisi, 895, n. 6, unfol. A few years later Fulvio Testi compared the two former nephews in similar terms, "Ludovisi è meglio fornito d’amici, Borghese di danari; l’uno si fonda sul cervello e l’altro su la borsa": Testi to Cesare D’Este, 9 October, 1627, Lettere, 116.

40"...perciò che il divider da un uomo, che per qualche tempo abbia gustata la dolcezza del regnare, la dominazione, cosa molto più è spaventevole che la separazion dell’anima dal corpo": Traiano Boccalini, Ragguali di Parnasso, ed. Giuseppe Rua, Bari, 1912, vol. 2, LIX, 212.
estimates the Society of Consolation to advise him of the joys of private life. The nephew, however, is inconsolable and driven to tantrums. The tale concludes with the moral that while powerful a man may seem to possess the wisdom of Solomon, but "returning to the dreariness of private life often shows to the world that he does not have the brains of a goose". Apollo later suggests to the nephew that if he wishes to maintain his reputation in Laconia he could do no better than look to the example of Odoardo Farnese, who won over Rome's nobility by being liberal towards absolutely everyone.. Good advice, but a little expensive, and the nephew wonders if he might feign the extravagance. His attitude mortifies Apollo - honour could not be granted to one who tied the purse strings tight.

Boccalini's parodies were grounded in life, targeting not only the disenfranchised nephew but also the entire genre of advisory treatises customarily given to nepoti following the death of the pope. Indeed Scipione himself was offered such advice. The anonymous counsellor
warned Borghese that his term in office would have seen him acquire many enemies and that the utmost delicacy would be required to negotiate the difficult paths ahead. The Cardinal should tone down his personal style, for grandiloquence appears arrogant when not based on genuine authority. He definitely should not, however, desist from patronage, for cultivating a generous and pious image can shore up against criticism by one’s enemies. Scipione had enough income to maintain himself, and should therefore give some of the excess as alms, which, apart from reasons of piety, would quell whisperings regarding his emoluments. The Cardinal should remember that God granted him riches in the first place so that he might exercise liberality. In short, spending money on others rather than oneself was a good way to deflect hostility.44

All apposite advice, for the Cardinal’s public spending increased markedly in the second half of his career, precisely after his fall from political office. Scipione’s average alms expenditure, for example, increased almost fifteen-fold after Paul’s death, jumping from 495 scudi per annum for the period 1606 to 1620, to 7419 scudi for the years 1621-33.45 His architectural patronage would eventually become more concentrated on ecclesiastical projects. While in the first half of his career Scipione’s church building was strictly associated with his commendatorial or titular duties, in the latter period his public patronage was more wide ranging and less firmly

44Dell’entrate ecclesiastiche et altre che V. S. Ill. ma possiede poiché l’Iddio le n’ha proceduto cosi largamente et tante che con splendore può sostenere il suo sublime grado, et anco la casa e distribuire larghe elemosine al che l’essorto perché in questo modo sodisfarà alla sua conscienza e potrà guadagnarsi il cielo, e prohibà et annullarà le voci et mormorij che li suoi emoli e poco ben affetti gli levassero confio calunni ando altre sue attioni delli quali non mostrerà difare molto conto anzi non ne fare nullo per non dare reputazione alla materia et ne respondete stulto stultitiam eius le quali voci ancò svaniranno per le stesse se non si darà occasione di nuovi alimenti, oltre che li mostrerà animo grande che non cura et non degnà di mirare bassezze et si scoprirebbe anco la vanità del fatto. Lodarei anco che si contentasse a favorire alcuna di queste religioni et erigere le chiese e monasterij perché oltre la celebrità del nome e fama quasi immortale farà spaurie (?) l’inclinatine sua verso la chiesa et religione Catholica essere sublime e grande, non sconandosi in tanto anco di sovvenire li poveri et li religiosi che hanno bisogno, perché l’Iddio gli’ha dato tanto che può supplire all’uno et all’altro.” BAV Vat. Lat. 12175, 117r-v.
45From Reinhardt’s balance sheets, 40-95.
administrative. Indeed by the end of his career the conventionally overt piety of his building may have expressed a genuinely interior penitence. Nevertheless, the turning point was the chastening experience of being a former cardinal-nephew. At the end of the fifteenth century Girolamo Savonarola had condemned the patron who insincerely "seeks to appear religious...but who is concerned only with external appearances, such as church-going, alms-giving, building churches and chapels [etc.]...". Savonarola had in mind the tyrant, whose ostentation was ultimately a display of power. But with the ex-nepote such ostentatious piety was more a matter of self-preservation, or rather the curious form of social contrition that follows a loss of power.

Scipio Redux: The Renovation of S. Crisogono

Scipione's fall from grace lasted just over two years. Gigli reports that when the Ludovisi pontificate came to an unexpectedly early end with the death of Gregory XV on 8 July, 1623, Borghese resumed his old pomp, beginning again "to go happily around Rome, passing through the city in splendid coaches, dealing with his creatures and adherents, which he had not done since Paul his uncle had died." The Barberini were old allies of the Borghese and their new administration seemed willing, if not to employ him in some useful role, then at least to acknowledge his status within the court. Soon after the election of Urban VIII on 6 August, Borghese was granted a private audience and received with much love; a few days later Scipione invited Francesco, the new cardinal-nephew, to witness a hunt at

---

47"finalmente essendo morto Gregorio, quasi che fosse risorto, cominciò andare attorno allegreissimamente, et passeggiando per la Città in cocchi pomposi, il che non haveva più fatto da che morse Paolo suo Zio, andava trattando con le sue creature et adherenti quello, che più a proposito et expediente riputava per se stesso." Gigli, Diario Romano, 76. Cardinal Cecchini noted that the conclave of 1623 was riven by the feud between Borghese and Ludovisi: BAV Barb. Lat. 4864, 72.
his villa on the Pincio. Conversely, while Scipione returned to society he was replaced as an outcast by Cardinal Ludovisi.

It was in this favoured period following the death of the Ludovisi pope that the now resurgent Cardinal Borghese seems to have upgraded work in S. Crisogono to a full-scale restoration. Such a staged chronology is contrary to earlier interpretations, which describe the restoration of S. Crisogono as the uninterrupted execution of a commission begun in 1618. Nevertheless, such a reading can be partly inferred from the building documents, which suggest a clear gap in the stages of construction. The first *misura e stima*, covering the long period from 23 April, 1618, to 26 January, 1623, is concerned almost solely with work relating to the ceiling, as described above. It is only with the second document, an account for stonemasonry dated 8 August, 1623, that work moves to the lower part of the church. Moreover, the first document contains one minor item for stucco decoration on the cornice of the old facade *(fora d(i) d(ett)a chiesa...per l'abbozzatura e stucc(atu)ra del cornicione attorno le facciate)*, an item that would be redundant if the facade that was eventually built as part of the

---

48 *Avvisi* of 27 September and 1 October, 1623, Urb. Lat. 1093, 743r and 820r. Borghese’s earlier intention to invite Urban to the Villa Mondragone (677v-678r) was prevented by his ill-health.

49 Wood, “The Indian Summer”, 241-2. An *avviso* of 21 February, 1624, reports Ludovisi as finally being reconciled with Borghese and other members of the sacred college: Urb. Lat. 1094, 110r. The following year, however, the two were quarrelling again, this time over a farmhouse: Testi, *Lettere*, 87.

50 While not being very specific, Reinhardt, 165-6, at least suggests that the restoration of S. Crisogono signals Scipione’s changing fortunes. Salimbeni argues the restoration was motivated primarily by a desire to exemplify the Cardinal’s munificence and to reform the image “in senso più aderente al clima culturale del momento”: “Giovanni Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese”, 400. Although Ringbeck, 39-42, securely establishes the sequence of *misure e stime*, she is mainly concerned with architectural issues and largely ignores the significance of the stages of construction in relation to the patron. As regards motivation, Ringbeck (idem, 60-1) connects the general Counter Reformation enthusiasm for early Christianity with Reinhardt’s suggestion, cited above. Michele Cigola, “La Basilica di San Crisogono in Roma”, 7-49, does not speculate on the issue. It should be pointed out that the addition of the cloister and oratory (since demolished) sprung from the tail-end of the restoration; they should not be regarded in connection with the recommencement of work in 1623.

51 Document published in Ringbeck, 154-56; below, II.3, for details regarding the weight of payments during the years 1618-23.

52 Ibid., 156-7.
restoration had been planned from the beginning.\textsuperscript{53} Incongruités, however, of surviving \textit{misure e stime} would not of themselves yield up a scheme of construction without the crucial circumstantial evidence supplied by Borghese's changing fortunes. As argued, the Cardinal's original intention in modifying the roof of S. Crisogono was primarily to re-affirm his pre-eminence over Cardinal Aldobrandini. By 1623, however, the extension of work in the church carried the deeper significance of Borghese's fall and rise within the Roman court.

Certainly what was eventually done to the church suggests the restoration should be primarily interpreted in symbolic terms. Unlike any other restoration of this scale the alterations to S. Crisogono were almost entirely decorative, with no significant structural corrections apart from the buttressing of the clerestory. In fact, at least inside, it appears at first glance that most of the original twelfth century basilica was left intact, with cosmatesque pavement, colonnaded nave and aisles, raised transept, and semi-circular apse all retaining their original disposition. Some of the features were simply repositioned: the Latin inscriptions and the exquisite cosmatesque tabernacle, for example, were moved to either side of the new sacristy door, as if the church were a room to be redecorated. Close inspection, however, reveals that the restoration has completely changed the character of S. Crisogono, insinuating its modifications throughout the church's medieval fabric.

The major changes were organised along the central axis and emphasised the specifically classical nature of the twelfth-century basilical design, itself a revival of late antique models.\textsuperscript{54} At the head of the church antique motifs were stuccoed on the proscenium arch and the apse [figs. 53-54], the latter also featuring panels depicting scenes from the life of S.

\textsuperscript{53}Idem.

\textsuperscript{54}Krautheimer, \textit{Profile of a City}, 168-70.
Crisogono. In the nave, the original marble Ionic capitals of the granite columns were encased in plaster [fig. 55], the new mouldings 'improving' the twelfth-century versions through the addition of festoons and cherubs' heads. Above, the nave entablature was granted a classical profile, the stucco acanthus vine in the frieze recalling late antique acanthus mosaic in churches such as S. Maria Maggiore. The decoration is underscored by the colour scheme of gold highlights against a cream background, so that it seems to frame the central hall, rather like the heavy gold frames indoratori were fitting around the Cardinal's ever expanding collection of old master paintings. In this sense S. Crisogono was re-presented, its classical 'essence' distilled from its medieval brew and itself suspended within the decorative armature of the restoration.

The most conspicuous new element and the focus of the whole interior is the domed ciborium over the high altar [fig. 56]. The appearance of the original ciborium is unknown, but it was probably similar to other extant twelfth century ciboria, such as those in S. Lorenzo fuori le mura, S. Clemente, or S. Maria in Cosmedin. It would be interesting to learn if there were reasons for the replacement of the medieval ciborium other than its incongruity in view of the overall classicising programme. Whatever the condition the original structure, the classical form of the new ciborium specifically alludes to early Christian models; or rather, recent reconstructions, such as that done under the direction of Baronio in SS. Nereo ed Achilleo [fig. 23], or the four column domed model built by Sixtus IV (demolished 1594) over the Gregorian crypt of the apostle in St. Peter's. Ringbeck points out that the ribbed and leafed dome supported on four arches in S. Crisogono adopted the elements of the ciboria both existing and currently being designed in the apse of the new St. Peter's. As a celebratory

---

56Ringbeck, 56-8. In particular, Francois Derand's sketch (c.1613-16) of Maderno's ciborium (1606) in St. Peter's: Hibbard, Carlo Maderno, 166 (note also Maderno's domed ciborium of
new focus for the church, the ciborium also refers to the sort of ephemeral baldachins normally associated with catafalques. In particular, the spandrel putti and flaming urns at the base of the dome were typical of more temporary structures; their ossification into permanent architectural forms is telling of the ceremonial underpinning of the period's artistic expression.57

The antique theme is especially prominent in the articulation of the vaulted portico on the facade [figs. 57 and 59]. The original portico was a lean-to structure supported on four Ionic pink granite columns [fig. 58]. These columns were reused in the new portico, where they were converted to the Tuscan order and incorporated as the centre supports of a massive travertine entablature. Despite the portico's solemn and classical bearing, it nevertheless maintains the disposition of the original facade. As discussed above in relation to the facade of S. Sebastiano, porticos of early seventeenth century restorations were normally designed as narthexes within a two storey facade structure, a practice that sharply distinguished them from their medieval antecedents. Single storey porticos were rare. The only recent precedent for S. Crisogono was the portico built c. 1513 in front of the medieval S. Maria in Domnica. It therefore seems likely that the addition at S. Crisogono was deliberately designed in sympathy with the original structure.58 Yet this is not a precocious example of historicism, for what is striking is the way in which the portico's characteristic medieval form was reabsorbed into the vocabulary of contemporary classicism.59 As with the

---

1614 over the high altar in S. Agnese fuori le mura). Irving Lavin provides a checklist of projects for the ciboria in the apse and over the tomb of St. Peter's between 1605 and 1623: Bernini and The Crossing of St. Peter's, New York, 1968, 40-44.

57Compare, for example, the catafalque designed by Ludovico Cigoli for the funeral of Ferdinand I of Tuscany, held in 1609 in S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini: Caradini and Fagiolo Dell'Arco, L'effimero barocco, vol. 1, 25-8; also Fagiolo's essay in the same publication, 'Dall'effimero alla struttura stabile, ovvero lo sperimentalismo', vol. 2, 85-91.


59Salimbeni observed that the emphasis of the church's romanità should be associated with Borghese's self-image: "Giovan Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese", 401.
interior, it is as if the medieval church was re-cast according a seventeenth century vision of a late antique (early Christian) basilica, a model, ironically enough, that had itself informed the classicism of the original twelfth century builders.

Atop the portico's parapet one notes the protective presence of eagle and dragon, standing guard above the facade dedication, SCIPIO S. R. E. PRESB. CARD. BURGHERSUS M. POENITEN. A. D. MDCXXVI; within the narthex, SCIPIO CARD. BURGHERSUS is written above each of the three entrances [fig. 60]. Inside, references to the Cardinal are no less prominent, with his arms in the major panels of the ceiling's long axis, mounted not discreetly on eschutcheons, as normal, but freed directly into the frame [fig. 45]. SCIPIO CARD. BURGHERSUS forms the keystone of the proscenium arch at the end of the nave; underneath, an inscription at the base of the baldachin dome reads, SCIPIO S. R. E. PRESBYTER CARDINALIS BURGHERSUS PAULI V NEP[OS] M[AIOR] POENITENS ANNO DOMI MDXXVIII. Finally, his name is carved into the lintels of each of the internal doors [fig. 61]. Moreover, the Borghese emblems are incorporated into the decoration itself: within the Corinthian capitals of the external side door [figs. 63-64]; among the acanthus fronds and winged putti of the minor cavities of the ceiling [fig. 45]; on the feet and atop the shaft of the massive gilded candalabrum [fig. 62]; within the stucco lintels and aprons of the clerestory windows [fig. 48]; above every second column within the frieze of the nave entablature [fig. 55]; and finally, inlaid into the polychromatic pavement at the head of the nave, in such a way that they blend harmoniously with the swirling patterns of the twelfth century tessellation [figs. 65-66]. As noted, such display was characteristic of Borghese's earlier architectural patronage. It was also common of other patrons, and again one notes the comparison with Rusticucci's imagery in S. Susanna, particularly the motif of the proscenium arch keystone and the inscription style above
the Doric doors in the aisles. Yet at S. Crisogono the sheer volume of patronal imagery has been raised to an unprecedented level, while the incorporation of motifs into the decoration itself is more thorough-going than ever before. The church appears almost completely personalised to Borghese himself; in consequence, it speaks with unrivalled eloquence of his desire to leave his mark on the city’s sacred architectural heritage.

It would be unbalanced to view the restoration of S. Crisogono in exclusively personal terms. As discussed in the previous chapter, Catholic reform initiatives meant that by the early seventeenth century a medieval church could almost expect some form of restoration. That much is given; indeed it is the conventional framework within which individual patronal imperatives were articulated. Nevertheless, this was not a restoration according to contemporary standards of church amenity. Despite the acoustic improvements provided by the ceiling, it is significant that the disposition of the church in relation to the liturgy was unchanged, unlike at S. Sebastiano where the nave was reorganised and high altar repositioned. Nor was the restoration a much-needed sanctification of a hitherto neglected sacred structure, again as at S. Sebastiano: S. Crisogono was in good condition and noted for its beauty and it was also considered worthy enough to be accorded the status of alternate on the seven church circuit for those unable to venture outside the city walls.60 Thus one is left with the way the restoration allowed its patron to express his own magnificence, albeit one harnessed to the greater glory of the church. In this sense it is significant that the major dedication on the internal facade places the emphasis on patronal lineage:

A GREGORIO III AN(NO) DOM(INI) DCCXXXI REPARATAM
A CARDINALI CREMENS AN(NO) MCXXV REFECTAM

60See below, II. 3; Panciroli, I tesori nascosti, 601, on the status of the church in relation to the seven churches.
From Gregory III to Cardinal de Crema, thence Borghese - elliptically via Paul V, harking back to an earlier illustriousness. The declaration that the church was falling to ruin cannot be taken at face value, for there is no evidence to suggest that the church was in poor condition or even in need of minor repairs. *Collabentam* must therefore be interpreted metaphorically as a wreakage borne of the years, while conversely the church's restoration was the reinstatement of the lustre deserved by its symbolic importance. Moreover, in the context of contemporary Roman society, the renovation had a personal significance, the basilica's chrysalis-like conversion from time's ruin an index of Borghese's own wavering fortunes. As the patron's titular church, S. Crisogono was symbolic of Scipione's status in the city; just as it had been expensively refashioned in the early years of the Barberini pontificate, so also Borghese himself had risen again, like Phoenix (an eagle!) reborn from the ashes of Ludovisi pre-eminence.

---

61"Cardinal Scipione Borghese, Grand Pentitiary, restored and ornamented this sacred temple of S. Crisogono, his titular church and that of his uncle Paul V (though not while he was Pope), which, having being repaired by Gregory III in 731 and rebuilt by Cardinal de Crema in 1125, was falling down due to its age after 500 years, in the year of our Lord, 1623."
S. Maria della Vittoria: the rhetoric of a facade.

The Cardinal's next major ecclesiastical commission was the facade of S. Maria della Vittoria, for which the first payments were made in January, 1625. The church itself was built between 1608 and 1620 from the designs of Carlo Maderno [fig. 67]. According to an early eighteenth century source, Cardinal Borghese is supposed to have promised to pay for a facade in return for an antique marble Hermaphrodite, presented to him by the Carmelites following its discovery on the property at some stage during the construction of the church. Recent research provides confirmation for this traditional account, although with some refinements. In her study of Borghese's collection of antique statuary, Katrin Kalveram noted an entry in the Cardinal's account book from 26 June, 1619, for 300 scudi "which we give to them [the Carmelites] as alms for a statue that they gave to us, found during the construction on their property." The statue, however, was worth a great deal more than 300 scudi: in July, 1619, Cardinal del Monte catalogued the pieces being sold by Carmelites, notably excluding the Hermaphrodite, which had already caught the attention of a particular buyer:

I send to you the enclosed list of statues that have been found here in the monastery of the [Carmelite] brothers....I had seen one

---

62Below, II.5.
63"...la statua dell'Ermafroditò fu ritrovata nel cavare i fondamenti del nuovo tempio dedicato a S. Maria della Vittoria...e che essendo stata da quei religiosi Carmelitani scalzi offerta in dono al Cardinale Scipione Borghese, concorse egli con generosa gratitudine alle spese di quella fabbrica, con favi la bella facciata, che vi si vede nobilmente eretta." Paolo Alessandro Maffei, Raccolta di statue antiche e moderne..., Rome, 1704, 71, cited in Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, Taste and the Antique. The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900, New Haven and London, 1981, 234; also Ringbeck, 68. There is no doubt that Borghese was in possession of the statue by 1620, for in March of that year Gian Lorenzo Bernini was paid sixty scudi for restoring and making a mattress for the figure: Kalveram, Die Antikensammlung, 231-3. The statue was bought by Napoleon in 1807, along with most of the Borghese sculpture collection, and is now in the Louvre.
64"per tanto che gli diamo per elemosina per una statua che ci hanno data, trova nella fabrica del loro giardino." ASV AB 7929, quoted in Kalveram, Die Antikensammlung, 120 n. 134.
beautiful statue of a woman who is reawoken as a man, but Signor Cardinal Borghese has claimed it. As the brothers did not want to set a price on it, and Signor Cardinal did not want it as a gift, he sent 300 [scudi] of gold to them (although in the opinion of the cognoscenti the value is 3000 scudi). 65

Del Monte implied that the statue was a great bargain for Borghese, yet it is likely that the Carmelites' reluctance to fix a price was due to their negotiating a more concrete recompense. The 300 scudi alms payment was therefore a goodwill payment, perhaps made because Borghese was unable at the time to commit any of his building resources. In any event, given the acknowledged monetary value of the *Hermaphrodite*, the Carmelites' presentation of it to the Cardinal should be seen as a straightforward commercial exchange rather than as a patronage-seeking gift, one to be understood in the light of Scipione's widespread purchasing of antique sculpture for his villa on the Pincio in the final years of the Borghese pontificate. 66 The facade thus resulted from what was perhaps a unique type of commission, an architectural by-product of a sculptural acquisition.

The facade itself is startlingly typical, a two storey screen whose narrower upper storey is surmounted by a pediment and flanked by giant volutes [figs. 68-70]. As a type, the design has roots in Alberti's facade of S. Maria Novella [fig. 31], an arresting image in stone that in silhouette nevertheless expresses the basic elements (clerestory, nave, and aisles) of the

---

65"Vi mando l'acclusa lista di statue che si sono trovate qui nel Monast(ér)o de frati della Scala...Io havevo dato d'occhio à una belliss(im)ma statua di una Donna che si svegliò huomo ma il s(igno)r Cardinal Borghese l'ha voluta, et perché i frati non ne volevano far [prezzo] e t il s.r Cardinale non la voleva in dono li man(do) 300 d(or)o ma a giuditio de intendenti vale tremila scudi..." Del Monte to Alessandro del Nero, 5 July, 1619, published in Wazbinski, *Il Cardinale Francesco Maria del Monte, 1549-1626*, vol. 2, 548.

66For example, in 1619 the Cardinal's account book (ASV AB 7929) records him buying: three antique statues (11 March); *una statua d'Apollo, et un pie di stallo antico* (20 October). In 1620 (ASV AB 7931) his purchasing is more intense, including: a figure of an Emperor, a torso "senza testa e senza braccia", and a head of a woman, (30 April); the heads of Ceasar and Augustus the following day; a nude youth (30 May); the figure of Faustina and a Gladiator (14 October).
basilical church behind. In the following century, Alberti's model defined
the standard basilican facade in the monument-rich Roman city centre, as
exemplified by facades such as S. Caterina dei Funari (Guidetto Guidetti,
1564) [fig. 71], the Gesù (Vignola and Giacomo della Porta, 1570), and the
Madonna dei Monti (Giacomo della Porta, 1580) [fig. 72]. By the early
seventeenth century such facades were becoming increasingly fantastic. At S.
Caterina dei Funari the primary horizontal divisions are absolutely clear,
with subordinate elements arranged between flat pilasters on a relatively
even planed surface (the flanking bays are slightly recessed). In contrast, at
the later S. Susanna (Carlo Maderno, 1597-1603) [fig. 34] clustered columns
and layered pilasters articulate a surface of shifting planes, whose rhythms
grow more complex from the sides to the centre. Note in particular how the
projection of the central bay allows the conceit of incorporating the main
entablature as the lintel of the aedicule surrounding the main door, as if the
entrance were itself a miniature porticoed temple front (a motif that had
first appeared on the Gesù facade). The characteristic features of S. Susanna
were adopted by Soria on a reduced scale in the design of S. Maria della
Vittoria, on the other side of the street [fig. 73]. Indeed, Soria explicitly
emphasised the derivative relationship by copying Maderno's peculiar yet
defining motif of the balustrade atop the giant pediment. There are also
subtle differences which enliven the symmetry: S. Maria della Vittoria has a
segmental rather than triangular pediment over the entrance, while the
central bay of the upper storey is recessed rather than projecting.

While the similarity of the two facades has been frequently noted, it is
worth emphasising the broader urban significance of their relationship.67
Along with the Acqua Felice (Domenico Fontana, 1587-89), the two churches

67Ringbeck, 70-72, describes the stylistic character of the facade and its association with S.
Susanna. For Hibbard, the significance of the relationship did not extend much beyond the
similarity. "The facade, attributed by all the old sources to G. B. Soria, is a pale reflection of
Maderno's Santa Susanna next door. The two churches stand something like 'twins, flanking
the modern street between': Carlo Maderno, 141.
are parts of an ensemble of buildings that define the northern and eastern sides of the piazza of S. Bernardino [figs. 74-76]. As Tempesta's 1593 map shows [fig. 77], when Maderno designed the facade of S. Susanna the piazza was on the city's outskirts, the edge of its semi-rural area, and it was dominated by the recently erected fountain front. Although the differences between church and fountain are clear, Maderno nevertheless keyed the height and dimensions of S. Susanna's first level frieze with Fontana's earlier triple arch front, thereby providing some scaled unity to the piazza and accenting its western extent along the straight Via Pia.

Maderno continued this urban formulation when he later orientated the Carmelite church, raising it on a platform (although this was also to accommodate the sloping site) to match the ground level horizontal with that of S. Susanna, surely in anticipation of a complementary facade. From Maderno's point of view, the two churches were therefore meant to be seen as a pair, together forming a gateway for the street that runs down to the piazza soon to made over by the Barberini. Soria exploited the intentions of Maderno (who, it must be remembered, was still alive) when he scaled the combined height of pilaster and plinth of S. Maria della Vittoria's lower level to exactly co-incide with the height of S. Susanna's Corinthian column shafts. In so doing Soria also harmonised the frieze with that of the Acqua Felice, thereby indicating that it was not two but three structures that were meant to be seen together, at an angle from the piazza or more obliquely from the via Pia.

Indeed, Soria underscored the less obvious relationship of S. Maria della Vittoria with Fontana's fountain by adopting its festooned Ionic order

---

68It is possible Maderno had actually built at least the framework of a facade. The rear view of the church in Giovanni Maggi's map of 1625 shows a front wall surmounted by a crucifix extending slightly beyond the envelope of the building, suggesting some sort of front: Borsi, Roma di Urbano VIII, 53. According to Pascoli, Soria had earlier helped Maderno with the design of the church itself and would later ensure his design for the facade was approved by other architects: Lione Pascoli, Vite de pittori, scultori ed architetti moderni, Rome, 1736, vol. 2, 526.
on the lower level, rather than the Corinthinian order of Maderno's facade. Such a triadic configuration of two churches and fountain resolves the apparently (when seen from a plan) awkward urbanistic relationship between S. Maria della Vittoria and the bald-faced side wall of the Acqua Felice, directly in front [fig. 76].\(^ {69} \) That is, the intended oblique view of the church as it is approached from the the south and the west corrects its actual displacement outside the piazza, bringing it into a right-angled alignment with the classical facade of the fountain. Moreover, these two structures together form an eastern exit onto the passage that ends with the facade of the Porta Pia, a nondescript transitional zone between the inner and outer extremities of Rome's urban space. While not quite the scenographic architecture typical of later in the century - the actual elements of the facade retain their objective integrity; they are not, that is, manipulated to coordinate with desired sight-lines, as is the case, for example, of Bernini's St. Peter's piazza - the facade of S. Maria della Vittoria is clearly a work of architecture whose meaning is only activated when understood in the context of the original relationships between the site, the surrounding buildings, and the city at large.

Flamboyant in its individual style and acculturated to the discourse of the piazza, the facade is at once conventional, engaging, and articulate. In short, it is a classically rhetorical piece of architecture. Moreover, the eloquence is obviously staged. While it was typical of screen facades to project above the body of the church, the urban scaling required of S. Maria della Vittoria resulted in a notable over-sizing, even by contemporary standards. The disjunction between facade and church is exaggerated when seen from behind [fig. 78], whence the facade resembles a monumental prop,

\(^ {69} \)Seventeenth century views of the church, such as that by G. B. Falda, *Il nuovo teatro delle fabbriche di Roma*, Rome, 1665, vol. 3, pl. 10, portray the facade front-on by pushing the fountain eastward, thereby artificially positioning the church as the rectangular piazza's corner accent.
its undecorated back extending as a sheer wall well beyond the actual roof. This, however, is an atypical view; Rome's narrow streets, closely packed arrangement of buildings, and lack of elevated perspectives meant one was rarely afforded a rear prospect.\(^7^0\) When, as here, one was granted a view from behind it only served to illustrate the principle, succinctly expressed by Vincenzo Scamozzi, that just as the human body was articulated at the front, so ornament was something naturally confined to the side and front of a building.\(^7^1\) Nevertheless, the return wall buttressing required by such a tall, thin sheet of masonry does offer some concealment of the plain surface, its pilaster decoration in turn permitting the conceit, as it does with S. Susanna, that the facade is truly a three-dimensional temple-front structure. Such deception, more knowing than real, was part of the decorum of public architecture: later, for example, Borromini would explain that he displaced the facade of the Oratory of S. Filippo Neri because it was more important to underscore the rhetorical relationship between it and the adjacent Chiesa Nuova than to represent the actual building behind. Hence the necessity of "deceiving the view of the passer-by [by making] the facade in the piazza, as if the oratory began there".\(^7^2\)

As is increasingly well understood, there is a long tradition of art historical thought hostile to the staged effects and concealed artifice one sees at a facade such as that of S. Maria della Vittoria. These 'baroque' features were thought characteristic of the bombast and deception of rhetoric in general and were explicitly condemned by modernist critics.\(^7^3\) Although

\(^7^0\) The view from the river opened up numerous back perspectives. A drawing, for example, by the Anonymous Fabriczy, c. 1568-72, of the Ospedale of S. Spirito shows not only the plain masonry of the facade's rear but also the flattened backs of the pediment sculptures, suggesting the whole front had the character of a relief: reproduced in H. Egger (ed.), *Römische Veduten*, Vienna-Leipzig, 1911-31, taf. 10.

\(^7^1\) Vincenzo Scamozzi, *L'idea dell'architettura universale*, Venice, 1615, part 2, bk. 6, iii, 8.

\(^7^2\) "Mi risolsi dunque d'ingannare la vista del passaggiere e fare la facciata in piazza, come se l'oratorio cominciasse ivi...". Francesco Borromini, *Opus architectonicum*, ed. M. De Benedictis, Rome, 1993, 46.

\(^7^3\) See Wolfgang Stechow, "Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts", *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 5 (1946-47), 109-115. Benedetto Croce, perhaps the seicento's
such antagonistic views are no longer tenable, it is not enough to simply assume a positive attitude where before a negative one prevailed. Instead one must try to understand the critical and poetic foundation of the rhetorical aesthetic. The key to the old criticism was that ornament was used for expressive purposes beyond the strict articulation of structure in order to create the illusion that the building is grander than it really is. The result is insincerity - a characteristic criticism of the Baroque generally - in that the form conceals rather than reveals the true nature (that is, its structure) of a building.74 This moral antagonism to ornament stems from an underlying philosophical realism. From this standpoint, architectural 'sincerity' equates with honesty, which shows what something is, not what it is like; it logically demonstrates a proposition rather than persuades of an opinion. Ornament, being inessential and metaphorical, is thus associated with insincere persuasion rather than honest demonstration. According to Plato, ornament is a type of image, in the sense that it is not the thing itself; conversely, persuasion, the acknowledged purpose of rhetoric, is the art of images. Plato banished image-makers (who disguise the true model, thereby deluding the observer as to reality) from the Republic, and he was similarly dismissive of most influential antagonist, stressed the period's excessive ornamentation. Croce noted that barocco emerged as a stylistic term as early as the mid-eighteenth century and was used by the authors of the Encyclopédie in reference to bizzare architecture: Storia della età barocca in Italia, Bari, 1946, 22-3.

74 Nikolaus Pevsner appealed to truth when he warned that the architecture of reason (that is, the functionalism of Behrens, Gropius, et. al.) might be threatened by the next generation's perversions, by the "craving of architects for individual expression, the craving of the public for the surprising and fantastic, and for an escape out of reality into a fairy world": Pioneers of Modern Design (first published as Pioneers of the Modern Movement, 1936), Harmondsworth, 2nd ed. 1960, 217. Ornament was not opposed in principle, although the discursive function of applied ornament was explicitly condemned. The influential modernist Henry van de Velde expressed the hope that the renunciation of ornament would lead to the discovery of "an original, in-dwelling ornament which will find its expression in proportions and in volume": from "Das Neue: Weshalb immer Neues?" (1929), quoted in Hanno Walter-Kruft, A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present, trans. R. Taylor, E. Callander, A. Wood, London/New York, 1994, 383. On the other hand, Robert Venturi, longing for the allusive capacity that ornament allows, objected to the puritanical language of orthodox modern architecture, and when he countered Mies van der Rohe's "less is more" with "less is a bore" his historical models were almost all from baroque periods: Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture, New York, 1966, passim.
rhetoric, describing it as a semblance of politics, no different to flattery and of no use to anyone but a criminal.\textsuperscript{75} Idealist philosophers revived Plato's distaste, including Kant, who called rhetoric "the art of deluding...of playing for one's own purpose upon the weaknesses of men...[rhetoric] merits no respect whatever".\textsuperscript{76}

Plato's dislike of rhetoric derives from a poetic ontology, one where imitation, the raw material of persuasion and ornament, is a superfluous barrier to the essence of a thing whose representational fundaments are thought to be transparent. Plato's dismissal of mimesis, which is the imitation of the appearance of a particular thing (so being three removes from the real), derives from its lowly place in the demonstrable world.\textsuperscript{77} But there is also a limit to demonstrability, for the fundaments of logical demonstration are themselves ultimately resistant to analytic demonstration.\textsuperscript{78} Clarity, founded in the physical world, is itself limited by that world. Beyond that intractable point there is the metaphysical, the realm of the irrational - the realm reached through metaphor. In this sense metaphor provides the link to the irrational, employing likeness to enable an observer to grasp the essence of a thing beyond physical demonstration.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{75}Gorgias, 461a-480a. Plato also dealt with rhetoric, with slightly less vehemence, in the Phaedrus, 265-275d.

\textsuperscript{76}From Critique of Judgement, Part I, sec. 53, quoted in Ernesto Grassi, Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition, Penn. State University, 1980, 18-19. The following comments are indebted to Grassi's study, especially 18-34, as well as the same author's Renaissance Humanism. Studies in Philosophy and Poetics, trans. W. Viet, Binghamtom, New York, 1988, passim.

\textsuperscript{77}Republic, bk. X, 595-606.

\textsuperscript{78}For Parmenides, such axioms, definitionally resistant to demonstration, remain on the edge of the knowable: Plato, Sophist, 237e; F. M. Cornford, Plato's Theory of Knowledge, London, 1960, 311-13.

\textsuperscript{79}The critical issue in seventeenth century image-making was to divine the conceit, the wit that gave a metaphor coherence, granting insight into the divine and marvelous artifice of the world. Emanuele Tesauro, the period's foremost aesthetician, described the faculty ingegno. "Quinci, non senza qualche ragione gli huomini ingegnosi fur chiamati divini. Peroche sicone Iddio di quel che non è, produce quel che è: così l'ingegno, di non ente, fà ente: fà che il Leone divenga un'huomo, e l'acquila una città. Inesta una femina sopra un pesce e fabrica una sirena per simbolo dell'Adulatore. Accopia un busto di Capra al deretano di un serpe: e forma la chimera per hieroglifico della pazzia. Onde fra gli antichi filosofi alcuni chiamaron l'ingegno, particella delle mente divina: e altri un regalo mandato da Iddio a suoi più cari": Tesauro, Il cannocchiale aristotelico, Venice, 1663, 76.
Thus the virtue, in fact sanctity, of poetic speech is due to its capacity to inspire through metaphor a revelation, that glimpse into the unfathomable, the incomparable, and the divine. The realm of metaphor is also the realm of rhetoric, or at least that type of rhetoric concerned with praise (epideictic) of the divine, a topic beyond apprehension, if not perception. Thus the rhetorician's task, like the poet's, is the confection of magnificent apparitions, astonishing images that lead where reason falters.

Apart from the increasingly well-acknowledged importance of rhetoric to the perception and theory of the visual arts from at least the time of Alberti, the practical importance of all this in relation to architecture is associated with the aesthetic significance of the concept of the marvelous.

In contemporary literary theory, particularly that deriving from Aristotle's Poetics, a marvel was that fantastic or surprising element in a composition which either enlivened a passage, or simply spared it from the commonplace. A marvel was thus a compositional element evoked through an unexpected or unusual metaphor, whose meaning depended on the reader divining the conceit of the author. But a marvel might also be a startling image in a general sense, with the more profound purpose, extending from the philosophical purpose of persuasion and ornament discussed above, of providing the observer with a glimpse of the veil separating the manifest from the ideal world. Hence the importance of the grand, the stupendous, the deceptive, or the illogical image, forged not to confuse but to open perception to the wonder beyond reason. From the end

---

80 It was a commonplace of display rhetoric that certain subjects could only be praised, not understood: Grassi, Renaissance Humanism, 41-44; John O'Malley, Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome. Rhetoric, Doctrine, and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c.1450-1521, Durham, 1979, 45-49.

81 On the relationship of rhetorical categories to the arts, see the works of Argan and Contardi, cited below; in addition, Christine Smith traces the way in which categories derived from Ciceronian rhetoric shape the language of architectural description and theory, with particular reference to Alberti: Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism. Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence, 1400-1470, Oxford, 1992, 81-97.

82 Aristotle, Poetics, 1458a-60a; James Mirollo discusses the inflections of the term in The Poet of the Marvelous, Giambattista Marino, New York/London, 1963, 166-7.
of the sixteenth century, this idea of the marvelous became indissolubly linked to the former meaning of the unexpected device. Ironically, this formulation became itself a commonplace of aesthetic perception, extending well beyond the literary theory from which it derived. Marino's well known dictum (è del poeta il fin la meraviglia) would be echoed in Bernini's own assertion in relation to the figurative arts: "wit and design are the magic arts by which sight comes to be deceived in a style of astonishment".83

Meraviglia was a particularly appropriate aesthetic category in relation to the city of Rome. The city of wonders, as the guidebooks described it: Ottavio Panciroli wrote of Rome as if it were a cachet of jewels, whose superfluity suggested the infinite abundance of heaven.84 Another writer enthused that entering the city was like passing into a holy sanctuary, filled with otherwordly sights that leave the soul drunk with wonder, so that it seems one has entered a terrestrial paradise.85 Rome as a heaven on earth was a common theme, sometimes expressed as if the visitor to the city were in a dream:

E paremi mirar palaggi e fonti
cinti di superbissimo lavoro
edificij divini, in piani e in monti,
ricchi di gemme e carchi di tesoro
in sui volgendo il guardo inteso e fiso

83"...l'ingegno e il disegno sono l'arte magica attraverso cui si arriva a ingannare la vista in modo da stupire": quoted in Fagiolo, "Il fin la meraviglia", L'effimero, vol. 2, 231. Marino's line is from a sonnet composed c. 1609 as part of a disputation with the poet Gaspare Murtola. It is normally understood in the context of Marino suggesting a minimum standard of professional capacity: "E del poeta il fin la meraviglia/(Parlo del l'eccellente e non del goffo);/Chi non sa far stupir, vada alla striglia!" Yet the preceding lines playfully imply the marvelous can also be like hot air: "nessuno fa meravigliare/come fa egli [Murtola] in ogni sua parola" (Fischiatta XXXIII, from La Murtoleide, reproduced in Felici, Poesia italiana del seicento, 17-8). See Mirollo, The Poet of the Marvelous, 168-74; Francesco Guardiani, La meravigliosa retorica dell'Adone di G. B. Marino, Florence, 1989, passim; Terri Lee Frongia, 'The Aesthetics of the Marvelous: Baroque Meraviglia and Marino's Galleria', PhD Diss., University of California (Riverside), 1990, 208ff.

84Ottavio Panciroli, I tesori nascosti nell'alma città di Roma, Rome, 1600, 11-34.

85"parmi quando rammento ogni sua parte/ Che nel terrestre paradiso io fui." From Maravigli (dedicated to Cardinal Borghese; anonymous, no date) ASV FB II 506, 127v.
Disse tra me rassembra il Paradiso.86

In such a rhetorical space, the buildings of popes and cardinals were highlights within an urban epideictic. In his discourse on architecture, Vincenzo Giustiniani (1564-1637) spent so much time discussing facades he apologised for his prolixity, excusing himself on the grounds that they were the principal ornaments of the public realm87 And the most splendid facades were those of churches - larger, costlier, more dramatic and beautiful than anything else in the city. Such facades were both visible manifestations of institutional magnificence and sources of the wonderment to which that institution was dedicated. In this sense, the facade of S. Maria della Vittoria could be seen as just such a dazzlingly image, its illogical (a balustrade on the pediment!), upright, and over-sized immediacy providing a marvelous vision of super-reality that helped spiritualise the urban space of the eternal city.

As indicated, to be properly understood the marvel must be put in the context of the rhetoric of display, that form of oratory concerned with celebrating some worthy person, thing, or concept, an art that had flourished in the Roman court since the fifteenth century. Rhetorical praise is intimately wedded with a certain attitude to hierarchic authority; indeed Giulio Argan argues that this type of rhetoric was a cultural characteristic of absolutism, a way of thinking and form of expression that reinforced hierarchy.88 Argan went so far as to suggest that in the Baroque the mimetic

86 "And in looking at palaces and fountains and superbly worked walls of divine temples, on the flats and in the hills, encrusted with gemstones and laden with treasure, my entranced gazed seems to suggest to me that I am in heaven." From Sogno occorso all'autore di ritornare alle patria all Ill.mo Sig.re Cardinal Borghese..., in Rime diverse di Massimiliano Caffarelli...con alcuni sonetti, et altre poesie fatte da diversi Sig.ri e altri virtuosi ingegni...All'Ill.mo e R.mo Cardinal Borghese....(1613), ASV FB I 449, 12r.
88 Giulio Carlo Argan, "La 'Rettorica' e l'arte barocca", in E. Castelli (ed.), Retorica e barocco, (Atti del III congresso internazionale di studi umanistici), Rome, 1955, 12-13. This was a similar position to Guido Morpurgo Tagliabue, who argued in the same volume that in the Baroque the idea had become an ornament to the elocution, inverting the normal relationship. Tagliabue linked this perversion to the rise of the aristocracy, comparing it unfavourably
object - what one was being persuaded of - was unimportant in comparison to the form and act of persuasion itself. An overstatement, perhaps, but there is little doubt that praise became a genre of expression in itself, like pastoral or landscape. If a letter, for example, can seem on occasion dominated by the conventions of salutation, the dedication of a published book could be overtaken, as in Marino's *ad infinitum* list of the Paul V's virtues in the prologue to *Dicerie sacre* (1614). Today one tends to pass over such amplification in favour of content or traditional formal issues. Yet dismissing the apparatus of flattery can divest the work of its spirit, denying it the allusive language of praise through which it is articulated.

This is particularly the case when considering a figure as important as Cardinal Borghese. His archive abounds with philosophical and poetic tracts written, quite literally, in his honour. These were not empty exercises in epideictic; nor did they necessarily have an ulterior purpose. One of the best known is Scipione Francucci's *Galleria* of 1613. This epic work of more than 560 octaves has generally been approached for the information it...

---

with the normative social model of the Renaissance: Tagliabue, "Aristotelismo e barocco", idem, 138-9 and 142. These views were largely followed by Bruno Contardi, who regarded rhetoric, characteristically associated with humanism (logic, convincing rather than persuasive, was connected with the scientific tradition), as a dominant system - institutionally structured, transmitted through schools, and with an ideology that reinforced hierarchy: *La retorica e l'architettura del barocco*, Rome, 1978, 20-4. Contardi suggested that the tell-tale signs of rhetorical architecture - quotation, manipulation of orders for symbolic purposes, and association of diverse images - can already be detected in the work of Bramante (idem, 57).

89 Giovanni Pozzi notes that Tesauro regarded Marino's dedication as the exemplum of its kind - indeed it was a *facciata* as worthy as the book itself: Marino, *Dicerie Sacre e La Strage de gli innocenti*, ed. G. Pozzi, Turin, 1960, 69 n.2.

90 ASV FB IV 102, "La Galleria dell'Illustris. e Reverendis. Signor Scipione Cardinale Borghese. Cantata da Scipione Francucci" (prologue dated 16 July, 1613). Borghese's art collection, subsequently housed in the villa on the Pincio, was then in his palace in the Borgo. Most Borghese scholars have consulted the work, known to exist only in this single Vatican manuscript, particularly those concerned with his patronage of painting and sculpture: see in particular, Cesare D'Onofrio, *Roma Vista da Roma*, 207-10; Lamberto Donati, "Un poema in lode della Galleria Borghese", *Strenna dei Romanisti* (1977), 129-34; Patrizia Tosini, 'Bernardino Cesari: *Diana and Acteon*', in Claudia Cieri Via (ed.), *Immagini degli dei mitologia e collezionismo tra '500 e '600*, (Lecce, Fondazione Memmo, 7 dicembre 1996 - 31 Marzo 1997), Lecce, 1996, 153-5. Little is known of the author; his other works include: *Il Belisario*, Rome, 1620, dedicated to Cardinal Borghese; *Il Pentimento di Maria Maddalena...*, Rome and Viterbo, 1622, dedicated to Grand Duchess of Tuscany; *La Caccia Etrusca*, Florence, 1624, dedicated to Cardinal de'Medici.
contains about the Cardinal's art collection. The eighth and final canto, however, is wholly concerned with members of the Borghese family, in particular Scipione, who is established as the heart of the work and to whom the gallery is in reality an ornament. The portrait begins simply enough, with Francucci sketching the Cardinal in broad terms, his clear and sovereign valour counted among Italy's greatest assets (510). Thereafter, Francucci spins an allegory in which the Olympian taming of a barbaric and war-ravaged world was as a precursor to Scipione's reign (511-14). Eclipsing even Scipio Africanus, the Cardinal gilds his era with golden peace, subdues avarice, and revives in Rome all her antique glories (515-7). Francucci slowly builds the portrait in intensity, reaching a crescendo over the last five octaves (518-22): as in heaven, virtue is exemplified in Scipione's heart; he is a sun, illuminating the earth and radiating goodness; his valour yields only to the divine; through him Rome inhales the victories of antiquity. The portrait concludes
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O magnanimo Heroe vivi felice
Al nostro bene, e alla tua gloria intento,
   Et à i rai della Gloria alma Fenice
Risorgi pur grand'il tuo fral sia spento
   Gia gia la Fama de'gran nomi altrice
Benc'habbia cento bocche, e lingue'cento
Muta ad ogn'altro, il tuo gran nome solo,
   Rimbombar fa dall'uno dall'altro polo.91

The tumbling images, each more overwhelming than the last, suggest the Cardinal has broken the limits of prosaic comparison - he is himself a

91 "Oh, magnanimous hero, you live happily for our benefit, for it is your glory I proclaim. The wonderous radiance of Phoenix's spirit rises again, extinguishing your frailty. The fame of the loftiest reputation, even if it has one hundred mouths and one hundred tongues, is silent to any other but your great name alone, thundering from pole to pole." (Thanks to Alessandra Anselmi for help with the translation.)
meraviglia. The boundless allusions attempt to accomplish the unaccomplishable, the representation of Scipione's infinite excellence. This as well was a common topos, the conceit that even a thousand poets could do justice to only a fraction the Cardinal's virtues.\textsuperscript{92} Indeed it could be argued that Francucci's 'portrait' of Scipione mobilised such a commonplace stock of praises that to quote it at all is virtually redundant. Yet it is precisely this stereotypical aspect that illustrates the point, for the fact that such a 'portrait' was a traditional literary genre, governed by the rhetorical conventions of amplification, only serves to reinforce awareness of the prevailing language of praise.

In \textit{La Galleria}, Francucci adopted the usual strategy of positioning a work, in this case an art collection, as an ornament to its creator, Cardinal Borghese. Yet no physical patronal ornament was more apt than architecture. Girolamo Preti, for example, allegorised the pearly crowned fountain in front of St. Peter's as a miracle of Paul V: just as Moses drew water from the rock and Jupiter torrents from the underworld, so the pope divined rain from a cloudless sky.\textsuperscript{93} In turn, a facade like that of S. Maria della Vittoria was the real thing, the perfect ornament to the patron's splendour. In this sense, note the spicing of the facade with patronal imagery. The usual frieze inscription (SCIPIO S[ANCTAE] R[OMANAE])

\textsuperscript{92}See the variety of sonnets dedicated to the Cardinal in ASV FB I 449 (above, n. 86), particularly: "Che pur bisognarebbon mille omeri/ A dir di vostri preggi una sol parta...Apollo con le muse, sol potranno/ cantar vostre vittorie e vostri honori/ ei marmi e i bronzi stompe ne saranno,/ E nel futuro secolo maggiori/ fiam le corone ei vanti, e si vedranno/ qual al sol, tal à voi raggi e splendori" (99v). For anonymous poet cited above (n. 85), Cardinal Borghese was the one marvel that surpassed Rome's built wonders: "Ma tacco qui le maraviglie sparte/che si trà l'altre una rapir mi puote/che m'è forza di lei vergar le carte/vidi del Santo Padre il Gran Nepote...dinanzi cavalier, prelati al tergo/havea ben mille, e s'ho da dirne il merto/nel mar da'le lor lodi io mi sommergo." See also the other poems in the volume of verse dedicated to the Cardinal, ASV FB II 506.

\textsuperscript{93}"...Quasi corona, il marmo orna e circonda/ misto a perle stillanti argento molle./ Cade un fiume d'intorno, e l'aria inonda;/ e par che procellosso ondeggia un colle/ Meraviglie di Paolo: i marmi e i monti,/ noto Encelado santo, inalza e muove,/ e trae, novo Mosè, da pietre i fonti;/ e mentre è il ciel sereno, il nostro Giove,/ che i torrenti sotto la cenno ha pronti,/ gl'inalza, e senza nubi i nemi piove": Fontana di Paolo V nella Piazza di San Pietro in Roma, in Felici, \textit{Poesia italiana del seicento}, 71.
E[CCLESIAE]. CARD BURGHESIUS M[AIOR]. POENITEN. ANNO D. DMCXXVI) and escutcheon in the tympanum are accompanied by Borghese emblems atop the giant volutes, within the festooned volutes of the lower level [fig. 79], and carved on the timber panelling that frame the door within the central portal [fig. 80] (a motif possibly copied from S. Susanna). In its physical exaggeration and allusions to Scipione, the frontispiece of S. Maria della Vittoria unambiguously declaims ecclesiastical and patronal splendour. Argan suggested that such a facade addressed itself less to the sacred building it screened than to the audience in the piazza, offering an invitation to enter inside.94 One might add that the strange and fantastic image of the church offered not only entry, but wonder.

The Latin inscription on the entablature functions as a personal signature - "Scipione made this". As such, it added to Rome's civic chatter, providing another point on its personalised architectonic map, a map accented by the coats of arms, inscriptions, and monuments of the monied and powerful. Screen facades were among the most prominent structures of the city, with most built between 1550 and 1750. As at S. Maria della Vittoria, almost every one represented a particular cardinal, comprising a sort of travertine sacred college - Cardinals Cesi at S. Caterina dei Funari, Farnese at the Gesù, Rusticucci at S. Susanna, Ludovisi at S. Ignazio, Leni at S. Carlo ai Catinari, Mazarin at SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio, to cite some of the more brilliant examples. As argued in the previous chapter, such a personally inscribed facade was concrete testimony of patronal magnificence and piety. But its rhetorical presence provided an added dimension, making it virtually a metonymy of the Cardinal himself, who in turn was a living symbol of the Holy Roman Church. Finally, the facade, raised on a few steps

---

and mimicking the silhouette of a tabernacle, can even be seen as a type of altarpiece, an over-sized urban talisman demanding supplication.\textsuperscript{95}

\textsuperscript{95}At the end of his letter to Paul V (30 May, 1613) explaining the adjusted design of St. Peter's, Carlo Maderno conflated his dedication of the facade to His Holiness with the closing salutation, both united in the conventions of worship. "La [pianta] dedico, come per tutti i rispetti debbo, alla santità vostro supplicandola umilmente degnarsi di gradirla, per minimo segno della grandissima divozione, e obbligatissima servitù miaverso lei, alla quale prostrato, bacio li santissimi piedi...": in G. Bottari and S. Ticozzi (eds.), Raccolte di lettere sulla pittura, scultura ed architettura. Scritte dai più celebri personaggi dei secoli XV, XVI, e XVII, Milan, 1822-25, vol. 6, 47-8.
Chapter 4
LAST WORKS, 1628-33

In the aftermath of the death of Paul V and subsequent difficulties of the Ludovisi pontificate, Cardinal Borghese eventually emerged in the second half of the 1620s with his place in the Roman court relatively secure. Although he still celebrated the annual commemoration of Paul V's death, performed his duties as Grand Penitentiary, and acquired the occasional benefice in the consistory, he was gradually withdrawing from public life. No longer powerful, the experienced and fondly regarded Borghese possibly assumed the role of sagacious elder statesman in the college. The Barberini papacy was an expansive and liberal administration, congenial to Scipione's interests. As Maffeo Barberini, Urban VIII had been a Borghese creature and personally close to Scipione in particular; and they were united in their loathing of the Ludovisi. Although Borghese no longer took centre stage of Rome's artistic life (Bernini, for example, was lost to him from 1625), he lived his last years in an environment largely free of conflict and hostility.

The period 1628-33 was actually the most active in terms of his ecclesiastical patronage. In late 1627, with building ongoing at S. Crisogono and near completion at S. Maria della Vittoria, Borghese initiated construction at the Franciscan church and convent of S. Chiara a Casa Pia.

1Fulvio Testi, reporting the status of the various cardinals, noted that while Borghese "s'aiuta per risorgere, Ludovisi fatica per non precipitare": to Cesare D'Este, 13 October, 1627, in, Testi Lettere, 113.
2See the avvisi of 31 January and 11 April, 1629, Urb. Lat. 1099, 59r and 220v; 13 January and 27 March, 1630, Urb. Lat. 1100, 80v and 169r.
3The influence of Scipione on the younger Antonio Barberini is being explored by Karin Wolfe as part of her dissertation on the latter's patronage, in preparation for the Courtauld Institute, London.
4Maffeo Barberini, made cardinal on 11 September, 1606, had been similarly entangled, and humiliated, in the Scirocco incident, discussed above, ch. 4; D'Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma, 296.
Within three years he was also financing two new organs in S. Maria sopra Minerva, a new facade on S. Gregorio Magno, a complete new parish church in Monte Compatri, and an entire monastic complex in Montefortino. In addition, he was expected to negotiate the administration of the building of a choir and facade for S. Carlo ai Catinari with funds left by the testament of Cardinal Giambattista Leni. This latter project, however, did not proceed smoothly. A particular problem was Scipione's determination to advertise to his role through prominent display of the Borghese arms. Although the Cardinal's wish was tolerated, the Barnabites felt that it gave him more credit than was his due, as he was no more than administering someone else's funds. Further delays took their toll and nothing substantial was done before Scipione's death; it took the intervention of Cardinal Francesco Barberini later in the decade to complete the project according to Leni's wishes.

---

5 Leni died 3 November, 1627, leaving 29 000 scudi (later reduced to 21 000 due to irregularities in the will) to the Barnabites and naming Cardinal Borghese and Monsignor Tiberio Petronio (Leni's cousin) as the executors: see the extract from Leni's testament in L. Cacciari, Memorie intorno alla chiesa de' SS. Biagio e Carlo ai Catinari in Roma, Rome, 1861, 25-6. Borghese seems to have been interested only in the decoration. In fact, he replaced the designated artist Semenza with Domenichino for the stucco and fresco decoration of the cupola, also imposing the demand that the Borghese arms be shown along with those of Leni, "non perché essi fabbricassero, et ornassero la cuppola...ma perché così volle li esecutori testamentary...e così ci convenne tollerare dopo dongo lite...per vedere effettuato il legato": Archivio Storica Barnabita Roma, F. Valle, Stato Generale del Collegio dei SS. Biagio e Carlo di Roma, 1742, t.1, 52v. If the Borghese arms were ever put there they did not survive. It is unlikely work began on the facade and choir before the death of Borghese in October, 1633. According to the chronicle of the Order, when work did commence it was soon interrupted, as Monsignor Petronio had been siphoning the dedicated funds, "con occasione di un matrimonio di suo nipote con pensiero di rimetterlo a poco a poco con sua commodità. Questa fu la cagione per la quale...andò sempre con mille lunghezze tirando avanti senza fabbricare". Eventually the matter was resolved with the help of Anna Colonna Barberini (whose father, Prince Filippo Colonna, had earlier offered funds for the church's high altar) and Urban VIII, who "surrogò con suo breve speciale l'Em.mo Sig.r Card.l Barberino al defont Sig.r Card.I Borghese": Archivio Storica Barnabita Milano, cart. II, fasc. II, Cronaca, 1638-40. (Thanks to Alessandra Anselmi, who kindly made available her unpublished archival research on this phase of the church's history.) Although the date on the facade is 1635 it was not actually begun until January 1636 and finally completed two years later to Soria's design: Ringbeck, 98.
Cardinal Protector

As noted, Borghese's patronage at S. Maria della Vittoria was exceptional in that he had no prior administrative connection to the church, the normal pre-requisite for architectural patronage on the part of cardinals. The most common administrative relationship derived from commendatorial or titular responsibility, as at S. Gregorio, S. Sebastiano, and S. Crisogono. Another category of administration leading to architectural patronage was that of protectorship. The office of protector had its origins in the concept of individual patronage (*patrocinium*) in ancient Roman society, and it continued into the modern era as a ubiquitous feature of the prevailing system of stratified representation.6 The office of cardinal-protector was an extension of this individual concept onto a corporate basis, so that cardinals were considered universal protectors of the church in general, with a particular devolution on individual religious societies. This practice originated with the deputation in 1223 of Cardinal Ugolino Conti (nephew of Pope Innocent III) as protector - *gubernator, protector, corrector* - of the Franciscan order; over the following two centuries the office extended over the complete range of ecclesiastical institutions.7

Despite its ubiquity, the office is difficult to define: unlike a commendator, a cardinal-protector drew no annuity; although appointed by the pope upon the request of a religious society or some other organisation, he had no set administrative duties. His real function was in terms of the negotiating power he could offer, manipulating his diverse client networks

6Moroni, *Dizionario* vol. 55, 317. Indeed, one notes a standard form of address as "*il mio patrocinio*". An individual's protector was often literally just that: Traiano Boccalini, for example, had his writings manoeuvred away from the Index by his protector, Cardinal Borghese (Gaetano Cozzi, "Traiano Boccalini, il Cardinale Borghese, e la Spagna, seconde le riferte di un confidente degli Inquisitori di Stato", *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 58 (1956), 239-40), while Flaminio Ponzio's sodomite son was spared the stake because of the protection of the first family (avviso of 17 July,1610, Urb. lat. 1078, 518r).

7Moroni, *Dizionario*, vol. 55, 319-22.
to secure preferment, fill vacancies, and generally ensuring the smooth
passage of the institution's affairs through the world at large. Moreover, in
the case of a religious order, protection was not confined to the order's
Roman chapter, but extended throughout the peninsula and the continent.
So, for example, one finds Borghese writing to the Cardinal of Vienna,
requesting that he intervene (perché l'autorità, et patrocinio di V. S. Ill.ma
può farli conseguire tutti gli aiuti necessarii) to help the Dominican brothers
of S. Maria Maddalena in Prague, who were so impoverished they were
unable to observe the rule.

It is difficult to imagine the sheer number of people who were either
directly protected by Borghese or who felt his influence via his
protectorships - according to an inventory compiled in the late 1620s,
Cardinal Borghese protected some forty seven different religious orders,
houses, nations, cities, colleges, monasteries, confraternities, and
universities. Such coverage also carried a financial obligation; at his death
Borghese left 200 scudi to each of thirty seven churches under his
protection. Some institutions, however, required special attention. As
protector of the sacred house of Loreto, for example, Borghese was
continually harassed by the Prior, Monsignor Cenci, for help in alleviating a
debt of over 24 000 scudi incurred with a certain merchant in Venice.
Despite Borghese sending over 1000 rubbia of grain (about eight tonnes,
worth between 7000 and 9000 scudi), Cenci repeatedly requested further alms
and goods and eventually was forced to sell some of the ecclesiastical

---

8 Ingo Stader, *Herrschaft durch Verflechtung*, 70-1; the range of administrative duties is
indicated by the résumé of Borghese's correspondence with the Dominicans in Stefano Forte,
"I domenicani nel carteggio del Card. Scipione Borghese protettore dell'ordine (1606-33)",
*Archivium fratrum praedicatorum*, 30 (1960), 351-419.
9 Borghese to Cardinal of Vienna, 11 May, 1616, ASV FB I 944, 55; ibid., 379.
10 Below, III.3.
silverware.\textsuperscript{12} The dire financial state must have continued, for Borghese left in his testament no less than 10 000 scudi to Loreto, presumably for the administration of its debt, donated via Cardinal Antonio Barberini the younger, Borghese's successor as protector.\textsuperscript{13}

Assistance might also take the form of architectural patronage. This could be a partial contribution, as at S. Caterina da Siena, to whose rebuilding in 1628 Cardinal Borghese donated 100 scudi.\textsuperscript{14} It could also be a more complete funding, as it was for the Clarissan nuns of Santa Chiara a Casa Pia, whose church and convent were modified at the expense of their newly appointed protector, Cardinal Borghese, from late 1627 [fig. 81].\textsuperscript{15}

Although the work (remaking the monastery roof) on the since demolished complex is of little significance to the history of architecture, it nevertheless offers an interesting comparison between the style of Borghese and the order's previous protector (and likely builder of the convent), Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte.\textsuperscript{16} Early in his career del Monte had a reputation for luxury, but he was later known for his modesty, someone who "built a

\textsuperscript{12}The letters of Cenci to Borghese from the first half of 1624 in ASV FB III 125abc, 246-7, 248, 257, 265, 287r-v.

\textsuperscript{13}Borghese also left an encrusted cross and two candelabra to the sacred house: ASR Not. Can. A. C., n. 3, 371v; ASV AB 6094 39r.

\textsuperscript{14}Borghese's role in relation to the rebuilding of S. Caterina is not entirely clear. The architecture is normally attributed to Soria, but there is no record of Borghese financing the work beyond the initial donation: see Ringbeck, 79.

\textsuperscript{15}Borghese's protectorship of the convent was unknown to both Hibbard, \textit{Carlo Maderno}, 204-5, and Ringbeck, 75-6; below, II.6. According to Ferrucio Lombardi, work on the convent followed the transference in 1627 of the Franciscan \textit{Conventite}, also housed in the complex, to a monastery on the via della Lungara: \textit{Roma. Chiese, conventi, chiostri: progetto per un inventario, 313-1925}, Rome, 1993, 208.

\textsuperscript{16}Francesco Maria Bourbon del Monte, the patron of Caravaggio, protector of numerous religious houses, and builder of a church in Cavi in honour of S. Carlo Borromeo, the saint who had earlier established the Roman nunery dedicated to Santa Chiara: Cardella, v. 5, 301. Wazbinski's recent monograph on the Cardinal makes no mention of S. Chiara. However, the opening page of the \textit{Statuti del monast.o di S.ta Chiara} refers to the crucial vetoing role the monastery's protector, named as Cardinal del Monte, had in electing the abbess: ASV FB I, 407, unpag. (no date but script indicates early seventeenth century). As protector, del Monte is thus the most likely candidate for the previously unknown position of patron of the convent built by Carlo Maderno in 1612. Wazbinski, \textit{Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte}, vol. 2, 370, publishes an \textit{avviso} of 27 August, 1626, noting del Monte's death. Cardella wrote that he died in 1627, a date of death apparently on his tomb in the now destroyed S. Urbano: V. Comparato, "Bourbon del Monte, Francesco Maria", in \textit{DBI}, Rome, 1971, v. 13, 523-4.
monastery [S. Chiara?] without inscription or arms, rewarded enough by his own good intention". This is in remarkable contrast to Cardinal Borghese, who, despite the minor nature of his interventions, typically insisted that his coat of arms be prominently hung above the entrances to both church and convent.

As indicated, Scipione was also protector of the Dominican order. This position, which had officially existed since 1376, was traditionally assigned to a papal nephew: Borghese was preceded by Cardinal Bonelli (1580-98 - there was a eight year gap until Borghese's appointment in 1606), nephew of Pio V, and succeeded by Cardinal Antonio Barberini (1633-71). Such an arrangement had obvious advantages; as the master-general of the order wrote to Paul V on the appointment of Scipione, "it seems to me that this is the same as if Your Holiness were the protector." Borghese did indeed take an active role in the administration of the order, zealously protecting its municipal rights and controlling most of the processes of appointment and promotion. The problem was that protectorship was for life, yet when the pope died the nephew was naturally going to be a less effective influence. In fact it seems that Antonio Barberini had taken over as de facto protector as early as 1627, when one finds novitiates entering the college at his insistence; by 1631 it was he who informed the master-general in Madrid of the appointment of a new vicar-general.

Despite Antonio's increasing importance, Scipione was nevertheless the chief benefactor when in mid-1628 the Dominicans called for funds to amplify the organ in the transept of the order's Roman headquarters, S.

17"con semplicità di costumi, non ostentata.....ha fabbricato un monastero senza iscrizione, e senz'arme, contento del teatro della sua coscienza.....": ASV Arch. Boncompagni-Ludovisi 895, unpag. but 7r (n.d. but c. 1623); on del Monte's early reputation, see Haskell, Patrons and Painters, 29.
19"perché mi pare che è lo medismo che esser V. Sà il protectore", Girolamo Xaviere to Paul V, 6 April, 1606, ASV FB I 647, 155r-v; cited in Forte, "The Cardinal-Protector", 89.
20Ibid, 46.
Maria sopra Minerva [fig. 82], the church in which, coincidentally, he had earlier renovated the Cafferelli chapel. Two years later he paid for an almost identical organ on the other side of the tribune [fig. 83].

Like ceilings, the installation of organs, the principal musical instruments of the liturgy, was an integral aspect of the widespread refurbishment of churches in the period. Organ music was so vibrant in the sixteenth century that the Council of Trent tried to curtail its creative excesses. Like nude figuration in the visual arts, the "figural modulations" of music at mass were felt by the church fathers in 1562 to "delight the ears more than the mind...[and] to excite the faithful to lascivious rather than to religious thoughts". Music nevertheless flourished in Rome, a vitality confirmed with Clement VIII's extensive redecoration of the Lateran transept around the gigantic gilt organ erected above the northern door.

The Lateran organ adopted on a larger scale the elements of the design of the organ in the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's, constructed under Gregory XIII and restored in the mid 1620s. The Gregorian organ defined the basic features of the Baroque organ case, namely, the gilded combination of Serliana and the triumphal arch. The Lateran organ included in addition a creeping floral ornament, which possibly evokes of the idea of the paradisiacal garden, a garden presumably bathed in the perfect chords of celestial music. All these elements were harmonised by Soria in his design for the organs in S. Maria sopra Minerva, and Ringbeck rightly notes the organs as competing in splendour with those

21 Below, II.7.
22 Gino Stefani, Musica Barocca 2. Angeli e sirene, Milan, 1987, 113-5. Stefani suggests the pre-eminence of the organ was thought analogous to the sovereign in the political world. "Nel monarca è contenuto virtualmente tutto il corpo sociale; di riflesse, l'organo acquista dallo statuto regale il carattere di 'dominatore' degli altri strumenti...": idem, 121.
23 Quoted in Robert Hayburn, Papal Legislation on Sacred Music, 95 A.D. to 1977 A.D., Collegeville, 1979, 27.
25 Idem.
of St. Peter's and the Lateran: indeed, Soria had already worked as an assistant on the organs of both churches.26

Despite the traditional design, there are some important innovative features. In doubling the original organ, S. Maria sopra Minerva was provided with a dramatic and lustrous visual symmetry on either side of the choir. Moreover, the supports of the organs contain a new allusion, for the angels underneath, which function as herm-like brackets, are gathered into the Corinthian capitals clustered on the supporting piers; seen from below, the organs seem to burst like gold lilies from their masonry stems.27 Finally, one notes the pervasive imagery of the Cardinal, including the family emblems carved on the balustrade, the volute-like dragons on either side and the eagle breaking through the segmental pediment above. The inscription under the coat of arms indicates the context of Borghese's patronage: CARD. BVRGHESIVS. ORD. PRAEDIC[ATOR] PROTECTOR. In the context of the protectorship of the Dominicans, such display has a special poignancy. As noted, in administrative terms by the late 1620s Scipione had largely given way to Antonio Barberini. Borghese's sponsorship of the organs would thus grant testament to his nominal status as protector, affirming an authority that in reality was in decline.

The Facade of S. Gregorio Magno

In mid-1629 Borghese initiated the reconstruction of the atrium, facade, and stair in front of S. Gregorio Magno, the medieval church where

26 Ringbeck, 108-111. Soria was a colleague of the designer of the Lateran organ, Giovanni Battista Montano (1534-1621), later publishing his drawings of antique architecture (Scielta di Varii Tempietti Antichi...Libro Primo, Rome, 1624, dedicated to Cardinal Borghese). As a carpenter Soria had earlier modified the Gregorian organ for the Fabrica di S. Pietro: See also, Renato Lunelli, L'Arte organaria del rinascimento in Roma e gli organi di S. Pietro in Vaticano dalle origini a tutto il periodo frescobaldino, Florence, 1957, 75ff.

27 An opening flower is a richly allusive metaphor, suggestive of a whole range of renewal, and in the hands of Bernini at S. Maria del Popolo, the organ-case would literally become a sapling tree itself, interweaving family heraldry, the legend of the church's foundation, and the broader theme of Christian regeneration: George and Linda Bauer, "Bernini's Organ-Case for S. Maria del Popolo", Art Bulletin, 62 (1980), 115-23.
he had begun his patronal career [figs. 2-3]. The original atrium consisted of a single storey cloister projecting from a portico supported on paired Ionic columns [fig. 1]. This formed the blue-print for the alterations, which built on the existing, though fortified, foundations, seamlessly incorporating the trabeated portico into a grand new two storey arcaded cloister [figs. 84-86]. The original disposition of forecourt and facade was thus reversed, with the showpiece now being the huge structure at the top of the reconstructed stairs. This square facade of three equal bays is Soria's masterwork, its clear proportions and assertive yet uncluttered decoration combining for a restrained monumentality in harmony with the delicate bearing of the oratories beside it.

Following numerous recent examples, Soria incorporated a narthex, articulated on the facade as a three bay arcade. In earlier churches, however, a giant pediment unified the design, whereas at S. Gregorio the pediment is confined to the slightly projecting central bay. This distinctive feature followed the model of Bernini's facade of S. Bibiana (1624-6) [fig. 27], designed only a few years before. As Wittkower points out, S. Bibiana has a projecting central bay expressed as an aedicule, a motif that probably derives from Michelangelo's unexecuted facade for S. Lorenzo in Florence. Bernini's facade obviously impressed Soria, for S. Gregorio is virtually a more planular variation on its theme. By implication S. Bibiana must also have impressed Scipione himself, for Lione Pascoli records that he vetted the design for S. Gregorio: "[Soria] had resolved to make something noble and grand and, having shown his designs to [his friend, Pietro da] Cortona, took them quickly to the cardinal, who chose one that he wished to consider

---

28Below, II.8.
29Wittkower, Art and Architecture, 175. Wittkower considered the facade "palace-like", a characterisation followed by Pedrocchi, San Gregorio, 129-133. The stylistic antecedents of S. Gregorio, which include such non-portico facades as that of S. Luigi dei Francesi, are traced by Ringbeck, 120-30.
more closely, [asking Soria] to make a model of it, which he did”. Lacking information about the alternatives, the incident reveals more about Soria’s relationship to Cortona and Scipione’s role in the design process than about architectural taste. Nevertheless, it exemplifies the close and competitive observance of model and precedent in seicento Rome by both architect and patron.

The typical elements of Borghese patronage are all present, with the Borghese stemma on an escutcheon in the tympanum and the emblems among the garlands and balusters of the upper storey windows. Most striking are the dragons and eagles perched on the keystones of the lower arcade [fig. 87]. This was a motif of patronal ornament without precedent in Rome, suggesting that Borghese emblems were no longer confined to subordinating architectural elements, but now existed within the broader frame of the whole facade itself. The inscription in the frieze - S[CIPIO] EPISC[OPUS] SABIN[IENSIS] CARD. BURGHESIUS M[AIOR] POENITEN A. D. MDCXXXIII - refers to his newly won bishopric north east of Rome, granted on 22 August, 1629. The office of bishop was an ecclesiastical position for which he had waited almost twenty years, having earlier had to renounce his diocese of Bologna due to the requirement of residency.

With the Sabine diocese, however, Scipione was permitted absentee status. This was somewhat unusual, since (except with his own family) Urban VIII was normally strict in such matters and had earlier issued an edict commanding to return to their dioceses those bishops living in Rome.

---


31 “Lunedì mattina il Papa tenne consistoro, dove furono proposte alcune chiese...come anco quello di Sabina vacato per morte del Cardinale Madruzzì dal Card. Borghese con la rettione del titolo di San Crisogono chiesa restaurata con grande spesa da Sig. Ill.ma”: avviso of 22 August, 1629, Urb. Lat., 1099, 519r-v. On the Bolognese bishopric, above I. 3 n. 119.

32 “E stato pubblicato editto d’ordine di N. S....alli vescovi, et altri, che si trovano in Roma senza negotij à dover sotto diverse pene ritornare alla residenza delle loro chiese”: avviso of 21 November, 1626, Urb. Lat. 1096, 634r.
The avvisatore suggested that Cardinal Borghese's expense at S. Crisogono justified his continued habitation in the city, but he was hardly unique in this respect. Perhaps it was Borghese's long service and venerable status, along with the fact that he was no longer an influential example in college, that convinced the pope to waive the rule in Borghese's case and award him with the appointment, the crowning achievement of his church career.

We do not know exactly why the facade and forecourt of S. Gregorio were renovated. There had been no need to attend to them when the Cardinal was completing the oratories twenty years earlier. Perhaps the Cardinal's by now well-established reputation for patronage had prompted the Camaldolensians to approach him with the project for an up-grade in the abbey quarters. From Scipione's point of view, the project was timely. By the later 1620s he had refashioned both the other churches in Rome with which he was associated; the facade of S. Gregorio thus culminates his career of ecclesiastical patronage in the city. The contrast with the earlier oratories is also instructive. As noted, Cardinal Borghese was considerably more assertive in the imagery he imposed on the chapels than his predecessor, Cardinal Baronio. This paled, however, in comparison to the supremely confident personal legacy of the church facade itself.

Building in the Country

Soon after work began on the facade of S. Gregorio, Scipione initiated two more ecclesiastical commissions in his patrimonial lands south of the city. The first was for a new church and convent for the Franciscans of Montefortino [fig. 88], a hillside town about forty kilometres south of Rome.33 This was the first time Borghese had built a church in his patrimonial lands and he made public his intention of spending no less than 40 000 scudi on the complex (although this was an inflated estimate).

33Below, II.9.
The foundation ceremony was staged with some splendour, accompanied by the granting of plenary indulgences to those in attendance and concluding with a feast paid for by the Cardinal. Unfortunately, Borghese was too sick to attend himself, and the first stone, dedicated to Santa Maria di Gesù, was laid by Giovanni Battista Altieri (Borghese’s majordomo - latter Clement X) on 21 October 1629. The stone bears the inscription: SCIPIO CARDINALIS BURGESIUS EPISCOPUS S. R. E. POENITENTIARIUS, TEMPLUM COENOBIOUMQUE MINORIBUS FRANCISCANIS Scriptoris observatiae a fundamentis exstruxit, anno domini 1629.

It is unknown exactly why the Franciscans approached Cardinal Borghese in relation to the project, apart from the fact that he was an obvious candidate as local seigneur. One can, however, be precise about Borghese’s other regional ecclesiastical commission, begun about six months later. When Urban VIII came to power in 1623 one of the main tasks was to survey the state of worship in the papal states. To this end he initiated a visitation of all churches, convents, prisons, and hospitals in the

---

34 An avviso of 8 September, 1629, first reported: “Cardinale Borghese havendo risoluto di erigere nella sua terra di Montefortino uno monastero et chiesa, per servitio de Frati reformati di S. Francesco, della prossima settimana Sig.a Ill.ma tirà di quella volta per mettere la prima pietra nelle fondamenti di quella chiesa”. Then, on 27 October: “Il Cardinale Borghese per l’impedimenti dalla podagra non havendo potuto andare a Montifortino suo Castello qua vicino a gettare la pietra nelle fondamenti della nuova chiesa, et convento, che vi fa fare sotto l’invocazione di Santa Maria di Giesù per li padri riformati di San Francesco, vi fece domenica tal cerimonia da Monsig.re Altieri suo Maggiordomo sendo intervenuto alla processione molti padri della medisma religione con buon numero de preti concorsivi da qui e luoghi convici quali tutto furono splendamente cibassi a spese di Sig. Ill.ma, che si fa conti sia per spendere in tal fabrica da 40 000 scudi”. Urb. Lat. 1099, 602r and 687r. Borghese’s securing of indulgences is indicated by a later letter to Cardinal (presumably Francesco) Barberini. “Havendo risoluto di rifar la chiesa di Monte di Compatri, e di porre la prima pietra domenica prossima, che sarà la prima di Maggio [sic; the stone was laid on 5 May], piglio ardirò di supplicar V. S. E. à d’impresarme da N. (S.) indulgenza plenaria per tutti quelli, che in tal giorno interrevanno à quella funzione?). Una simile grazia mi concesse par N. S. i mesi passati per Montefortino...di Mondragon”: 28 April, 1630, ASV FB I 99, 214v.
36 Nussdorfer, Civic Politics, 25.
lands, taking more than eight years to gather the information needed for effective reform. Visitation delegates had the power to recommend immediate remedial action if they encountered a particularly dire situation. Such was the case in 1629, when the delegate reported unfavourably on the parish church of Monte Compatri. The visitation found that the church was unable to accommodate the community; that its walls were leaking, deformed, and generally in ruin; and that its bell-tower was leaning over. The report therefore recommended that "as a matter of urgency and necessity the church must be brought back to a more decent and dignified state".\footnote{"ac diligenter perspexit totum corpus ejusdem ecclesie parochialis de iurepatronatus III.mo ac R.mi D.mi Scipionis Cardinalis Burghesi et invent ex aspectu loci et parochii relationem illam non esse capacem ad recipiendum in ea populum de terre...Perspexit etiam murum, cui immediate aderet altae majus SS.mi Sacramenti ob contrucam et magnam humiditatem provenientem ex stillicidiiis cisterne contique damnum, ac defformitatem maniam afferre, itaut pericolosum sit alicujus ruine. Insuper inventit campanilem ejusdem ecclesie quod ruinam manifestam minabatur. Quapropter ob dictas satis urgentes causas, et necessitates decrevit ecclesiam ipsam in decentiorem et ampliorem formam redigendam esse..."; ASV AB 555, 315; full text quoted in Ringbeck, 94 n. 375.} Monte Compatri was a town under the patrimony of Cardinal Borghese and it was the Cardinal who was thus ultimately responsible for the state of its worship. Accordingly, he lost little time initiating construction of a church that would meet the community's needs and satisfy post-Tridentine liturgical standards. The foundation stone of a new church was laid on 5 May, 1630. It bears the inscription: \begin{quote}SCIPIO CARD.LIS BURGHESIUS AD NOVA AEDIFICANDAM ECCLESIAM VIRGINI DEI GENTRICI DICATAM SUB ANTIQUO PATRONATUS IURE DOMINORUM MONTIS COMPATRI PRIMUM HANC LAPIDEM IECIT ANNO D. 1630 DIE V MAII.\end{quote}\footnote{"Cardinal Scipione Borghese laid this first stone, dedicating the new church building to the Virgin mother of God, under the ancient legal patrimony of the lords of Monte Compatri. 5 May, year of the Lord, 1630." Transcribed in Saturnino Ciuffa, \textit{Monte Compatri e i castelli limitrofi}, Vignanello, 1927, 94. (The stone was actually laid by Borghese's majordomo, Giovanni Altieri: Ringbeck, 94.) The foundation ceremony also included the granting of plenary indulgences: above, n. 34.} Both of these rural projects are strikingly simple in architectural terms. At Montefortino the convent courtyard has almost no pretence at
ornamentation, articulated through no more than balanced proportions and a simple use of tufa stone for piers, pilasters, and window surrounds [figs. 89-90]. The church itself adopts the familiar Roman idiom of a hall with lateral chapels, with the additional extension of the separate choir behind the altar indicative of its monastic use [figs. 92-94]. The two storey facade [fig. 91] with giant volutes and pediment also presents a recognisable silhouette, which mimics the more eloquent contemporary screen facades of the city. As in the convent, the stone detail is noteworthy. Or perhaps one should say lack of detail, for the pilaster capitals are barely indicated, while the entablature has reverted to a flat lintel band. This is like the band articulation of the upper storey of S. Sebastiano, taken to an extreme. Here the elements of architectural language have been pared down to an almost vernacular level, divested of all but the most cursory features of classical ornament.

Similar observations can be made of the church in Monte Compatri. Like the Franciscan church, the design is a miniature version of a contemporary Roman hall church, complete with shallow lateral chapels divided by a Gesù-like system of arches and paired pilasters [figs. 95, 98-101]. The sense of this being a transplanted design is unmistakable in the facade, which adopts the overall idiom of the giant screen - somewhat awkwardly, given the extremely cramped setting [figs. 96-97]. As at Montefortino, the decoration is strikingly simple, a simplicity accentuated by the crisp contrast between rendered brick and hard stone. The use of Tuscan pilasters - the plainest of the orders - is significant, and one notes the way the pilasters on the second storey of the facade have given up even a rudimentary indication of ornament. Other elements, such as the aedicule surrounding the main door or the segmental pediment over the upper

39Below, II.10.
window, have a similarly severe and archaic quality, one quite remote from Soria’s architecture in Rome.

The simple articulation of these two rural churches in Montefortino and Monte Compatri is worth emphasising, for as indicated it contrasts to the projects of Borghese and his architect in Rome itself, particularly the almost exactly contemporary facade and atrium of S. Gregorio Magno. Perhaps the decoration could simply be described as inexpensive. Given the constancy of craftsmen, building types, and construction techniques, the chief factor in determining the cost of an average size church was ornamentation. Indeed the simplicity of these two churches (and convent) is directly reflected in their combined cost, from their foundation to consecration, of around 40 000 scudi. In comparison, the restoration of S. Sebastiano had come to 27 000 scudi, the remodelling of S. Crisogono close to 40 000 scudi, while the facade and atrium alone of S. Gregorio would amount to almost 15 000 scudi. In all these examples the expense was generated by the high quality of decorative materials and finishing, whether in stone, stucco, or gilding. In contrast, at Montefortino and Monte Compatri Borghese’s builders were able to use the local tufa (asprone), a more easily worked and cheaper stone than travertine. Marble was not used, the statue niches were left unfilled, there was no internal stucco decoration, while painting was restricted to Montefortino’s plastered altar (there is no trace, or record, of the original altar of Monte Compatri).

Although there was a commensurability between cost and material beauty, it does not follow that inexpensive architecture corresponded to a belief that these churches were unimportant compared to those within Rome itself. Even assuming that the Cardinal set budgetary restrictions,

---

40Reinhardt, 98, estimates Borghese spent just under 35 000 scudi on the two churches; the higher figure cited here is justified on the grounds that Reinhardt generally did not calculate payments made after Borghese’s death, which in the case of Monte Compatri included the major account for stonework.
economy in building outside the city was not purely a financial matter. It was an essential tenet of architectural theory that ornament should be tailored to the particular character and context of a building. For Sebastiano Serlio, the disposition of orders - the principal vocabulary of ornament - was chiefly determined by use. Thus when he advocated the primitive Tuscan order for 'rustic' architecture, he had in mind not buildings in the country but rough and utilitarian structures (city gates, fortifications, prisons, aqueducts, and the like) on the metaphoric outskirts of the civilised environment. This was consistent with the earlier recommendations of Alberti, who advised that a building's type will determine its ornament. Yet Serlio added the possibility of another factor, implying that the typology of usage was shaped by the degree of urbanity or rusticity associated with the building. From here it was only a short conceptual step to include location itself as one of the defining criteria of a building's decoration. This was explicitly affirmed by Vincenzo Scamozzi, who stated simply that the ornamentation of a building should reflect where the building is situated - more decorated in the city and less on the

41 Apart from the inflated report in relation to Montefortino (above, n. 34) there is little actual record on the extent to which the Cardinal gave instructions on such matters. It was normal, however, for patrons to define the upper limits set on spending. See, for example, Alessandro Farnese's letter to Vignola regarding the cost of the Gesu, Robertson, Il Gran Cardinale, 187; Cardinal Montalto's pledge for S. Andrea delle Valle, reported in an avviso of 30 April, 1608, Urb. Lat., 1076, 303v; Cardinal Aldobrandini and the ceiling of S. Maria in Trastevere, above, ch. 3 n. 6.


43 "It is quite clear that building does not require the same ornament:...sacred works must be furnished for the gods, secular ones only for man." Alberti, On the Art of Building, bk. 8, ch. 1, 244. This view is implicit throughout books six to nine.

44 In that the natural environment was associated with primitive purity (hence the chaste Doric order for churches dedicated to founder saints: Serlio, bk 4, ch. 6, 139), the issue emerges as one of allusion: if decorum demanded that utilitarian buildings in an urban environment bear the unpolished informality associated with rustic life, it also required that sacred buildings in a natural environment display the solemnity associated with the simple, 'natural' orders.
In practice, it was normal to articulate a building according to its setting, an aesthetic exemplified in the marked contrast between the archaic Doric order and unpolished stone of S. Biago (Antonio da Sangallo the Elder, 1518), standing in the fields at the foot of Montepulciano, and the delicate detailing of the major buildings within the town itself.

In the case of the two churches designed by Soria, the significance of the varying degree of simplicity should be noted. At Montefortino the church stands apart from the hillside town, looking out over the fields toward Valmontone. Accordingly, its decoration is less refined than that of the church of Monte Compatri, which sits at the apex of a concentrically laid-out village. Here the location is suburban rather than rural and the ornament correspondingly less minimal, maintaining in particular a precise articulation of the basic elements of Tuscan pilaster, capital, and entablature [fig. 97]. Indeed, it is of similar order to other small-town churches in the region, including the later S. Tomaso di Villanova in Castelgandolfo (Bernini, 1658-61) and S. Andrea in Paliano (Antonio del Grande, 1664-66), both of which are expressed in the delineation of Tuscan pilasters against plain and unbroken wall surfaces.\[46\]

Despite the simplicity of the churches in Montefortino and Monte Compatri, both facades carried the essential features of Borghese’s urban buildings: the Borghese escutcheon in the tympanum (that in Monte Compatri is now missing) and the frieze inscription, SCIPIO. EPISCOPUS SABIN. S. R. E. CARDINALIS. BURGHESIUS. M. POENITENTIARI. ANNO DOMINI MDCXXXIII. The patronal imagery is here of a particular importance. Although there were specific administrative reasons for the

---

45 Vincenzo Scamozzi, L’idea dell’architettura universale, part II, bk. 6, ch. 1, 2.
46 Rudolf Wittkower noted the restrained exterior of S. Tomaso was "in keeping with the modest character of the papal summer retreat to which the church belongs": Art and Architecture in Italy, 178. On del Grande’s architecture, see Alba Costamagna, “I principi di Paliano e alcuni momenti della committenza nella ‘Campagna’”, in L’arte per i papi e per i principi nella campagna romana grande pittura del’600 e del ’700, Rome, 1990, vol. 2, 18-19.
building of both churches, from a patronal point of view these are overshadowed by the fact that the Cardinal was the proprietor of the lands in which the churches were built. As indicated, this was explicitly stated on the foundation stone of the Monte Compatri church, which records that the Scipione's building of the church was done according his "ancient legal patrimony" of the town.

The churches are therefore indicative of the Cardinal's seigneurial status. As discussed in chapter 1, the majority of Scipione's income while cardinal-nephew was spent buying land south of Rome. This was investment with a short-term return in the form of fixed annual sums agents paid for the normally nine year long privilege of collecting rents from the perpetual lease holding inhabitants.\textsuperscript{47} Reinhardt calculates that of the 2 000 000 scudi Scipione spent on real estate during his career, 591 000 scudi was returned in rental income (of which the Tusculum and Montefortino holding were major components).\textsuperscript{48} Mainly, however, Scipione's spending on real estate was a long-term investment for the family, with the patrimonial privileges regarding hunting, trade, and magistracies transferable to his heirs by papal decree.\textsuperscript{49} The acquisition of land also meant that of title, which in this case wast an investment of great prestige, for the lands of these southern regions had been gathered together for almost four hundred years, with a heritage of ownership that reads as a roll-call of traditional Roman aristocracy.

Given the newly earned patrimony, the Montefortino and Monte Compatri churches were in one sense the final, ecclesiastical, elements of comprehensive building campaigns that served to establish the Borghese physical presence in the areas. Borghese had bought the Tusculum

\textsuperscript{47}Rossella Vodret Adamo, "La vicenda storica di Monte Porzio Catone e la committenza artista di una grande famiglia romana: I Borghese", in \textit{L'arte per i papi}, vol. 2, 155.
\textsuperscript{48}Reinhardt, \textit{96}.
\textsuperscript{49}Reinhard, \textit{Papstfinanz}, vol. 1, 26.
holdings, which included the towns of Monte Compatri and Monte Porzio, in 1613. His authority in Monte Porzio was established soon after with the conversion of the eastern wall of the town into a shallow (just one bay in depth) family palace [figs. 102-103]. This was a striking symbol of Borghese’s seigneurial status, for the gateway through the wall into the town became in addition the entrance to the palace, prominently marked with the family emblems [figs. 104-105]. Such was the urban component; the major buildings in the region were the villas in the surrounding country. The most important was the Villa Mondragone, built in the 1570s for the Boncompagni (whose own emblem provided the name, Mons Dragone) and greatly extended by Scipione at huge cost (over 136 000 scudi!) between 1616 and 1621. The resultant size and luxury had a specific purpose, for the villa was originally intended as the venue for papal business during spring and autumn, a two to three week event of startling logistical difficulty, when almost the entire court was uprooted from the Vatican and transported to the hills. So great was the scale of such occasions that the nearby Villa Taverna, also owned by Scipione and known at the time as the Villa Borghese, was used as a guesthouse for the overflow of dignitaries, all those "crimson vested princes, kings' ambassadors, and great prelates" who

50 Adamo, "La Vicenda storica di Monte Porzio", 155-160. Adamo cites the relevant carpentry and stonework (Gironamo Falciani) misure e stime in ASV AB 4173 and 4174, signed by Giovanni Vasanzio. Since Villa Mondragone is only short distance away (about two kilometres) it is uncertain who would actually stay at the palace. Perhaps it was used by Borghese's rent collector or other municipal official.

51 Marcucci, "Villa Mondragone", 127-30. Borghese owned as many as four villas in the region: below, II, appendix 2. Filippo De Rossi described the Villa Mondragone in 1645 as "il maraviglioso edificio di Mondragone esposto ai fiati de'venti più felici signoreggia dal suo sublime sito tutta la campagna di Roma...Il Card. Scipione Borghese con magnificenza regia le diede il compimento, aggiungendo saloni, e appartamenti nobilissimi Galeria longhissima, ampio theatro [etc.]...": Ritratto di Roma moderna, 522-3.

52 The procedures followed when Paul V, Scipione, Marcantonio, and some of the famiglia, would journey to the villa on 1 April and 1 September each year were detailed by Monsignor Costaghuta (Paul V's majordomo) in "Instruttione per l'Andata di N.ro S.re a Frascati", published as an appendix to Grossi-Gondi, La Villa dei Quintili, 250-69.
could not fit into the main villa. After the pope's death, Villa Mondragone was primarily a place for the Cardinal's relaxation, its elevation above the river-plain of the city centre providing what was traditionally regarded as one of the chief causes of good health - fresh air. Indeed, since the mid sixteenth century Frascati had replaced Tivoli and Viterbo as the favoured retreat for newly landed clerics, reviving images of Tusculum's heyday in antiquity, with the palatial gardens providing the ambience of leisureed rusticity that had been so praised by the ancient authors. With the villas in the countryside and palace at the entrance to Monte Porzio, Cardinal Borghese's landed authority over Tusculum was well represented by the 1620s. The building of a church in nearby Monte Compatri in early the 1630s was the final but critical element, a permanent expression of the public spiritedness and piety of the region's new proprietor.

Although it served slightly different purposes and lacked the antique allusions of Borghese's building in Tusculum, there was nevertheless a similar pattern of development in Montefortino. The town had previously been owned by the Colonna; Scipione's task was to assert his own proprietorial presence following the acquisition of the estate in 1615. Initially this was done personally, with papal visits and tax concessions quickly establishing Borghese's popularity. Soon after Paul's death,

53 De Rossi described the villa on a "sito alquanto inferiore a quella di Mondragone, fu dal Card. Scipione Borghese notabilmente aggrandita per la sua numerosa corte...V'albergo spesse volte nel Pontificato di Papa Paulo V. Principe d'immortal memoria, grandissimo numero di principi purpurati, d'ambasciatori regij, e di prelati grandi, in guisa, che difficilmente può persuaderselo, chi non se ne assicura considerando la villa di presenza.": Ritratto di Roma moderna, 520-21.
54 The importance of fresh air became a particulary pressing issue following the 1630 plague, as discussed below.
55 David Coffin, The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome, Princeton, 1979, 9-16 and 24-42; see particularly the engraving of the area by Matteo Greuter (1620), reproduced idem, 44-5.
56 Attilio Cadderi, Artena , 115-16, who publishes a contemporary account of the rain-marred papal procession to the town on 11 October, 1615. According to Dino Ramacci, the pope was fond of Montefortino and spent long periods there in 1617 and 1620: "Il Palazzo Borghese di Artena", Strenna Ciociara, (1973), 135.
Scipione began an extensive building campaign, one centred on the seigneurial palace in the middle of town [figs 104-105].

Much of the work on the palace was concerned with upgrading the interior and uniting its separate buildings with a three storey gallery, the south side of which was articulated as an arched loggia to a courtyard [figs. 106-107]. The palace was also the focus of a broader programme of civic improvements, including a new Palazzetto del Governatore, the laying of a new street leading to it, the reconstruction of the main piazza to include a granary underneath, and the erection of a new town gateway. The west face of the palace provided the thematic guide for the reordering of the piazza, its rendered brick and tufa detailing looking directly across to the similarly detailed Palazzetto [figs. 108-109]. The latter building was the residence of the town governor, one presumably appointed by the Cardinal. The symbolism of this civic palace facing the Borghese seigneurial palace, across the Borghese-built piazza (atop the Borghese-built granary [fig. 110]), is obvious; together they formed twin foci of authority in what was virtually a mini-Borghese state. In fact the town’s entrance, the aptly named Arco Borghese [figs. 111-112], is immediately below the piazza. A triumphal arch in the rustic order, the structure is dominated by the Borghese eagle on the keystone and their dragons in the medallions on either side; above is a Borghese escutcheon with cardinal’s hat and the inscription SCIPIO CARD. BURGHESIUS. So prominently does it bear Scipione’s name and the Borghese symbols that, like the arched entrance to Monte Porzio, passing through the gateway was to enter his private domain, a dependent civic community ordered like the elements of his personal parklands. Like the church in Monte Compatri, that of Montefortino was the critical ecclesiastical culmination of the Cardinal’s private and civic building in the

---

57The renovation of the palace and the related civic works are discussed below, II. 9.
58Below, II. 9.
region. Whatever the immediate reasons for its construction, its broader meaning is within the context of a new proprietor using architecture to establish his patronal authority.

In converting the traditional seigneurial castles into modern palazzi, undertaking campaigns of civic improvements, and building new churches, Borghese's activity in his patrimonial lands was typical of past and future papal families. The archetype was Pius II's transformation of Corsignano into Pienza in the late 1450s, where the architect Bernardo Rosselino arranged the cathedral and the three palazzi (episcopal, civic, and seigneurial) on a trapezoid, unifying the four facades in the modern all'antica style and impressing all with the imagery of the Piccolomini. In the sixteenth century, the Farnese had transformed much of northern Lazio in their own image, particularly Viterbo. The following century Borghese's successor, Ludovico Ludovisi, also adopted the practice in Zagarolo, converting the seigneurial palace (yet another of the Colonna), funding the completion of the church of the Annunciation, and extending himself as the Jesuits' chief patron by building a church for the order and an additional chapel in honour of Ignatius Loyola in the now destroyed church of S. Sebastiano. None, however, was quite so unmistakable in the seigneurial inflection of urban imagery as the mid seventeenth-century Chigi modification of Ariccia. Entering the town, one confronts the seigneurial castle (formerly of the Savelli) opposing the church of S. Maria dell'Assunzione, the former remodelled according to the template of a seicento Roman palazzo, the later erected as a modern version of the Pantheon. The striking feature of their relationship is the alignment of central doors: from the palace entrance, which tellingly recalls

59 Robertson, Il Gran Cardinale, 131-2.
60 Angela Negro, "Committenza e produzione artistica nel Ducato di Zagarolo dai Ludovisi ai Rospigliosi", in L'arte per i papi, 201-209. Ignatius had been canonised by Ludovico's uncle, Gregory XV; Ludovico would later finance the order's novitiate church of S. Ignazio.
that of the pontifical palace on the Quirinale, one has a direct view to the high altar, a highly symbolic sight line measuring the ceremonial passage to the Mass of the Chigi lords.

In retrospect, Ariccia was a high point of post-Tridentine regional building; Cardinal Borghese’s buildings in towns such as Montefortino, Monte Compatri, and Monte Porzio seem modest in comparison. Nevertheless, all exemplify the same issue regarding the construction of ruler imagery. Yet legitimating authority was not the sole motivation of such architectural interventions. At the close of the sixteenth century the seductive pleasures of absentee landlordism were memorably portrayed by Stefano Guazzo (via the mouthpiece of Annibale Magnacavallo). Guazzo tells the story of the urban lord at the local rural mass, who, overwhelmed by the awed reception granted him by the townsfolk, surrenders to delusions of grandeur: whereupon "he returned to his manor filled with pride and glory, which lasted for more than a quarter of an hour, and at that point he really did believe that he was a great master".61 Guazzo’s anecdote satirises a social type that had become increasingly common since the mid-sixteenth century, one whose pretensions were intimately associated with the awareness of the capacity of architecture, in individual monuments and the composite of civic elements, to create a total urban environment of seigneurial authority.

61"...conosco io alcuni gentiluomini più humili che altieri, i quali consentono à quel proverbio, che è meglio esser capo di lucerto, che coda di dracone. E mi ricorda d’haver udito un gentilhuomo assai piacevole raccontare ch’egli non è mai così lieto, e gonfio come quel giorno che par tendosi dal suo podere se ne và alla messa ad una Chiesa campestre, ove non concorrono se non certi contadini, i quali, quando egli entra in chiesa, subitamente si ristringono tutti presso le mura, e facendogli strada nel mezo dalla porta infino all’altare, gli s’inchinano con riverenza e ammirazione, e gli lasciano in torno grande spatio di terreno voto, nè vi è alcuno ch’ardisca d’accostargli, et si serba un continuo silentio, e l’curato finita la messa si rivolge, e gli da il buon giorno, e tutta la turba nell’uscir di nuovo, gli s’inchina per modo tale ch’egli risalutandoli con gravità si ne ritorna al suo podere ripieno d’una occulta gloria che dura per un quarto d’hora, e gli fa credere in quel primo punto ch’egli sia un gran maestro.” Stefano Guazzo, Dialoghi piacevoli, Venice, 1590, 360; passage cited in Claudio Donati, L’idea di nobilità in Italia secoli XIV-XVIII, Rome and Bari, 1988, 161.
Seigneurial authority rests on the collection of rent, and in this sense Scipione's regional building projects were the visible articulation of economic interest. In fact, given the perpetuity of the leasing and the antiquity of the holdings, all the towns mentioned so far were varieties of feudal holdings. This in itself is not particularly noteworthy; what is significant is that in the 100 or so years after the Council of Trent, the very period of the greatest rationalisation of papal government and its boundaries, almost every town within a fifty kilometre radius of Rome was transformed by an urban clerical gentry into a satellite system of rejuvenated feudal arrangements. In economic terms this reflected a shift of capital from the city - with its manufacture and finance and trade - to the land, a process described by some historians as a refeudalisation of the central Italian economy, one of the key phenomena in the dramatic post-Renaissance decline of the Italian economy from its continental pre-eminence.62 Money into land was partly the result of the growing paucity of spending opportunities elsewhere in the economy.63 Apart from real estate, the only other viable avenue for capital was the public debt (monti), itself symptomatic of the malaise.64 (Scipione Borghese himself invested a total

62 Carlo Cipolla pointed to the high costs of production (especially taxes and wages) in comparison with French, Dutch, and English competitors, as the principal reason for the decline in demand for Italian goods and services, and concomittant fiscal shift to the land: "The Economic Decline of Italy", in Cipolla (ed.), The Economic Decline of Empires, London, 1970, 196-214; see above, ch. 1 n. 78, for more detailed references on the state of the seventeenth century economy.

63 Richard Goldthwaite revises this traditional interpretation in suggesting that investment opportunities did not so much contract as fail to keep pace with the increasing supply of money; hence the flow of capital into land and corresponding growth of deposit institutions: Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300-1600, Baltimore/London, 1993, 38. This, however, puts a positive spin on a fundamentally negative process. The increase in money supply was illusory, or at best double edged, for it was largely the result of inflation, caused not by growth but by debt and influx of silver from the Americas. Moreover, the institutions accepting deposits were not conversely making loans, like a bank, but financing debt.

64 Monti consisted of a fixed number (usually 1000) of equal interest (usually 6-10%) yielding shares erected either to service interest on debt or for other designated purposes (for example, Monte guerra ungharese, 1595). The first Monte (delle Fede) was established in 1525, probably copied from the Florentine tradition of private monti: Delameau, Vita economica, 209-16; Stumpo, Il capitale, 247-9; Michael Veseth, Mountains of Debt. Crisis and Change in Renaissance Florence, Victorian Britain, and Postwar America, Oxford, 1990.
of 660,000 scudi in *monti*, his second largest investment category after real estate.) Yet the phenomenon of land investment was also fostered by its own aristocratic justification, which significantly coincided with the general growth of absolutism and reinvigorated notions of vassalage. In this respect it is symptomatic that the most influential political theorist of the period, Giovanni Botero, was chiefly concerned with systems of hierarchy. Similarly, Botero's counterpart in ethics, Stefano Guazzo, was almost exclusively concerned with noble behaviour in a justly ordered society, a concern that met with great success - *La Civil Conversatione* (1574), written in the tradition of Castiglione and Della Casa, went through around thirty editions up to 1631. Finally, the concentration of investment in the land corresponds to the general romanticisation of rural life at the turn of the century, a trend most notably encompassing the flourishing of pastoral in poetry and the rise of landscape in painting. In short, there was a thriving cultural framework that both promoted and legitimised the process whereby papal families such as the Borghese avidly converted ecclesiobureaucratic enrichment into the foundation of landed aristocratic wealth.

**Gout, Plague, and Good Works.**

Borghese's regional church building closes his career. The relatively modest nature of these last enterprises provides a coincidentally enigmatic conclusion to a life of unparalleled splendour. Yet Borghese's life had in fact been scaling down since the mid 1620s. At his height, Scipione had at his service three city palaces. This grandeur partly dissolved following Paul V's

---

65 Reinhardt, 99.

66 In this respect, Goldthwaite contrasts the wealthy of the late Renaissance with those of the fifteenth century, who, notwithstanding some enthusiasm for heraldry, were little influenced by the feudal consumption model: *Wealth and Demand*, 150-76.

67 See the recent critical edition by Amedeo Quondam, *Stefano Guazzo, la civil conversazione*, 2 vols., Modena, 1993. The work was also translated into the major European languages and there were fourteen Latin editions printed in Germany between 1585 and 1673: Claudio Donati, *L'idea di nobiltà*, 151-3.
death; having sold his palace in the Borgo, Borghese moved his household in 1621 to the family headquarters in the Campo Marzio, joining his aunt Virginia Lante and cousin Marcantonio. As a private cardinal with no particular connection to any foreign court, Borghese's official hospitality was considerably diminished. As such, his main Roman property, the villa on the Pincio, became less of a showpiece banqueting centre and more of an art gallery and personal sanctuary. From 1629 the size of his household steadily decreases: from 174 in May of that year, to 160 in September, 1630, to 154 in December, 1632. It is difficult to be too specific about his biographical data, for the archival sources begin to dwindle from the later 1620s. The avvisi report him infrequently, while the only surviving volume of letters (1629-30) is fairly inscrutable, being mostly confined to the family's financial and administrative interests. Yet this creeping scarcity in the archive may also be symptomatic of growing reclusion. Fifteen years earlier Borghese was ubiquitous in the records; in his final years, rarely appearing in the public forum, he is almost entirely represented by his building projects.

As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, Borghese's patronage of ecclesiastical architecture increased since in the latter half of the 1620s. This is starkly reflected in his patterns of expenditure. Up until 1626, the Cardinal had spent approximately 55,000 scudi on church building, about 1.1% of his total expenditure; from 1626 to 1633, he spent a further 78,000 scudi on churches, about 5.2% of expenditure (the figure rises close to 9% in

---

68 The crowded living situation at Palazzo Borghese eventually necessitated the building in 1624-26 of a separate palace, across from the main residence, especially to house Scipione's extensive famiglia: Ringbeck, 62-63 and 178-185 (docs. 23-29); Waddy, Seventeenth Century Roman Palaces., 109-111.

69 Borghese's spending on banquets after Paul's death ranged between one-third and one-tenth of the amount of the cardinal-nephew years: Reinhardt, 43-95.

70 Ibid., 179.

71 ASV FB I 99. The only other registro of letters of the post cardinal-nephew years is for 1623-4, ASV FB II 478.
the last three years).\textsuperscript{72} From 1630 onwards, for the first time in his life, Borghese spent more on ecclesiastical architecture than he did on palaces. This was mainly because work on the Palazzo della Famiglia, Villa Mondragone, and Villa Pinciana was completed by the end of the 1620s, but it is significant that no new projects were initiated. There was also a change in the direction of his investment, with spending on \textit{monti} dramatically overtaking that on real estate. Although he was still only in his early fifties, it seems Borghese stopped expanding his fixed assets well before his death.

Borghese's declension from public life was therefore accompanied by an increase in his patronage of religious architecture and a decrease in that of his private building. The question is whether or not there is a meaningful relationship between these three facts. Volker Reinhardt, at least, noted a significant correlation between the last two, suggesting either that there was a "spiritualisation" of the Cardinal's patronage at the end of his life, or that he was deliberately constructing for posterity a more pious personal and family legacy after a lifetime of accumulation of assets.\textsuperscript{73} Reinhardt prefers the second interpretation, but in my view it is the weaker of the two, or at least insofar as it is considered separate from the first: public building as self or familial aggrandisement is a relevant context throughout the Cardinal's life, but as a specific interpretation it begs the question. Why would Scipione feel the need to assert a more pious image in this period, considering that the family fortune had been made long before and that he personally, except for a short period after the restoration of S. Sebastiano, had always been engaged in ecclesiastical architecture? What is important is the link between the change in the direction of his investment and the circumstances of his life. Earlier, I discussed Cardinal Borghese's building as

\textsuperscript{72}Calculations based on figures supplied by Reinhardt, 89-95, rounded and with some adjustments - Reinhardt does not factor the cost of the Caffarelli chapel, nor consider the payment of building debts for S. Gregorio Magno after Borghese's death: see below, II. 8.

\textsuperscript{73}Reinhardt, 180.
indicative of patronal and ecclesiastical magnificence, a well accepted interpretative approach and one significantly confirmed by the triumphant details of Borghese's biography. While magnificence remains relevant, particularly considering the prominence of inscriptions and overall building strategies, it can no longer be taken as a personal index during Borghese's final years. On the contrary, magnificence contrasts with Borghese's diminished stature, and this, combined with the blackening mood of Rome and the psychological consequences of the Cardinal's own deteriorating health, provokes a new, though perhaps no less traditional, interpretative context.

Borghese had never been an especially healthy man. He had almost died from one fever contracted in his early thirties and simple debilitations always seemed to him more threatening and long-lasting than normal. To modern observers this sickly tendency may come as a surprise, being in such contrast with the robust associations of his universally acknowledged jovial temperament. Yet certain ills were in fact characteristic of Borghese's constitution, understood by contemporaries as being warm and humid, the classic combination that results from the blood humour's predominance.

74His most serious illness was in 1610, when he was so sick through the summer and autumn that arrangements were made for his passing: avvisi of 1610, Urb. Lat. 1078, 541r, 556r, 562r, 572r, 589v, 608v, 626r, 640r, 662r, and 722v.

75In 1623 the Venetian ambassador Renier Zeno had harshly attributed the Cardinal's frequent indispositions to the soft living that stemmed from his distemperate complexion, which he predicted would cause Borghese's early demise (Relazione, 158-59). Others, however, were more generous. One anonymous critic neatly summed up the Cardinal's genial character. "Il Card.le Borghese temperò la severità di Paulo con la facilità de suoi costumi, essendo più tosto mancato istruzione, e buon consiglio, che bontà di natura, la quale predominata, e rischiara dal sangue poteva in lui prepararsi a tutte le forme, natura veramente blanda, e versabile, grata e fallace à speranti, implicità nelle simulationi, e nelle lusinghe, ma senza amaro": ASV Archivio Boncompagni-Ludovisi, 895, n. 6, unfol. The most detailed assessment of the Cardinal was made in 1627 by Angelo Cardi, who described the Cardinal's character as being formed by the interaction of upper, or celestial (astronomical), influences, and the lower, or natural, influences; that is, the spirits and the four humours, which in Scipione was blood-dominant: ASV FB IV 151, Idea della sanità, 32r; reproduced below III.4. A later report by an unnamed physician proceeded on the basis of the Cardinal's warm and humid temperament and sanguine complexion: ASV FB IV 133, Modo di Conservare la Sanità, (prologue dated 25 February, 1629), 5r and 20r.
From the mid 1620s the signs multiply that Borghese was being overtaken by increasingly severe ailments.76 One infirmity in particular bedevilled Borghese's final years - gout.77 Gout is an inflammation of the joints, once thought to result from a concentration of humours. The Italian term for Scipione's variety, podagra, refers to the principal affliction of the feet, the catchment of the overflow from the upper body's humoral superfluity.78 In the past gout was regarded as the by-product of sloth and gluttony, an unfortunate penalty paid by aging bon vivants.79 Its debilitating effects were chillingly described by a contemporary physician as a "violent stretching and tearing of the ligaments, sometimes [resembling] the gnawing of a dog, and sometimes a weight; moreover, the part affected has such a quick and exquisite Pain, that it is not able to bear the weight of the Cloaths upon it, nor hard walking in the Chamber."80 In the seventeenth century the patient could expect the disease to become evermore severe, with bouts soon lasting

---

76 The Cardinal was indisposed for much of 1623; in spring with urinary defects (kidney problems?), then in autumn with a fever: Urb. Lat. 1093, 249v and 632v.

77 The first recorded incidence in 1627 suggests it was already a common occurrence. "Il Sig. Card.le Borghese rihavutosi del suo male podagra mercordia mattina se ne passo alla sua villa di Frascati...": avviso of 6 November, 1627: Urb. Lat. 1097, 576v. Constant banqueting took its toll on the sacred college and gout was always a threat to its more hospitable members. Cardinal Salviati was one such sufferer in the sixteenth century: Pierre Hurtubise, "La table d'un cardinal de la Renaissance: Aspects de la cuisine et de l'hospitalité à Rome au milieu du XVIe siècle", Melanges de l'Ecole franaise de Rome, Moyen Age Temps Modernes, 92 (1980), 263-64. Scipione's successor as cardinal-nephew, Ludovico Ludovisi, suffered from gout, and for relief would go to Torre del Greco near Naples, where the air was sweeter: avviso of 1 January, 1631, Urb. Lat. 1101, 2r. Urban VIII was also afflicted: avviso of 21 August, 1632, ASV Seg. dello Stato, Avvisi, 82, 212r.

78 The English gout comes from the old French goute, which, like the general Italian term gotta (covering gonagra, chiragra, and podagra), derives from the Latin gutta, meaning a drop of liquid. Podagra in the present sense had an antique use (podagrae doloribus) and was ultimately derived from the Greek, literally meaning 'to snare an animal by the feet'. Medical interest in the ill was uniform throughout the continent; the varieties of gout were profiled by Philemon Holland, Gutta Podagrica: A Treatise of the Gout, London, 1633 (facsim. ed. Amsterdam, 1971), 1-5.

79 Thomas Sydenham (1624-80), the century's most comprehensive etiologist of the disease, wrote: "The Gout most commonly seizes such Old men, as have lived the best part of their Lives tenderly and delicately, allowing themselves freely Banquets, Wine, and other spirituous Liquors, and at length by reason of the Sloth that alway attends Old-Age, have omitted such Exercises as young Men are Wont to use", Sydenham, The Whole Works of That Excellent Practical Physician...corrected from the Original Latin by John Pechey, London, 4th ed., 1705, 342.

80 Ibid., 344.
the whole year (excepting summer), and he (gout was thought to be a peculiarly masculine ailment) would eventually end a slave to his need for bed rest, light food, and clean air. The only proven remedy was to bleed out the excess humours, an inconvenient and painful process that exposed the patient to the risk of dropsy.

Such was the case for Cardinal Borghese, who by 1629 was firmly in the podagric grip, so much so that in autumn he was actually forced to have a proxy lay the foundation stone of the Franciscan church in Montefortino. It seems his deterioration had accelerated: two years earlier Angelo Cardi, Scipione's personal physician, had concluded that at just fifty years of age the Cardinal could consider himself in his prime. In contrast, another physician's report of 1629, while retaining a customary tone of optimism, warned that if the Cardinal did not begin to moderate his habits then gout would be just one symptom of the many problems caused by an habitually over-heating constitution. The palliative suggestions for gout were generally applicable: he should avoid rich food (especially beef, which makes too much blood, and eel, which impedes urine and stimulates gout), take plenty of clear air (the mountains), and make more of an effort to exercise on a regular basis. In short, he was to lead the very opposite of the life he had led his entire career. The doctor warned that failing to heed his advice would have serious consequences, for the stars augured badly and the Cardinal could expect a malady within two years that could well be critical if he failed to temper his desires.

Borghese's health, however, continued to decline. It is possible that he did take heed of some of the warnings: his villa near Frascati was ideally

81 Above, n. 34.
82 Cardi, 30v-34v, 40v-42r, 45v-48r (below, III.4).
83 ASV FB IV 133, 5r-14r.
84 Ibid., 17r-18v. Later the doctor suggested Scipione prepare himself for the infirmity by, beginning in 1630, cleansing himself of all superfluities, including a disburdening of his bad blood after the autumn or spring equinoxes (21v-22r).
located for clean air, while extended periods of rest (whether forced or otherwise) may well be one explanation for why reports of public activities were becoming increasingly rare. But he did not lose weight - just the opposite. In fact by 1632 he was obese, which would have aggravated not only the gout but also the other problems of circulation and over-heating identified in the 1629 report.\(^{85}\) The clearest document of the Cardinal’s condition is Bernini’s renowned profile study [fig. 116] (c. November 1632, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York), a preparatory sketch for the even more famous marble bust. The drawing is normally thought to sparkle with the same vitality observed in the bust.\(^{86}\) Yet close inspection reveals a candid study of a weakened individual, albeit one softened by the artist’s affection for his former patron. Note the sagging skin and limpness around the edge of the parted lips: Borghese, rather than bursting with life, is doing little more than breathing, having relaxed the muscles that might have kept his mouth closed. Moreover, the eyes suggest a rheumy glaze, the red chalk showing heavy lids and puffy bags. The importance of the drawing’s colour should be stressed, for it was used to emphasise morbid inflammation, a

\(^{85}\)In 1627, Cardi, 34r, had estimated the Cardinal’s weight at 200 libbre (about 68 kilograms). Even taking into account he was of below-average height (somewhere around 150 centimetres, judging by full length group portraits, such as the panel on Paul V’s tomb in S. Maria Maggiore, the lunette of Paul and Scipione in the Vatican libraries, or Pietro da Cortona’s Udienza concessa da Paulo V al Principe Savelli nel 1620, Schloss Rohran Collection, Harrach), 68 kg was only moderately over-weight. Other portraits (for example, by Ottavio Leoni, c. 1617, Musée Fesch, Ajaccio, reproduced in C. Roxanne Robbin, “Scipione Borghese’s acquisition of paintings and drawings by Ottavio Leoni”, \textit{Burlington Magazine}, 127 (1996), 456-57) show that for most of his career he had a full rather than obese figure.

\(^{86}\)The drawing is normally reckoned to have a more straightforward relationship to the bust. Rudolf Wittkower’s opinion - that a lively Borghese was represented in conversation - is typical, \textit{Gian Lorenzo Bernini. The Sculptor of the Roman Baroque}, London, 1955, 2nd ed. 1966, 13. Wittkower was followed by Howard Hibbard, \textit{Bernini}, Harmondsworth, 1965, 93; Valentino Martinelli, \textit{Bernini, disegni}, Florence, 1981, unpag. notes to tav. XI; Charles Scribner, \textit{Gianlorenzo Bernini}, New York, 1991, 22, who says the drawing contains "no hint of imminent mortality". On the other hand, Felice Stampfle and Jacob Bean noted the contrast between the bust’s "official idealizing" and the drawing’s "time-mellowed private man", \textit{Drawings from New York Collections II. The Seventeenth Century in Italy}, New York, 1967, 53. Ann Sutherland Harris wrote ambivalently that "in no other portrait does Bernini create so strongly the impression of a living human presence, an effect all the more poignant to those spectators who know that the Cardinal died a few months after the bust was completed": \textit{Selected Drawings of Gian Lorenzo Bernini}, New York, 1977, xvi.
quality lost in a black and white reproduction. The drawing does exude life, but the effervescence is all in Bernini's handling of chalk, for the view is onto a sick man. Lest my interpretation projects too much onto the drawing, Borghese's poor health is confirmed by a letter sent by a concerned colleague soon after the Cardinal sat for Bernini.87

If the evidence is unmistakable that Borghese's final years were endured in escalating ill-health, this was not his only concern. Indeed as his condition declined, the worst plague in living memory drifted over the peninsula, crossing the Alps in the autumn of 1629 courtesy of the German soldiers passing through Lombardy on their way to sack Mantua.88 Rome, far enough south and with one of the best systems of public health in Italy, managed to avoid disaster.89 It did not, however, avoid the fear engendered

87"L'antica obligatione con la quale vivo alla persona di S.ra Em.a, et il sentire ch'ella non goda buona salute, come per l'ultima sua, della quale mi hà favorito, mi spingono ad'accompagnare con queste due righe il S.re Honorato mio agente, acciò à nome mio venga à riverire l'Em. sua, e con la risposta me dia relatione del stato dell'Em.ma sua persona, osservando S. E. che niuno de ser(vito)ri suoi in desiderarli prosperità e sanità perfetta supererà mai l'infinito desiderio....": Cardinal of S. Cecilia [Giovanni Spinola] to Borghese, 23 January, 1633, ASV FB III 103abc, 234r.

88The existence of the plague north of the Alps had already been known to Italian authorities: on 30 July, 1629, the papal legate in Bologna had advised Milan, Genoa, and Florence that trade, diplomacy, and all other contact was indefinitely suspended with Switzerland and the south of France: ASR, I Bandi, b. 14, n. 193. Carlo Cipolla, Fighting the Plague in the Seventeenth-Century Italy, Madison/London, 1981, 100, provides a table of mortality rates, on average around 40%. See the same author's Cristofano and the Plague. A Study in the History of Public Health in the Age of Galileo, Los Angeles, 1973, 15-21, and Faith, Reason, and the Plague. A Tuscan Story of the Seventeenth Century, trans. M. Kittel, Brighton, 1979. Studies of the 1630 plague are generally written on a regional basis: see Cipolla, Fighting the Plague, for bibliography.

89Perhaps because the city avoided devastation the impact of the 1630 plague on Rome has also largely avoided scholars' attention: Pastor, vol. 29, 366-70, provides a guide to the main sources; Mario Vanti, I ministri degli infermi nella peste del 1630 in Italia, Rome, 1944, 108-17, details the administration of the Flaminia quarantine station. The best account is by Laurie Nussdorfer, Civic Politics, 145-161, which in particular discusses the preventative measures taken by the civic government. The decrees issued both by the Congregazione della Sanità and directly from the Apostolic Camera, each mostly concerned with reinforcing banishment and quarantine, record the fluctuating intensity of the threat. The city steeled itself well in advance, for although the first guard on all the doors of Rome came on 7 January, 1630 (Gigli, Diario romano, 109), the plague did not enter the Papal States until June, when contact with Bologna was suspended; in August contact was banned with virtually all of Italy north of Florence: ASR Bandi, b. 14, nos. 160, 164, 169, 171 and 185. By the second half of the year Rome was virtually islanded and the food supply had to be assured; on 15 July it was forbidden for anyone who produced food within a thirty mile radius around Rome to take it anywhere other than into the city: idem, b. 14, n. 176. In April the following year the Congregazione della Sanità issued an order that completely cut off the city, resulting in
by the mysterious contagion.\textsuperscript{90} The plague cast a pall over the city for more
than two years, overwhelming its newsworthy life and, as news of horrors
elsewhere in Italy escalated through 1630, granting all Romans a sobering
perspective on their day-to-day concerns. Apart from the sorrow at loss of
life, equally unsettling was the perception of the plague as divine
punishment for human sins. Moreover, there was almost no escape from it,
for the plague was not seen as a discreet contagion but as a malignancy of
the environment, a putrefaction of the world's vapours signified by a
holistic mix of natural and celestial omens.\textsuperscript{91} As an elemental infection it
was linked to general conditions of existence: the air's contamination, even
if the disease itself was kept at bay, was transmitted to the body via
respiration, where it ultimately caused a corruption of the humours
(especially blood, being the most closely associated with air) and attendant
decline in virtue.\textsuperscript{92} Cardinal Borghese, already suffering the consequences

\textsuperscript{90} Gigli wrote eloquently of the fearful mood of the city, noting the widespread belief that
certain evil men were spreading the disease via mortiferous liquors: Gigli, \textit{Diario Romano},
117; also \textit{avviso} of 17 August, 1630: Urb. Lat. 1100, 490r. Another \textit{avviso} of 31 August, 1630,
indicates the widespread topos of the fear, this time in Naples: "Che ivi [Naples] erano
state carcerate alcune persone sotto pretesto che andassero attavaiido il contagio alli pili
dell'acqua santa, che sono nelle chiese, et non si era tuttavia veduto alcun effetto maligno"
(520r).

\textsuperscript{91} The signs, for example, of the plague - such as the flourishing in the waters of crabs, frogs,
and toads at the expense of fish were structured by Antonio Sponta according to Apocalyptic
portents (see especially Rev. 16): ASV FB I 685, "Tratato contra la peste et il male et
Contagio" (dated 21 March, 1631, dedicated to Cardinal Borghese), 9v-10r (another version
was dedicated to Urban VIII, in BAV Barb. Lat. 4301; see Pastor, v. 29, 370 n. 3, for a list of the
main plague treatises). Apart from some medicines and bleeding Sponta advised that the best
way to confront the plague was to avoid the problem by moving away from the pestilential
marshy heart of Rome to where the air is good and uninfected (25v). In Scipione's case that
meant the elevated safe havens of the castelli romani, where, of course, he was fortunate
enough to have some villas. This was consistent with the advice of 1629: "...la mutatione
dell'aere causa infermità come per esperienza si vede nella peste, dove per la inspiratione
dell'aere putrefatto si putrefanno gli humori del corpo. Deve però esser puro e libero da ogni
corrutzione. Il buono è orientale, che non sia vicino à laghi, paludi, caverne e simili; perche,
come dice Avicenna, \textit{Sol orien clarificat aere}m." ASV FB IV 133, 5v-6r.

\textsuperscript{92} Sponta, 11v-13r.
of his own humours' dysfunctioning, may well have seen the grim relevance of the broader humoral disturbances caused by a world gone awry.

Although Borghese had no official role in the fight against the plague, it appears he nevertheless took an active part in helping authorities with the situation.\textsuperscript{93} Two \textit{avvisi} of June, 1630, indicate the use of Borghese's villa on the Pincio for the quarantining of an aristocratic relative of one of the Cardinal's colleagues.\textsuperscript{94} Although the plague was theoretically regarded as an infection of the air, experience had taught that separation of people and goods was the key to prevention. Quarantine was imposed outside each of Rome's seven principal gates in specially constructed pesthouses.\textsuperscript{95} The main pesthouse was near Porta del Popolo, the northern and most critical entrance to the city (given infected persons were likely to come from the north).\textsuperscript{96} Borghese's Pincio villa is also near the Porta del Popolo gate and it is thus possible that it was used for the quarantining of diplomatic visitors and other dignitaries. Even if it only had a limited application, the quarantining of Cardinal Trivulzio's son could hardly be regarded as merely a friendly gesture offered by Borghese to his peer. Quarantine was too serious an issue to be compromised by any offhand hospitality - officials

\textsuperscript{93}James Harper researching Barberini patronage for his doctoral dissertation (University of Pennsylvania) kindly informs me that Borghese was not listed on any of the boards associated with the Congregazione della Sanità (Andrea Nicoletti, "Della vita di Papa Urbano Ottavo", BAV Barb. Lat. 4733, vol. 4, 347). He did, however, have close contact with the officials, with his cousin, Prospero Caffarelli, serving as secretary to the Congregazione: Mario Vanti, \textit{I ministri}, 117.

\textsuperscript{94}"Qui si fanno esatte diligenza per preservare questa città da ogni sospetto di contagione et havendo il S. Card.le Trivultio voluto visitare il Principe suo figlio nella vigna del S. Card.le Borghese gli'è convenuto di restar anch'egli a fare la quarantina, et un tale custode d i una terra di Marina per non havere osservato gli ordini della Cong.re della Sanità mandato un Galea per sette anni". Three days later, on 26 June, it was reported that the Prince and Cardinal were free to leave: "Il S. Card.le Trivultio p(er) l'amore che porta al S. Pr(i)n(ci)pe suo figlio volendo visitare mentre che stava nella vigna del S. Card.le Borghese facendo l a quarantina si è contentata di rimanere, l'Eminenza sua lascio al fine della med.ma quarantina onde sabato sera entrono ins(iem)e in questa città": Urb. Lat. 1100, 367r and 382r. As the \textit{avvisi} indicate, cardinals and dignitaries were not exempt from the quarantine regulations. Further exploration of how the imperatives of Rome's diplomatic life coped with the quarantine regulations is one reason why the effect of the plague on Rome deserves a more detailed study.

\textsuperscript{95}Nussdorfer, \textit{Civic Politics}, 147-9.

\textsuperscript{96}Vanti, \textit{I ministri}, 109.
would have been present on the property to monitor confinement and access to its normal inhabitants and staff would have been severely restricted. The incident may well be an isolated one in Borghese's case but it nevertheless exemplifies a particular social attitude, for in a time of crisis such as the plague, public spiritedness was expected of wealthy individuals, especially of church leaders (indeed, his sort of charitable action was woven into the economic logic of pre-industrial societies, with their chasmic inequities and rudimentary welfare). In an Aristotelian sense, such a gesture was an example of magnanimity, the selfless deed of the great-souled: at the funeral of Cardinal Antonio Barberini the younger, for example, the eulogist dwelt upon the Cardinal's donation of his villa in Rheims (his diocese) for use as a hospital during the plague of 1656. The orator stressed that this was a magnanimous act, the Cardinal preferring "to openly sacrifice himself for the public good rather than selfishly conserve his private interests". Borghese's donation of his own villa should be interpreted primarily in the same ethical terms, a self-sacrificing gesture made for the greater good in a time of extreme crisis.

The donation could also have been regarded as a type of good work, a personal act of piety presented to the pestilential face of an angry God. If an event like the plague, massive and mysterious, was a fertile environment for public gestures and good works, then it follows that its portents must

97 Carlo Borromeo's charitable work during the 1576 plague in Milan was proverbial, while his nephew Federico's tireless efforts during the 1630 Milanese epidemic were immortalised by Alessandro Manzoni in I Promessi Sposi, chapter 28.

98 "Del che mi fa pienissima fede la generosa beneficenza, colla quale à publica utilità s'adoprò nella pestilenza di Rens con evidente pericolo della vita per salvare il suo popolo dalla morte. Ritrovavasi egli in una villa di sua Diocesi, e alla prima fama de velenosi sibili, quasi diffondea questa serpe, date in un baleno le spalle all'amenità de'giardini, portò rapidissimo il piede tra l'horror de'sepolchri, nè fu bastevole à riternerlo qualunque è più ardente preghiera, è più autorevole istanza, che gli facessero i più cari amadori della sua vita, che amò meglio di sacrificare al ben publico con appararsi. Hor qual'eloquenza è bastante à coronar condegno encomio questa magnanima impresa?": Giovanni Battista Gizza, La Magnanimita panegirico, detto ne'funerali del signor Cardinal Antonio Barberini...dal P. D. Gio. Battista Gizza, Rome, 1671, 22-4 (BAV. Stamp. Barb. V.X 38; reference courtesy of Karin Wolfe).
also have cultivated the necessary salvational mood. Moreover, the generally amplified sense of mortality tended to focus attention on public duty as an extension of personal humility, an idea freighted with a peculiar poignancy for the already moribund Borghese. In this context one might query whether Borghese's church building at the end of his life was in any way informed by an overall sense of concern over his own mortality. If Borghese did have a sense of anxiety about his soul's salvation it was not reflected in extra-charitable payments - as noted earlier, the increase in alms-giving in his final years was more a function of the loss of his cardinal-nephew status. Nor is there anything in Borghese's testament that would indicate an amplified piety: 10 000 scudi to Cardinal Antonio Barberini as the protector of the sacred house of Loreto; 1000 scudi to the Propaganda Fide; 200 scudi donations to thirty seven Roman churches, hospitals, and religious institutions; 30 scudi to twenty poor spinsters. Although the donations added up to a substantial amount and were all ultimately associated with the idea that gifts helped secure salvation, they were no more than conventional testamentary gestures closely related to the Cardinal's various protectorships. Yet testaments were by nature conventional, their main purpose being to set the terms of inheritance, and it would be surprising to find that Borghese had waited for the framing of what was essentially a document of family administration before making special endowments. What remains striking is the concentration of the Cardinal's resources on religious architecture over the preceding five years.

Thus far, Scipione's church building has been considered primarily in administrative terms: the oratories of S. Gregorio and the restoration of S. Sebastiano were fulfilments of his commendatorial duties; the remodelling of S. Crisogono was a titular affirmation of personal status; the Caffarelli

99Ch. 3 n. 45.
100Most of the charitable gifts in the testament were paid out by the end of October, 1633: ASV AB 6094, 1r-39r.
chapel was an expression of paternal family solidarity; the facade of S. Maria della Vittoria resulted from a transaction associated with Scipione's collecting of art; the work at S. Chiara and the organs of S. Maria sopra Minerva were due to the Cardinal's role as protector of the relevant orders; the churches in Monte Compatri and Montefortino were extensions of his assumption of patrimonial control. Indeed he often received something in return for building - at S. Sebastiano, S. Gregorio, and S. Crisogono it was a benefice, at S. Maria della Vittoria an antique statue. Even the broader motives have been discussed in secular terms: magnificence and/or outward piety were regarded as instruments of the body-politic, while the rhetoric of display was seen nourished by social hierarchy. Such perspectives do not cynically discount the more obvious religious imperative. They simply result from the fact that for an historian spiritual motivations are normally considered via their conventional manifestation, their extrinsic integration with cultural values at large. In certain cases, however, one must soften the materialist interpretation by a more direct consideration of religious motivations. As already suggested, each of the projects from Borghese's final years is adequately accounted for by the relevant administrative circumstances; nevertheless, the distinctive nature of the Cardinal's last years may also have shrouded the projects in a atmosphere of public and personal foreboding.

For a long time Scipione had known he was dying, his own decaying body providing a constant reminder of mortality. Borghese's slowly maturing personal frailty was later brought into sharper relief by the plague, which both heightened awareness of death and focused the mind on the link between a humoral imbalance and the celestial coordinates - whatever its effect, Borghese was moved at least to public spiritedly grant his villa as a quarantine station. The plague highlighted the powerful link of the individual with his physical world; Borghese's ill-health was not seen as an
unfortunate but discreet malfunctioning, but was perceived within the broader natural and divine framework of the body's formation.

Moreover, the physiognomical diagnosis of the Cardinal carried its own prescriptive baggage. If Borghese's gout and other ailments were by-products of his constitution, the positive side was that the sanguine man was noted for his expansive personality, a personality given to public religiousness, charity, and magnificent works.\textsuperscript{101} From 1629 Scipione - unhealthy, living amid plague, and aware that his character and physique were his fate - may well have made a deliberate effort to live up to his image. At the very least, one must acknowledge the solace that would have been granted to the ailing Cardinal by ecclesiastical building in his final years. Some of Scipione's contemporaries, including Cardinal Bellarmine and Cardinal Antonio Barberini the Elder, demonstrated in their death the same worldly renunciation they followed in life, adopting the austere manner of saints.\textsuperscript{102} For others, however, the path to salvation was laid with public works and charity. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, for example, dramatically increased his ecclesiastical patronage in the last quarter of his life, ostensibly for his salvation after death.\textsuperscript{103} Earlier Cardinal Borghese had

\textsuperscript{101}Cardi, 31r-v (below, III.4).
\textsuperscript{102}Gigli reported on Bellarmine's death in January, 1621. "Fu ancora nel suo vivere mirabile, perché essendo Cardinale fu sempre poverissimo tal che non haveva mai appresso di se denari. Essendo Vescovo, et vedendo, che il voleva, che stesse in Roma, rinunzio il Vescovato, et dicendogli il Papa, che in questo lo dispensava, non lo volse pero ritenere, e rinunziandolo, non si volse serbare alcuna pensione, ne volse mai benefici, se non tanta entrata, quant'avesse vivere, et di quella non di meno faceva moltissime elemosine, et visse tanto provandamente, che alla sua morte non lascio un quattrino di debito, et esseno vacati li benefici, che haveva, no lascio roba alcuna; ordino di esser sepellito nel Gesù senza alcuna pompa, ma Papa Gregorio mando alli Padri della Compagnia denari per farli il funerale": Diario Romano, 5. Bellarmine's tomb, paid for Gregory XV and made by the Bernini, was installed in the apse of the Gesù. The tomb itself was destroyed in 1843, though Bernini's bust survives in place: Wittkower, Gian Lorenzo Bernini, 182. Antonio Barberini the elder's (Cardinal of S. Onofrio) floor tomb in S. Maria della Concezione carries the bare inscription, HIC IACET PULVIS CINIS ET NIHIL - "here lies dust, ashes, and nothing else". (The Barberini inscription in the Capuchin church was pointed out to me by Karin Wolfe.)
\textsuperscript{103}Clare Robertson argues Farnese's increased ecclesiastical patronage from the late 1560s indicates an amplified personal spirituality, although she cannot quite reconcile the "monumental self-advertisement" of the Gesù with genuine piety: Il Gran Cardinale, 158-62. Robertson, 313, also cites a document unearthed by Paolo Pecchiai, suggesting Farnese's dramatic increase in alms giving at the end of his life was the result of Jesuit advise
been advised that alms-giving, like architectural patronage, promoted an image that would help deflect criticism of his materialist ways. Such cynicism, however, mocked good intentions, for alms to the poor and needy remained a pious work that prepared the soul for eternal well being. Likewise, church building was a good work that could help correct a ledger more critical than that of the Roman court.

Farnese's almsgiving was seen as a tool for his salvation. The contract (1587), which held Farnese to 30,000 ducats a year in alms to the poor, was drawn up by the Jesuits, and was unequivocal about its efficacy. "Largitori bonorum, quae de manu eius [Farnese] acceperat, ita ab eius decreti die expertus fuit liberalem Dei benignitatem in anima sua: accensus enim vero desiderio aeternae salutatis, et bonorum spiritualium dulcedine recreatus, confessione generali, et spiritualibus exercitiis; primo se ipsum disposit, deinceps usque ad mortem exemplari vita illustris; tandem felicissimam mortem adepit, pro temporalibus, quae pauperibus dispersit, aeterna bona consequutus est" (Archivium romanum societatis Jesu, Arch. Chiesa del Gesù, b. 1, n. 9, published in Pecchiai, "La buona morte del Cardinal Alessandro Farnese", Roma, 21 (1943), 339-44).

104 Above, ch. 3 n. 44.
EXCURSUS: BERNINI'S BUST OF CARDINAL BORGHESE

If Borghese's ailing condition casts a distinctive shadow over his ecclesiastical patronage, it also raises important questions regarding the traditional interpretation of one of the most renowned of all works associated with the Cardinal - his marble portrait bust [fig. 117], sculpted by Gian Lorenzo Bernini late in 1632. Indeed, from the very moment it was carved, this bust was recognised by all as one of the great creations of the era, a work that pulses with a life denied to its medium. Its uncomplicated vivaciousness is now commonly regarded as heralding a more personal approach to official portraiture, animating the sitter's character formerly confined by the conventions of status and office. So successful is the work that it is barely regarded as official portraiture at all. Instead, art historians have focused on the relationship between the artist's innovative preparatory technique and expressive manipulation of marble, looking in vain for some key to unlock the portrait's intimacy. Considering, however, that a portrait is always more of a representation than simply a likeness (not to mention the importance of empathy to the portraitist) should prompt us

105 I refer to the original bust, with the crack across the forehead. There is a second bust, virtually identical, almost as brilliant, but slightly less animated than the first (both are in the Museo Borghese, Rome). The story of the two busts is told by Filippo Baldinucci, Vita del Cavaliere Gio. Lorenzo Bernini, Milan, 1821, 19-20; and Domenico Bernini, Vita del Cavalier Bernini, Rome, 1713, 10. Documentation is provided by: Italo Faldi, Galleria Borghese., 37-9; Howard Hibbard, "Un nuovo documento sul busto del Cardinale Scipione Borghese del Bernini", Bollentino d'arte, 46 (1961), 101-05; John Pope-Hennessy, Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture, London, 1963, vol. 2, 129-30.

106 Bernini himself thought it one of his most accomplished works. Some years later he remarked to Antonio Barberini regarding the bust, "Oh quanto poco profitto ho fatto io nell'arte della scultura in un si lungo corso di anni, mentre io conosco, che da fanciullo maneggiava il marmo in questo modo": Baldinucci, Vita, 20.

107 A. E. Brinkmann noted how Bernini, like Rubens, managed to capture a moment from the life of the sitter: Barockskulptur. Entwicklungsgeschichte der Skulptur in Den Romanischen und Germanischen Ländern seit Michelangelo bis zum 18. Jahrhundert, Berlin, 1919, 233. Howard Hibbard likened the bust's effect to the genre portraits of the Caravaggisti, noting it was the first serious sculpted portrait in the new 'naturalistic' style: "Un nuovo documento", 104; an interpretation repeated in Hibbard's Bernini, Harmondsworth, 1965, 96. Vincenzo Pacelli observed that the bust in showing movement contrasted with the ideal view of the Renaissance: L'ideologia del potere nella ritrattistica napoletana del seicento, Naples, 1987, 201-03.
to look less at the artist and more at the sitter and the culture of self-presentation. As we have seen, the Cardinal's medical records contrast significantly with his vivacious image. In this sense, it is revealing to position the bust's expressive gestures between contemporary ideals of vivacity and Scipione's actual decrepitude. First, however, one must reassess the keystone of the bust's apparent informality; that is, the open mouth, which for over forty years has been seen as pursed in the act of speaking.

The idea that Bernini depicted Borghese speaking originates from a public lecture by Rudolf Wittkower on the artist's bust of Louis XIV (1665, Versailles, Château). Virtually in passing, Wittkower regretted the lack of preparatory sketches of the king that might have illustrated Bernini's stated method of capturing the sitter's personality in informal situations, recalled by Chantelou as "walking around and talking as usual without being tied down in any way; had he [Louis XIV] been constrained to stay in one position, he [Bernini] would not have been able to make the portrait so lively". Wittkower went on to cite the Pierpont Morgan study [fig. 116] for the bust of Scipione, "which may be called a speaking likeness of the sitter, since he is clearly in conversation. The eye is sparkling and the mouth about to open. It is remarkable that the same liveliness emanates from the marble." Wittkower's observation, made informally to emphasise the work's vivacity, found its way into the first edition (1955) of

---

108 The method of viewing a portrait in terms of empathy (by both artist and beholder) for the sitter is explored by E. H. Gombrich, "The mask and the face: the perception of physiognomic likeness in life and in art", in Gombrich, J. Hochberg, and M. Black, Art, Perception, and Reality, Baltimore/London, 1972, 1-46.

109 Paul Freart De Chantelou, Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini's Visit to France, trans. M. Corbett, Princeton, 1985, 115; also, Baldinucci, Vita, 136. It hardly needs pointing out that this was a preparatory technique and nowhere did Bernini say that such study was the basis of the actual form of the finished bust. On the contrary, the sentence quoted above ends with the statement that when making the actual portrait Bernini would put aside the studies, "lest he should make a copy of his own work instead of the original."

110 Rudolf Wittkower, Bernini's Bust of Louis XIV, London/New York/Toronto, 1951, 7. Brinckmann, Barockskulptur, 233, had earlier connected Bernini's portrait style (exemplified by the Borghese bust) to his preparatory technique as reported by Chantelou.
his monograph on the sculptor. Here the drawing is referred to as a "snapshot" (Wittkower himself qualified the term with inverted commas), while the bust itself now shows "the cardinal as if he were engaged in conversation".\textsuperscript{111} Wittkower was followed by Howard Hibbard, who hardened a simile into a fact: "the Cardinal is portrayed in the act of speaking."\textsuperscript{112}

This interpretation, seemingly supported by Baldinucci's and Chantelou's general remarks on Bernini's working methods, has since informed almost every writing on the bust and has even affected the general conception of Baroque portraiture - if only as a counter-point to other sculptors' practices.\textsuperscript{113}

As a portrait that depicts speech, the bust has generally been considered as a 'speaking likeness', that mainly literary conceit exemplified by the story of Pygmalion.\textsuperscript{114} John Shearman has argued convincingly for the genre in Renaissance portraiture, noting the cross-fertilisation of literature that praised the representational arts for their ability to all but create life (the semblance Plato condemned) with increasingly knowing and

\textsuperscript{111}Wittkower, \textit{Gian Lorenzo Bernini}, 13.

\textsuperscript{112}Hibbard, "Un nuovo documento", 102.

\textsuperscript{113}For example, Mark S. Weil, publishing a previously unknown bronze bust of the Cardinal, cites Wittkower's analysis and affirms "my discussions of Bernini's bust of Louis XIV and Bernini's method of designing and carving portrait busts are based on this essay": "A Bronzetto of Scipione Borghese by Bernini", \textit{Source}, VIII-IX (Summer/Fall, 1989), 39. Weil presumes on grounds of connoisseurship that the little bust "is a cast of a clay bozzetto made by the master in preparation for the famous marble portraits of the cardinal in the Galleria Borghese in Rome," (34) and suggests that by the turn of the head Bernini wanted to evoke busts of "great thinkers of the past", such as the bronze Pseudo-Seneca now in the Museo Nazionale, Naples (36). On the other hand, Jennifer Montagu contrasts Bernini's "speaking likenesses" with Algardi's more formal approach: \textit{Alessandro Algardi}, New Haven/London, 1985, vol. 1, 158-9.

\textsuperscript{114}Pliny the Elder, the principal authority on ancient art and source of numerous topoi, had noted of Aristides of Thebes that his subjects were painted with such expression that one of them almost appeared to speak: \textit{Natural History}, XXXV, 98-9. Such naturalism was bound to end in frustration, and Giorgio Vasari wrote that Donatello exorted Zuccone (Florence, Museo dell'Opera del Duomo) "favella, favella, che ti venga il cacasangue": \textit{Le vite de più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori}, ed. G. Milanesi, Florence, 1878, vol. 2, 405.
literary-minded portrait painters. Baldessar Castiglione, for example, alluded to his own famously life-like portrait by Raphael when he wrote in an elegy to his beloved Ippolita Torrello that her portrait "seems to me often to want to say something, and to speak with your voice". It should be pointed out, however, that none of the examples cited by Shearman show the sitter physically speaking, but rather allude, directly via painted epigrams or indirectly via the legends that surround them, to the sense of speaking as a sign of animation. Poetry's advocacy of art's mute eloquence (loquace pittura redipinta) continued as a major theme for seventeenth century writers, especially those working within the ambit of Giam Battista Marino. Painters, too, explored the conceit, feigning the depiction of sound. Elizabeth Cropper has interpreted Caravaggio's Lute Player (c. 1595-96, Leningrad, State Hermitage Museum), with its strumming musician, legible sheet music, and sardonically placed still life, as a comment on painting's ultimately sterile power to vivify the inanimate, a sentiment that would look forward to Marino's meditations on the tension between the liveliness of art and the artifice of life. The idea of art having the illusion of life, of being even more life-like than life itself, was a familiar topos, so much a part of the repertoire of cultured conversation that it could crop up in (seemingly) casual observation, as it did when Maffeo Barberini disingenuously mistook Bernini's bust of Cardinal Montoya for the real thing. Bernini's later bust of Borghese would unite all these critical

116 Ibid., 136.
118 Bernini, Vita, 16. The anecdote is a part of the literary and critical tradition explored in Rensselaer Lee's classic article, 'Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting', Art Bulletin, 22, (1940), 197-269. Regarding expression, Lee cited Horace's maxim of empathy Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi (if you want me to weep, you yourself must first be grieved) and noted the unconscious parody by the sixteenth century critic Lomazzo, who exhorted the painter to render figures in life-like fashion, causing the observer "to smile with him who smiles, think with him who thinks...desire to eat with him who eats precious and
strands, finally realises an ekphrastic ideal, the portrait so lively it seems to speak; in fact, ironically and self-reflexively, it is doing just that!119

The idea in relation to Bernini's bust has become so standard it is well to remember that it is largely a recent view. Antonio Muñoz noted in 1919 that Bernini had depicted the Cardinal "in the grand manner, carving the bust broadly, giving it a breadth and vast fullness... [to show] the Cardinal's rich, potent, life-loving nature...with the mouth a little open to enable him to breathe more freely".120 In 1900, Stanislao Fraschetti described how the bust's "fat face is actually alive and palpitating...[with its] mouth half-opened, in a natural attitude, almost seeming difficult of breath, the wind drowned by that enormous chest."121 Both characterisations accord with that of Bernini's friend Fulvio Testi, who described in a letter (29 January, 1633)

delicate foods, fall asleep with him who sweetly sleeps...": idem, 218. One might add, 'speak with him who speaks.'

119 On ekphrasis and its influence on seventeenth century theory and practice, see Jennifer Montagu, The Expression of the Passions. The Origin and Influence of Charles le Brun's Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière, New Haven/London, 1994, 58-60. Ann Sutherland Harris recently invited the painter Simon Vouet into the speaking likeness group, again citing Wittkower as a source: "Vouet, le Bernin, et la 'ressemblance parlante'”, Simon Vouet. (Actes du colloque international Galeries du Grand Palais. 5.6.7 fevrier, 1991), ed. S. Loire, Paris, 1992, 193. Harris in fact nominated Procaccini's (1600, private collection) and Vouet's (1615, Arles, musée Réutu) open mouthed self-portraits as the precursors of Bernini's bust, associating both with Pliny the Elder's stories of Aristides of Thebes and Polycnoutus of Thasos, who "showed the mouth wide open...giving expression to the countenance" (Natural History, XXXV, 58-9). The mouth may convey liveliness, but why would a self-portrait be speaking? Surely not to address the viewer, who as argued was normally entreated by less literal means.

120 "Così trovandosi di fronte alla figura robusta e superba del suo protettore, Bernini si foggiò uno stile nuovo, che il Baldinucci chiama con indovinata espressione maniera grande, tagliando il busto più largamente, dando gli un respiro e un empito più vasto, che fa subito pensare a Rubens. Il cardinale ricco, potente, felice, amante della vita raffinata, buongustaio del bel marmo come del buon piatto, impetuoso, esuberante di vita, sbuffante sotto la porpora che gli pesa materialmente e moralmente, il rappresentato dal Bernini con la berretta un po' di traverso, il collare del mantello che sembra allargato con una stratta di mano, per sentirsi più libero, la bocca un po' aperta per respirare più ampiamente, e in tutto il viso qualche cosa di lucido, di luminoso, di pronto": Antonio Muñoz, Roma Barocca, Rome, 1919, 86-7.

121 "Il volto grasso è veramente vivo e palpitante...La bocca appare semiaperieta, in attitudine naturalissima, e sembra quasi che v'esca il soffio affannoso, di quel petto enorme, affogato nell'adipe": Stanislao Fraschetti, Il Bernini. La sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo, Milan, 1900, 109. Yet at the end of the description Fraschetti perhaps sowed the seed of the Wittkowerian interpretation: "Il busto meraviglioso ha una intensa espressione nell'attegiamento naturalissimo, tanto lontano dalle pose statuarie e grandeggianti, così che sembra proprio di veder rivivere il prelato famoso, affondato in un'alta sedia quadrata, nell'atto di ricevere familiarmente le udienze o di dettare ai segretari una corrispondenza diplomatica" (idem, my emphasis).
"a head alone of Cardinal Borghese, that is his portrait made in marble, *that is actually alive and breathing*".122

Was he speaking, or breathing? An open mouth was a common motif in religious imagery, usually conveying some sense of revelation. Bernini himself was a master of the emotion and he would regularly separate his subjects' lips to convey divine ecstasy - one has only to think of *S. Teresa* (1647-52, Rome, S. Maria della Vittoria, Cornaro Chapel). It was a far rarer feature in his portraiture, though not unknown: Bernini had earlier portrayed *Gregory XV* (c. 1623, private collection) with parted lips, mouthing, according to Scribner, "a prayer - or papal benediction".123 On the other hand, unspeaking wonder, not prayer, probably explains the open mouth of *Gabriele Fonseca* (1668-75, Rome, S. Lorenzo in Lucina, Fonseca Chapel), straining in his veneration of the Host. Bernini here portrayed Fonseca projecting out at seventy five degrees from the side panel, a disposition significantly similar to the form of wall tombs, where the deceased's head and shoulders jut out above a commemorative inscription.124

In a general sense, just as a portrait was a memorial that cheated death, so the open mouth might be related to the ancient but persistent idea of the mouth as the door of the soul, the passage for inhalation of God's breath.125 When not evoking divine being, breathing physiognomically

---

125Giovanni Battista Della Porta, *La Fisionomia dell'huomo, et la celeste*, (1586), Venice, 1652 bk. 2, ch. 13, 204. In a similar sense, the mouth was the servant of intelligence, the faculty that separates us from beasts: Plato, *Timeaus*, 75; Marino describes the mouth as "*la
signalled carnate sensuality, the exhalations of the mouth invoking the plaintive emotions associated with the heart: as Della Porta wrote, the sighing of a mouth is "always a sign of love, or sorrow, that is a tightening of the heart." The other notable Bernini portrait bust with a partly open mouth is that of his mistress Costanza Bonarelli (c. 1636, Florence, Museo Nazionale), whose parted lips express not just sensuality, but her own breath of being, her own intensity, the source of those heady vapours that fuelled Bernini's blinding love.

Taken by itself - speaking or breathing - the distinction may seem slight. Indeed, it may even be wrongly expressed as an either/or proposition, for they are hardly mutually exclusive expressions. Bernini himself would say that a portrait should strive for a particular movement and that the mouth before or after speaking presented an especially opportune moment. He did not, however, mean this in the literal sense that a portrait should represent someone before or after speaking, but in the sense that an action taken from life should be the basis for both conveying

126 "Sospirare sempre s'ha per segno di amore, ower di dolore, cioè de stretezza di cuore": La Fisonomia., bk. 2, ch. 2, p. 217. In Scipione Francucci's La Galleria the exquisite beauty of Cigoli's "La Donna Egittia" was expressed episodically by her different parts, including her open breathing mouth: "La rosea bocca tumidetta, e bella/E mista co sospir quindi ti è avviso" (stanza 193); cf. Marino, Adone, VIII, 122; Mirollo, Poet of the Marvelous, 152-3.

127 A letter of 18 July, 1640, from Francesco Mantovani to the Duke of Modena refers to Bernini making the bust "mentre di lei stava fieramente innamorato": Frascetti, Il Bernini, 49. Wittkower, Gian Lorenzo Bernini, 13, also called this bust a "speaking likeness", which in this case was meant purely in a metaphorical sense. Fraschetti, Bernini, 49-50, however, had evocatively discussed Costanza's ardent sensuality, with her loose blouse, swept-back hair, vivid eyes, and delicate semi-open mouth, with "i piccoli denti appaiono fra le labbra tumide di sensualità".

128 Chantelou, Diary, 165.
the sitter's personality and enlivening the permanently inactive medium. In the same general terms, one might also suggest that the speaking likeness is rooted in a deeper sense of animation, its loquacity indicating the vivification of the medium itself, the likeness so alive it bridles not only against its actual artificiality but, in the case of the official portrait, against the binding conventions of representation. Despite this, in the case of the Borghese bust, seeing the mouth as the hallmark of a 'speaking likeness' perhaps too readily absorbs the Cardinal's charged gestures into a critical tradition, so distancing the work from the context of its creation and obscuring its relationship to the particular psycho-physical reality of the subject.

As discussed above, from the casual observer to the trained physician, almost anyone who had cause to comment on the character of Cardinal Borghese noted that he was ruled by the blood humour. According to the widely accepted Hippocratic physiognomy, an individual's temperament was determined by the predominance of one of the four humours (phlegm, choler, melancholy, and blood), each a combination of two of the four primary qualities (cold, hot, moist, and dry), each a corresponding transformation one of the four physical elements (water, fire, earth, and air), and each under the governance of one of the primary planetary houses (moon, Mars, Saturn, and Venus and Jupiter). Thus phlegm was the cold, moist spirit (water and moon) issuing from the chylus in liver; hot, dry

---

129 Above, n. 75.
130 Apart from Hippocrates himself, the crucial authority was Galen (AD 129-99), a Greek physician whose writings, largely via Arab commentators, had an immense influence on medieval medicine: see On the Natural Faculties, trans. Arthur John Brock, London, 1916, esp. bks. 1 (chs. 1, 3, and 4) and 2 (chs. 8 and 9), in relation to the humours. Owsei Temkin succinctly expresses the tangle of principal sources that formed the classic doctrine of temperaments: "The doctrine of the four humors was not Galenic; it was Hippocratic. But the emphasis on these four humors as the Hippocratic humors, the linking of them with the Aristotelian qualities and with the tissues of the body was largely Galenic", Galenism: The Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy, Ithaca/London, 1973, 103; also, Raymond Klibansky, Erwin Panofsky, and Fritz Saxl, Saturn and Melancholy. Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art, London, 1964, 55-66, on the heritage of ancient thought in relation to the humours.
choler, or bile (fire and Mars), gathered in the gall to expel excrements from the body; cold, dry melancholy (earth and Saturn) issued from the spleen, a bridle to the other hot humours; finally, warm, moist blood (air, Venus and Jupiter) was the sweet red humour that came from the heart to colour and strengthen the body.\textsuperscript{131} Physique and character accompanied the humoral type and Giovanni Battista Della Porta, whose \textit{Physiognomy of Man} went through many editions after its initial appearance in Latin in 1586, summed up the sanguine man as having "a tendency to fatness, flushed with a fleshy colour, that is a mix of white and pink, with a florid, sensual, carmine coloured face. [Such persons] are by nature happy, playful, uncomplicated, and pleasant".\textsuperscript{132}

But this jovial temperament had its price, for we also know that by 1632 Borghese was in habitual poor health, a lifetime of sanguine pursuits taking full toll of an under-exercised and over-weight body. Indeed his delicate condition may have been the reason why the bust was sculpted in the first place, for one source suggests it was made at Urban VIII's request (Bernini was permanently in the Barberini service from 1625).\textsuperscript{133} Perhaps the pope thought there was some urgency about the need for a memorial of the affectionately regarded but declining Cardinal.

Now consider again the bust's liveliness. Bernini sculpted Scipione in obese condition, with gelatinous fat deposits around the cheeks, ears, and base of the neck. As in Bernini's famous caricature of the Cardinal [fig. 118], the jowls are remarkable, like drooping saddle bags, emphasised by showing Borghese with a slightly turned head, so that the fat swells over his collar; this a man completely blown out since his admittedly plump youth.

\textsuperscript{131}Della Porta, \textit{La fisonomia}, bk 1, chs. 9-12, 30-37; Cardi, 42v-48r; and Robert Burton, \textit{The Anatomy of Melancholy...}, (1621) London, 1826, 20-21 (Part 1. Sec. I, Member 2 ss. 2).
\textsuperscript{132}Della Porta, \textit{La fisonomia}, bk 1, ch. 9, 30.
\textsuperscript{133}Fraschetti cites a letter of 8 January, 1633, to the Estense court which notes "Il Cav. Bernini, di commissione del Papa, ha fatto in marmo la testa del Cardinale Borghese": II Bernini, 107.
Bernini was not being unkind. In fact, given the artist's own statements regarding the portraitist's duty to focus on the attractive particularity, we are bound to interpret the representation in a positive way. It is even possible Borghese was made fatter than he was (there at least seems to be more flesh, especially under the chin, than in the Pierpont drawing), as if his corpulence were characteristic of his particular excellence. Whatever the case, Scipione's fatness was clearly harnessed in the service of a more powerful vitality, made symptomatic of his temperament, his soft excessive flesh (corresponding to a super-abundance of brotherly warmth and conviviality) a necessary by-product of his large-veined constitution.

Here is a sharp-eyed cardinal (though he was long-sighted and wore glasses), one bursting with a blood-rich vitality, an ideal image of a man born under the happy influence of Jupiter and Venus.

In this context regard how Bernini parted the lips, of which the Cardinal's physician had earlier felt compelled to observe: "the bottom one is larger than the top, and that above is drier and shorter, so they do not fit together well....Their shape is natural, that is semi-circular...full and somewhat open, which signifies a sturdy constitution, a god-fearing soul without malice, and an apprehensive intellect" (emphasis added).

---

134Bernini was reported as saying that "nel ritrarre alcuno al naturale consisteva il tutto in saper conoscere quella qualità, che ciascheduno ha di proprio, che non ha la natura dato a d'altro, che a lui, ma che bisognava pigliare qualche particolarità non brutta, ma bella": Baldinucci, Vita, 136; also Bernini, Vita, 30. This echoes an established critical tradition, including Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo's recommendations (Trattato dell'arte della pittura, scultura, et architettura, Rome, 1844, vol. 2, 370-1) and ultimately Aristotle's instruction (Poetics, 1454b) for portraitists to strive for a naturalism tempered by an emphasis of the sitter's positive qualities.

135Cardi, 31r-v (below, III.4).

136Cardi, 78r (below, III.4).

137Cardi, 91v-92r (below, III.4). The specifics of physiognomy were open to interpretation (or adaptable to flattery) and Cardi's positive assessment of the open mouth contrasted with Della Porta's general diagnosis that the open mouth was a sign of ignorance: La fisionomia, bk. 2, ch. 17, 207. Where Cardi, 73r, found Scipione's slightly non-spherical head depressed at the temples a sign of his intellect's bounty, Della Porta described such a feature as indicative of meanness, citing Caligula as having concave temples: La fisionomia, bk. 2, ch. 1, 119. Cardi described the Cardinal's reddish eyes, 'i due principalissimi lumi del microcosmo humano' as one of his best features: Cardi, 78v (below, III.4). Della Porta, on the other hand,
Although Bernini concealed the defect of the small thin upper lip with a luxurious mustache, the distinctive features of his mouth are clear. In a complex sense Bernini sculpted the Cardinal in his natural state, his piercing eyes, fleshy ears, fat cheeks, and open mouth evoking both the strength of his life’s breath and his own physiognomic excellence, his sanguine good-humour, the robustness of his being.

Bernini’s bust is not simply an illustration of physiognomical prescriptions; nor can it be claimed there is a simple physical explanation for a work clearly formed in the dynamic of sitter and artist. It should be stressed, however, that this dynamic itself was shaped in a culture that regarded the individual’s nature as the confluent of a holistic system of determinates - astrological, terrestrial, and divine. In fact in retrospect the early seventeenth century was something of a culmination of the centuries old physiognomical tradition, a tradition that would slowly unravel in the face of the later century’s more mechanistic views regarding the fundamental distinction between the soul and physical attributes. In contrast to the mechanisms of the new views, in the existing tradition expression was seen as more than just signifying an emotion. Rather, it was thought that a person’s whole appearance - expression, facial features, body

138In 1649 René Descartes would polemically oppose himself to the subject’s prevailing authorities, cut himself from the ancients, empty physiology of astrology, and philosophically sever the greater chain of being implicit in the older tradition of physiognomic literature: "The Passions of the Soul" in The Philosophical Writings of Descartes, trans. J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, D. Murdoch, Cambridge, 1985, vol. 1, 328-404. For Descartes, the soul exercised its passions in the pineal gland, which rather mechanically transmitted its agitations to the body (part I, art. 31, 340). In essence, the passions were thought little more than functional communication lines between the soul and the body (part II, art. 137, 376). Meanwhile, developments in human anatomy, especially concerning the circulation of blood (particularly William Harvey’s Exercitatio anatomica de motu cordis et sanguinis in animalibus, 1628) were undermining the tenets of Galenic medical science that underpinned the doctrine of the humours: Temkin, Galenism, 152-54. Characteristically, Galenic compendia, such as those by Della Porta or Burton, were appearing just at the time when the accumulation of factual anomalies was about to overwhelm the science they had systematised. Like astrology, however, physiognomy has had a long afterlife, providing the intellectual backbone for the Romantic affectation of melancholia and surviving in vestigial form in our everyday categories of psychology.
type—was a sort of actualisation of temperamental characteristics that were both causative and symptomatic. An individual’s appearance could thus be conceived almost as a condensation of the invisible forces that had shaped it, any one of which could be extracted and highlighted by the skilled portraitist. Obviously Bernini’s portrait of Borghese is ‘life-like’ and remains, in a way, a type of ‘speaking likeness’ in the sense that the artist’s dazzling technique seems to have animated the inanimate medium. But the question of the portrait’s life-likeness is no more important than the language by which such a concept was framed. What, that is, could constitute the essence of vitality, and how did this interact with the conventions of representation? Bernini, rather than offering an unfettered glimpse of what a renowned cardinal really looked like, on the contrary presents a study in refinement, a sophisticated portrayal of the very sense of life, employing extreme naturalism and a feigned informality in a representation of animate being, one that in his prime Borghese himself was thought to embody.

Moreover, as an intimate in the court of Rome and former protégé of the Cardinal (Scipione was his first patron), Bernini would have been acutely aware of the Cardinal’s social image. If Borghese’s own appearance was symptomatic, fashioned like an artefact by natural forces, then Bernini’s bust was a type of demonstration, a display whose confection of assertions traded on the assumption of audience understanding. The ordinary Roman recognised Scipione by degrees of representation and separation: the former secretary of state whose magnificence continued only slightly abated despite the death of his uncle and protector Paul V in 1621; someone forever surrounded by familiars, at home in any one of his gigantic palaces or villas, riding in a coach or equipped for church, his name inscribed on buildings

---

139Della Porta, writing in the tradition of the ancient doctors, really begins from the principle that the habits of soul derive from the temperament of body: *La fisonomia*, bk. 1, ch. 6, 20.
throughout the city. This image of splendid importance extended, in ways infinitely refined by decorum, into the Roman court itself, where Borghese had been known since his early career as the Delizia di Roma; the long time factional leader in the sacred college but more notably the life-loving patron and skilled courtier, fond of flattering and being flattered; the collector, builder, and banquet-giver extraordinary; the most glorious of the august Borghese - Scipio Magno!Bernini's bust, made in the midst of the Cardinal's decline and informed by the broader psychology of the period, was one of the final and definitive statements of this grandiloquent image.

On 25 September, 1633, about one year after he sat for Bernini, Scipione made his testament, certain of his end; he died a week later. As each year passed from 1629 less and less is heard from the Cardinal and by 1633 little direct record exists at all. Despite the fragmentary sources for Borghese's final years, when one does hear of him in this period a prolonged deterioration is suggested, implying that his death came only at the end of a five or six year decline into gout-riven, over-weight, high

---

140Ciaconius's vitae (Rome, 1677) recorded the Cardinal was so good-natured as to be known as deliciurn urbis: cited in Cesare D'Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma, 203. Scipio Magno: Divi Augusti Burghesii Nepoti Gloriosissimo, part of an inscription on an obelisk formerly in the Cardinal's garden palace on the Quirinale: avviso of 11 June, 1611; BAV Urb. Lat. 1079, 425r.

141The papal diarist recorded Borghese's death. [180v] Dom.a die 2.a Ottobris...post hora septimam noctis in palatio sue solita [181r] habitiones in Campo Martio Em.mus et R.nus Scipio Burghesius...huis anima in pace requiescat. Feria tertia die 4 Octobris 1633. In die festo S. Fran. fuerunt facte exquis circa corpus Em. Card. Burghesij...in ecc.a S. Laurentij in Lucina, ad quam heri noctu fuit portatum corpus, quod postiu. fuit publice medio ecc.a supra lectum mortuorius indutus omnibus paramentis Pontificalis violaceus cum mitra de damascens albo, et cum galero pontificali rubeo ad pedes. ... [182r] fuit corpus ab ecclesia S. Laurontis in Lucina ad basilica S. Maria Maioris a Presbyteris (?)vantibus DD. canonici basilicis S. Petri, ut capitularis fuerunt in associando funus hoc amplus multo sobalitates, seu soc.tes laicos cum eoros crucibus magnis...pueri orphi, religiosi mendicantes et multo presbiteri...et orphi et canonici et capitulis ante clerus S. Petri, clerus S. Maria maioris ante religiosos mendicantes. funalia fuerunt CCC accensas, ultra funalia data sodali, tutibus ferunt accensa ante crucifreos...." ASV FB I 817. Marcantonio Borghese paid for the funeral: ASV AB 6095.

142The paucity of sources for 1629-33 is discussed above, n. 71. In the Cardinal's final year, even the relevant registro dei mandati (ASV AB 6093) is inadequate, finishing on 6 March 1633, and beginning again in October with the payments required by his testament (ASV AB 6094). Indeed, we lack even a memorial, for it seems Scipione was entombed in an unmarked cask alongside his uncles in the Pauline chapel of S. Maria Maggiore.
blood-pressured physical wreckage. The bust lives and breathes, but Cardinal Borghese was dying.
CONCLUSION

At fifty six years, Borghese died in his late middle age, yet he had already achieved a remarkable amount. Following the completion of the oratories of S. Gregorio Magno as Baronio intended, he refashioned each of the three churches in Rome for which he was responsible. He redecorated a chapel for his father and honoured his promise to erect a facade for the Carmelites. Not only did he provide funds when religious Orders under his protection asked for assistance, he also had his own construction team supervise the planned extensions and embellishments. Finally, he established a permanent legacy in the lands under his patrimonial control through the construction of new churches and other public works.

The Cardinal's patronage was diverse in range and circumstance, encompassing almost every type of ecclesiastical building save for the construction of new churches, at least in Rome. Yet despite its scope, it was remarkably consistent in its style. All his projects are noteworthy for their extensive inscriptorial and decorative integration of Borghese imagery. This in itself was traditional, although not uniformly so and not on this level. Certainly no modern patron had ever made such a sustained and widely cast impression on the city's buildings. The unified emblematic quality of Scipione's architecture is matched by an overall continuity of design. Scipione only ever employed three architects, each with similar artistic ambitions, and showed no inclination to explore other possibilities. Flaminio Ponzio was assigned to the Cardinal by the pope; Vasanzio was already in Scipione's employ and was promoted to the position following Ponzio's death; so also Soria in respect of Vasanzio. The Cardinal's loyalty to his architects extended to artisans. Although a bewildering array of individuals were contracted, most performed specific and often secondary tasks. The main work was done by a limited group. The projects in the first
half of Scipione's career were executed by the builder, Domenico Selva, and the stone-mason, Arminio de Giudici. Those in the second half were undertaken by the building team of Pietro and Marcantonio Fontana, and the mason, Andrea Appiano (except for the Caffarelli Chapel, where the mason was Giuseppe di Iacomo). The same architects and craftsmen were also responsible for the Cardinal's principal domestic projects, including the garden palace on the Quirinale, the villas on the Pincio and near Frascati, and the palace in Montefortino. In short, Scipione cultivated a closely knit production team, so that all his building activities can on one level be seen as differing manifestations of a single architectural enterprise.

The scope and unity of Borghese's patronage distinguish him from his contemporaries. As I have argued, cardinals of the period were expected to be involved in church building to some degree. This was particularly true of cardinal-nephews, whose position provided numerous building opportunities, both during and after their incumbency. Pietro Aldobrandini, for example, apart from installing a ceiling in his titular church of S. Maria in Trastevere, earlier reconstructed the martyrium church of S. Paolo alle Tre Fontane (1600). Paolo Sfondrato (Gregory XIV) was more extensive, restoring a number of churches, including his title of S. Cecilia in Trastevere (1599-1618) and the Monte Olivetan basilica of S. Francesca Romana (c. 1611-15). Few, however, were ecclesiastical architecture patrons throughout their career in the manner of Scipione. In this sense, the closest comparison to Borghese is Cesare Baronio. Indeed, the differences between the two cardinals define the change in ecclesiastical patronage from the late sixteenth to early seventeenth century. Baronio used architecture for proselytising purposes, his restoration of early Christian churches expressing a general belief about the role of history in the reform of the modern church. Moreover, Baronio's restorations were deliberately simple in form and decoration, intentionally recalling the presumed humility of the early
church. Like Baronio, Borghese's major interventions were also restorations of existing churches. For Scipione, however, this was perhaps more the result of papal policy than a personal programme of reform, the fact that restoration was considered the most prestigious form of building and an essential part of the cardinalate ministry. Further, where Baronio retired in deference to the authority of the church itself, Cardinal Borghese's restorations expressed a greater sense of personal and familial magnificence, consistently elevating the role and image of himself as patron.

In this and other respects, Scipione set the model for the princely style of ecclesiastical patronage pursued for the next fifty years. In particular, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the principal nephew of Urban VIII, would use the architect of the papal camera, Luigi Arrigucci, to restore several churches throughout the 1630s and 1640s, including SS. Cosma e Damiano, S. Sebastiano al Palatino, and Spoleto Cathedral. As with Scipione, Francesco's interventions were often made at the insistence of the pope and featured a strong presence of family and papal imagery. Also like Scipione, Francesco's ecclesiastical projects were part of a broader programme of artistic patronage, involving the building of palaces, the collecting of antiquities, and the commissioning of new works of art from the innumerable artists drawn to the city. The spectacle of parvenu papal families establishing the material basis of aristocracy was already familiar by the early seventeenth century. Scipione Borghese, however, had taken the process to a higher and more refined level, which was to culminate over the following decades in the unprecedented splendour of the Barberini court.

Scipione's example to Francesco (and his brother, Antonio) was neither abstract nor programmatic. Flourishing well into the Barberini pontificate, Borghese had been for more than two decades the living image of the cultured and munificent patron. Viewed in summary the map of his career seems remarkably well formed. The early years are all affirmation - of
the Borghese family, of Scipione himself, of Rome and its early Christian churches. A lull follows the establishment of reputation, subsequently broken by the remodelling of S. Crisogono, a commission whose complex and shifting symbolism significantly coincides with Borghese's difficult passage in the middle of his career from first minister to disgraced nephew to rehabilitated patron. Finally, there is the flurry of ecclesiastical commissions in his last ailing years, his slide toward death lit by the simple imagery of the last rural churches. In short, Scipione was one of those public figures whose patronage was ultimately a form of self-expression, seeming to articulate at every stage his dreams and obligations, ambition and piety.
II.1
Oratories of S. Gregorio Magno
[figs. 1-9]

The ancient church and monastery between the Clivus Scauri and the Colosseum were founded by St. Gregory the Great in the sixth century. In the biography of Gregory (872-82) Johannes Diaconus described the complex as including two oratories (one dedicated to the Virgin, the other to Santa Barbara, Gregory's mother) and a triclinium.¹ Cardinal Cesare Baronio was commended the abbey on 21 April, 1602. He immediately began the rebuilding of the oratory complex: that is, erecting two chapels, S. Barbara (which would be associated with the original triclinium) and S. Andrea, on the existing foundations, as well as building a third chapel, S. Silvia, ex novo. Nothing is known of the original architect, although it is possible Baronio himself worked directly with his tradesmen.²

S. Barbara was completed in 1604. It has interior frescoes on the life of St. Gregory by Antonio Viviani and an altar statue of the saint by Nicholas Cordier. In the centre the chapel's original function is suggested by an antique table, possibly brought from the Lateran. S. Andrea was begun at the same time as S. Barbara, with the altarpiece painted by Cristoforo Roncalli dating from 1602. The first stone of S. Silvia was consecrated on 15 March, 1604, and the altar statue was made shortly after. Nothing else of the decorative schemes of these two chapels was finished before 1607.

²Krautheimer, Corpus, 321.
The Intervention of Cardinal Borghese

The abbey was commended to Cardinal Borghese on 30 June, 1607. Borghese made the first payment of fifty scudi to the builder, Maestro Domenico Selva, on 12 August, 1607. Fairly regular payments follow over the next twelve months to Selva, to the mason, Armenio de Judice, and to the carpenter, Vittorio Roncone, with the last entry for building work being made to Roncone on 4 August, 1608, for work on the ceilings.

The work was overseen by the papal architect, Flaminio Ponzio (1568-1613). Ponzio signed both the major *misure e stime* relating to the completion of building. The first, for carpentry, dated 20 December, 1607, includes the entrance door frames for the three chapels, the easels for the altars in S. Andrea and S. Silvia, and the roof frame of the portico in front of S. Andrea. The most expensive items were the coffered timber soffits, that in S. Andrea costing 476.80 scudi, the smaller in S. Silvia 202 scudi.

The second account (28 November, 1607) was for Judice's stone masonry. This included: the three stairs and flanking plinths with Borghese arms in the courtyard in front of the chapels; the marble balustrades in S. Andrea and S. Silvia; and the marble entrance door to S. Andrea. At the tail of a *misura e stima* for S. Sebastiano of April 1608 there is an entry for the travertine arms of Borghese hung in the portal at the back of the monastery.

---


2 ASV AB 7925, 1v, n.6.

3 Ibid., 60v, n.337.


5 ASV AB 4173; Pedrocchi, *San Gregorio*, 107.

6 ASV AB 4174; Pedrocchi, *San Gregorio*, 90-1.

7 "Aprile 1608, a S. Gregorio. L'arme di trevertino dell Illustissimo Signore Cardinale Borghese fatta dentro al portone che va al vicolo verso S. Giovanni e Paulo....15.00." ASV
Missing from the documents are the specifications for the beautiful entrance door to S. Silvia, a replica of the door to the triclinium. Also not mentioned are the stucco decorations: these include the egg and dart moulding in the apse of S. Silva; and the window surrounds incorporating the Borghese griffin and dragon high on the walls of both chapels. Such refined decoration was typical of Ponzio's work (as seen in the mouldings of S. Sebastiano's high altar chapel).

There are payments of 12 scudi on 16 October, 1607 and 30 scudi on 1 December, 1607 to the painter Rinaldo Coradini, probably for the decoration of the soffits.\(^{10}\) The following year Guido Reni supervised the fresco decoration, which includes the famous pair, *St. Andrew being led to Martyrdom* (Reni) and *The Martyrdom of St. Andrew* (Domenichino), on the walls of S. Andrea.\(^{11}\) The walls of S. Silvia are bare, with frescoed decoration confined to the apse, where Reni painted *Angels in Glory*.

The Cardinal's accounts record 2042 scudi spent on S. Gregorio in 1607, 779.68 scudi in 1608, and 200 scudi in 1609, making a total of 3021.68 scudi spent by Borghese on finishing the two chapels.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) ASV AB 7925 7r n.40, and 14v, n.86.

\(^{11}\) The Cardinal's *registro dei mandati* for 1607-9 first record a payment of 50 scudi to Reni for work at S. Gregorio on 6 April, 1608, then two more payments of 100 scudi 25 September, 1609, and 6 November, 1609: ASV AB 7925. There is no record in the *registro* of Domenichino, and Fumagalli suggests Domenichino, among others, was in Reni's employ, which would explain why Reni was paid so much: Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 75. Painting must have begun around the autumn of 1608, with an *avviso* of 8 November, 1608, noting the Cardinal visited S. Gregorio "dove S. Ill.ma ha fatta diversi abbellimenti di soffite, di fabrica, di pittura, et paramenti di valore": Urb. Lat. 1076, 801r.

\(^{12}\) ASV AB 7925. These figures differ slightly from Reinhardt's calculation (45) that 923.68 scudi were spent on S. Gregorio in 1608.
II.2
S. Sebastiano fuori le mura
[figs. 10-19, 21-22, 24-25, 28, 30, 37]

Early History of S. Sebastiano

S. Sebastiano is on the via Appia Antica about two kilometres outside the Aurelian wall. The site was originally a quarry; by the third century it was occupied by a cemetery, positioned at the base of the hollow and consisting of a variety of small vaults and mausolea. The site was known as the catacumbae, although for what reason is unclear. In 258 the cemetery was filled in to allow the construction of a Christian sanctuary, soon to house the relics of the Apostles Peter and Paul (probably following the prohibition in 257 against Christians assembling at their tombs at the Vatican and on the Ostian Way). In the succeeding years the apostolic memoria were surrounded by the graves of other Christians and in the fourth century this burial ground was greatly extended as a columbarium, lending the catacombs their characteristic form.

Early in the fourth century the basilica, with nave, aisles, and ambulatory, was erected as a covered extension of the existing memoria. The interior quickly filled with graves and tombs, which were in turn eventually paved over when the church became used for congregational purposes. The relics of Peter and Paul were soon moved to their respective churches and in the seventh century the church was renamed in honour of Saint Sebastian.

---


2 Antonio Bosio, Roma Sotteranea, 257 preferred the etymology, catatombe, that is, the place containing the bodies of the Apostles, to the commonly held derivation from the Greek Kata and Latin tumba, meaning a "hollow place".

3 Ferrua, Guide, 10-13 and 17

4 A model reconstruction of the apostolic basilica was made by I. Pacini, La Basilica degli apostoli sulla via Appia, Rome, 1951.

5 Ferrua, Guide, 14, 17 and 23. In 826, Pope Eugene II had the remains of Saint Sebastian moved to the Vatican, although part of his relics were donated to the church of St. Medard in Soissons, while his head found its way to SS. Quattro Coronati in Rome. Despite this, pilgrims continued to worship the now empty crypt at S. Sebastiano until finally, following petitioning from the local Cistercians, Honorius III (1216-27) had the remains in the Vatican taken back to the church: ibid., 24-5.
In 1167 the church was granted to the Cistercians, who initiated the first major alterations to the church, filling in the nave arcade, leaving the interior as a simple hall. The southern aisle was incorporated into the convent, while the ambulatory and northern aisle fell into disuse, though remained largely in place. A bell-tower was built and a six column portico was added to the facade. The Cistercians were replaced by the Lateran Regular Canons in 1259, but returned in 1431 and remained associated with the property until after the French Revolution.

Between 1563 and 1575 the interior altars were reorientated under the direction of the abbot Alessandro Rastelli, primarily to shift the focus of the sepulchral monument dedicated to the apostles away from the altar in the centre of the church towards the open crypt (the *pozzo*) more closely associated with them. This included: re-assigning the altar of St. Stephen, which conserved the sacrament, as the high altar; moving the pontifical altar of St. Fabian to the right wall, in the position of the current Albani chapel; positioning a new altar, dedicated to the cult of relics, on the right wall near the main entrance. As Antinori observes, this valorisation of the crypt and regularisation of the interior space were consistent with the liturgical prescriptions of the Council of Trent.

Engravings of the late sixteenth century show the church as a run-down rural structure, with atrium, typical medieval lean-to portico, and attached shop buildings. In 1575, Jakob Rabus noted that in several places the church had fallen to ruin. In 1584, the Cistercian monks abandoned the church and two years later Sixtus V declared in part VI of the bull *Egregia populi romani*: The church of S. Sebastiano, antique and sacred, is not sufficiently venerable to justify its great distance away, and its dimensions are too modest for proper pontifical celebration. Therefore it is to be optional [in the seven church circuit] with S. Maria del Popolo....S. Sebastiano is not, however, deprived of its privileges or indulgences.

---

7Ibid., 41-4.
9*Quoted in Gamrath, *Roma Sancta Renovata*, 136; also, Antinori, 45. An earlier papal decree of 1556 had forbade Romans "to go out on the Sunday of May to the church of S. Sebastiano with woman and courtesans and play licentious games": Richard Joseph Ingersoll, "The Ritual Use of
The Intervention of Cardinal Borghese

The apostolic camera commended the abbey to Cardinal Borghese on 28 November, 1607. By 20 December, 1607, the Cardinal already had to pay Selva and Mola, the muratori whose teams were working at S. Gregorio, 200 scudi "on account of work on the fabric of the church of S. Sebastiano". Before the end of the year the pope went to inspect S. Sebastiano, perhaps to make sure the work was well under way. Over the next six years S. Sebastiano was almost completely remodelled. The tradesmen at S. Gregorio - Domenico Selva, builder, Armenio de Judice, mason, Vittoria Roncone, carpenter - also worked at S. Sebastiano, initially under the guidance of Flaminio Ponzio, then, after Ponzio's death in 1613, under Giovanni Vasanzio (Jan van Zanten), who took over the position of Borghese family architect.

Antinori published all the major documents relating to Borghese's intervention. The earliest accounts date from 15 March 1608 and relate to the pictorial decoration and the rebuilding of the crypt. The first records the making of easels for the altars of Saints Peter and Paul, the high altar, the altar of S. Sebastiano, and the altar of the crucifix. The paintings by Archita Ricci over the altars of relics, of S. Sebastiano, and S. Bernaro were removed during the insertion of the chapels of relics (1625), S. Sebastiano (1672), and Albani (1706). Surviving altarpieces are: S. Francesca Romana (Flaminio Allegrini, centre left); S. Carlo Borromeo (Ricci, centre right); S. Girolamo (Ricci, second left).

Public Space", 119-20 and 135 n. 50. Writing just before the end of the century, Domenicus Custodis noted the church's poor condition and the monastery's desertion; Deliciae Urbis Romae. Divinae et humanae anno sacro publicaei, Rome, 1600, 2.

10"Monsignore Capponi nostro Thesorie Generale havendo la santa memoria di Sisto Quinto nostro predecessore unito l'abbazia di San Sebastiano fuor di Roma alle catacombe reducendola à secularità alla capella, e sagrestia pontificia, e dopo havendola noi disunita e redotta allo stato di prima e successivam data in commenda al Illustissimo Cardinale Scipione Borghese nostro nipote quale speriamo sia per restaurare detta chiesia con parte dell'entrate di detta abbatia, il che non seguirebbe, se fusse restata unita, come sopra, e però mancando alla detta capella, e sagrestia l'assegnamento dell'entrate di detta abbatia per pagar il salario, e provisione dellimi ministri di essa, e volendo noi in luogo di dette entrate darli altro assegnamenti...." ASR Camerale I: Giustificazioni di Tesoreria, busta 33, 18. Document discovered and partly published by Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 82-3, n.1; also in Antinori, 141.

11ASV AB 6076, 65r. From 1 March, 1608, Mola was the sole muratore being paid: AB 7925, 30v, n.173.

12On the 29 December, 1607: BAV Urb. Lat. 1075, 817r.

13ASV AB 4173, Antinori, doc. 2, 142, for the easels' carpentry. Payments for paintings made on 13 July, 1613, in ASV AB 6083, 169r, Allegrini paid 30 scudi; 177a, Ricci paid 150 scudi. The paintings are shown around the restored church in Giovanni Maggi's 1625 engraving of S. Sebastiano in the
Fumagalli has reconstructed the complex programme of paintings in and around the crypt, done 1608-9 under the supervision of Guido Reni.\textsuperscript{14}

The restoration of the church itself began with the renovation and vaulting of the crypt in April 1608.\textsuperscript{15} The \textit{misura e stima} for the \textit{facciatella} attached to the ambulatory dates from 22 April, 1609, and includes costs for the beginning of the renovation of the choir.\textsuperscript{16} Work on these elements continued through 1610 with a \textit{scarpellino} account of 21 December, 1610, which includes the four marble doors in the nave, one of which was removed to make way for the Albani Chapel built under Clement XI (1706-12).\textsuperscript{17} The inscriptions on the small facade are: in the frieze, \textit{PAULO V PONTEFICE OPTIMO MAXIMO ANN. MDCIX}; in the panel above the door, \textit{IN HONOREM SANCTI MARTYRIS SEBASTIANI}. A glasswork account of 4 March, 1612, included six round windows of Venetian glass painted with the arms of the Cardinal in the tribune and three windows in the main facade of grey crystal.\textsuperscript{18}

On 7 July, 1612, Annibale Durante was paid 524 scudi for painting and gilding the soffit in the nave; the soffit's carpenter, Vittorio Roncone, was paid 1158 scudi in January of the same year.\textsuperscript{19} Although Durante was responsible for the colour scheme of the ceiling, and the central painted relief of Saint Sebastian, the design of the ceiling was likely by Ponzio.

In 1612, the tempo of work increased with Iacomo Mola, who had replaced Selva as the site's main \textit{muratore}, receiving steady payments for a large account of 1698.15 scudi made in January of that year.\textsuperscript{20} The major

---

\textsuperscript{14}Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 70-8. Reni's account book records a partial payment on 9 November 1609 for a fresco of saints Peter and Paul; Stephen Pepper, "Guido Reni's Roman Account Book", \textit{Burlington Magazine}, 113, 1971, 315. Fumagalli located another payment to Reni on 6 December 1611 for "...tutte le pitture fatte, et fatte fare sino a questo di a San Sebastiano." ASV AB 23/38, published in Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 89, n.57. These two payments cover all the paintings in and around crypt that were supervised by Reni before 1610.

\textsuperscript{15}AB 4174; Antinori, docs. 3-7, 143-52.

\textsuperscript{16}AB 4174; Antinori, doc. 8, 153-9.

\textsuperscript{17}AB 4174; Antinori, doc. 14, 168-73. See also AB 4174; doc. 17, 175.

\textsuperscript{18}AB 4170; Antinori, doc. 21, 181-2.

\textsuperscript{19}AB 4170; Antinori, doc. 21, 181-2. The documents settle the question of authorship of the ceiling, which had earlier been presumed to have been made by Vasanzio and decorated by Rinaldo Corradini, or even Paulo Guidotti: Ferrua, \textit{Guide}, 25; Fabrizio d'Amico, "Su Paolo Guidotti Borghese e su una congiuntura di tardo manierismo romano", \textit{Ricerche di Storia dell’Arte}, 22 (1984), 73. On the correct attribution to Durante, see G. Hoogewerff, "Giovanni Vasanzio fra gli architetti romani del tempo di Paolo V", \textit{Palladio}, 6 (1942), 51; Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 79 and 90-1; Antinori, 96.

\textsuperscript{20}As per an entry of 8 May in the \textit{registro dei mandati} for 1612-13: "...pagar a maestro Iacomo Mola
masonry account dates from 8 January, 1613, recording the wide ranging work largely done the previous year by Judice, with the assistance of Antonio Ruzzi and Gironimo Falciani, the later brought over from the building site on the Cardinal's villa on the Pincio. The account details work on the new facade that replaced the medieval portico, the courtyard in front of the facade, the marble balustrade before the choir, the travertine doors to the sacristy, and the grotto.21 Another scarpellino account of 18 January, 1613, records the construction by Agostino and Belardino Radi of the since demolished atrium portal; Piranesi's mid-eighteenth century view shows it was similar to the Villa Borghese entrance.22

The completion of the facade in the early months of 1613 signalled the winding down of building activity at the church. An avviso records the Cistercians returning to the church on 24 March, 1614.23 Further carpentry accounts, however, at the end of 1613 and 23 October, 1614, include work on the decoration of the high altar, including the making of its easel for the painting of the crucifixion by Innocenzo Tacconi, paid for in July 1614.24 The final scarpellino account of 4 July, 1615, records the building of the splendid marble altar with its four columns of green marble.25 In 1627 the Cardinal paid Marcantonio Fontana for the construction of a new sacristy, decorated with frescoes by Marco Tullio Montagna.26 Reinhardt estimates that the Cardinal spent a total of 27 153. 62 scudi at S. Sebastiano.27

muratori seicento settanta [sc.] 53 [giiu.] moneta di mille seicentonovanta otto (1698.15 sc.) per salde et intero pagamento di tutti li lavori che egli ha fatto a S. Bastiano fuori delle mura Abbazia come per la stima fattare da Giovanni Antonio di Pomis architetto sotto li 27 di Gennaro 1612...: AB 6083, 39v. On 6 August, 1613, Mola was paid 529.91 sc. for the final muratore account, AB 6083, 174v.

21 AB 4174; Antinori, doc. 22, 183-98.
22 AB 4174; Antinori, doc. 23, 199-201.
23 Fumagalli, "Le fabriche", 454.
24 AB 4173; Antinori, docs. 26-7, 207-17. Tacconi was paid 50 scudi for the tempera on wall altarpiece on 29 July, 1614: ASV AB 7376, cited in Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 80. On Tacconi, a pupil of Annibale Carracci, see Baglione, 312-13; Alessandro Brogi, "Innocenzo Tacconi e l'officina classicista: un eredità dilapidata", Paragone, 539 (Jan. 1995), 27-57.
25 AB 4174; Antinori, doc. 28, 218-21.
26 Fumagalli, "Guido Reni", 82 and 92-3.
27 Reinhardt, 99.
II.3  
S. Crisogono  
[figs. 43-48, 52-66]  

Early History of S. Crisogono  

The church of S. Crisogono in the Trastevere district is first recorded by the Roman Council in 499.\(^1\) Between 1123 and 1129 Cardinal Giovanni de Crema built a new church and bell-tower, above and about ten metres to the north of the original basilica.\(^2\) The new S. Crisogono had a trabeated nave, vaulted aisles, and raised transept, a type based on the distinctive interpretation of the early Christian church by the builders of Monte Cassino (1066).\(^3\) The apse featured a mosaic panel of the *Virgin and Child with Saints Crisogono and John (the Madonna del Carmine)* surrounded by frescoes, possibly by Pietro Cavallini and Maestro Giovanni.\(^4\) The clerestory of the nave was also decorated with paintings.\(^5\) Outside, the facade had a high central bay with a straight parapet and a lower-level projecting portico trabeated on two piers and four Ionic columns.\(^6\) The exterior appearance of the basilica in the early seventeenth century is recorded in contemporary guidebooks. Ugonino Pompeo described the entire church in 1588:

> The church of S. Crisogono is made of superb material. Francesco Albertino....said that the columns and the marble with which it was built were taken from the baths of Severus Africanus [like S. Cecilia and S. Maria in Trastevere]....The church has a sturdy front portico supported on four Ionic columns. The interior is large and

---
\(^1\)On the palaeo-Christian S. Crisogono see: Bruno Apollonj Ghetti, *S. Crisogono*, (Le chiese di Roma illustrate 92), Rome, 1966, 13-67; Krautheimer, *Corpus*, vol. I, 144-63, with extensive bibliography. Most of the literature is, understandably, dominated by archaeological reconstruction. A substantial part of the ancient church survived, as was discovered in 1907 when two of the Trinitarian fathers located a secret entrance in the sacristy: Apollonj Ghetti, *S. Crisogono*, 7.
\(^2\)On the medieval S. Crisogono, see Apollonj Ghetti, *S. Crisogono*, 68-90; Michela Cigola, "La Basilica di San Crisogono in Roma", 7-29, with excellent measured drawings.
\(^3\)Richard Krautheimer, *Rome. Profile of a City*, 178-80. Krautheimer suggests that the nearby church of S. Maria in Trastevere (begun 1120s) was also a 'seedling' of Monte Cassino.
\(^4\)Mandl, *Die Kirche des HI. Chrysogonus*, who cites Giulio Mancini as testifying to the frescoes (*Viaggio per Roma*, BAV Barb. Lat. 4135, 4; date of composition actually not earlier than 1622.) Also Salimbeni, "Giovan Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese", 401.
\(^5\)Salimbeni notes that fragments of the frescoes, possibly also the work of Pietro Cavallini and Master Giovanni, survive under the stucco: 'Giovan Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese', 401.
\(^6\)In 1575, Jacob Rabus noted S. Crisogono "ist ein schöne Kirche jenseit der Tiber mit viel schönen porphyretischen Marmorstücken und Säulen": Schottenloher, *Rom. Eine Müncher Pilgerfahrt*, 96.
commodious, with two gigantic and magnificent rows of eleven columns dividing the space into nave and side aisles. The pavement is marvelously comprised of a variety of inlaid stones, and there are few others like it in Rome. The major arch of the church is supported on two huge porphyry columns. The altar is raised on five steps; under it is a confessional; above it is a tabernacle supported on four mixed columns, two greenish and two white. Behind is the tribune, with antique images, including a painted mosaic. Underneath there are the stalls for the choir, in the middle of which rests the ancient pontifical seat. In the right-hand aisle entering the church one sees a beautiful stone basin, which formerly served as the baptismal font, as is shown by [the fact] that nearby a new basin according to modern usage has been made for he same [sacrament of] baptism. There are seven altars in the church, which as in St. Peter's and St. Paul's are embellished with many indulgences. The company of the blessed sacrament is established here, also known as Santa Maria de Carmine, whose chapel is on the right-hand side of the tribune, with the altar reserved for the dead.\(^7\)

\(^7\)La chiesa di S. Chrisogono è per fabrica bellissima. Francesco Albertino...dice, che le colonne e i marmi con le quali fu fabbricata la chiesa di S. Chrisogono furono presi dalle terme di Severo Africano....Ha la chiesa di S. Chrisogono un forte portico innanzi sostenuto da quattro colonne. Dentro è grande convenientemente, il cui spazio due ordine di magnifiche et grosse colonne à XI per parte dividono in tre navi. Il pavimento è si mirabilmente di varie pietre commesse insieme intarsiato, che pocchi altri lavori simili sono in Roma. L'arco maggiore della chiesa è sostenuto di due grosse colonne di pordido. L'altare è rilevato cinque scalini in alto: ha sotto la sua confessione, di sopra il Tabernacolo che sopra quattro colonne mischie, due verdeggianti e due bianche s'appoggia. Dietro gli soprasta la Tribuna con antiche imagini ancorche' non di Mosaico dipinta. Sotto vi sono i bianchi da sedere per il coro, nel mezzo dei quali vi resta l'antica sedia Pontificale. Si vede nella nave minore che è à man dritta entrando in chiesa, un bella conca di pietra, la quale servì già per il fonte del Battesimo come dimostra, che qui vicino v'è stato fatto per il medesimo Battesimo un nuovo vaso all'usanza moderna. Sono in questa chiesa sette altari, come in S. Pietro et S. Paolo ornati d'i grande Indulgentie. Vi è eretta una compagnia del santissimo Sacramento, detto anco di S. Maria de Carmine, la cui cappella è à man dritta della Tribuna, et il suo altare è privilegiato per i defonti": Pompeo Ugonio, Historia delle stationi di Roma, Rome, 1588, 282. Passage partly published in Mandl, HI. Chrysogonus , 8-9; and Ringbeck, 36. Cf. Panciroli, I tesori nascosti, 601.
The Intervention of Cardinal Borghese and Attribution

Following his ascension to the papacy in 1605, Paul V passed on the titular post of S. Crisogono to Scipione on 17 August. Borghese officially took possession of the title on 22 November, in a grand ceremony, with reportedly sixty coaches of prelates filling the church. The event was commemorated annually with a service and concert in the church, an important date on Scipione's ceremonial calendar.

The restoration of S. Crisogono is traditionally thought to follow from the opening payments of June, 1618, to Marcantonio Fontana, for building in the church. The architecture is generally attributed to Giovanni Battista Soria (1581-1651), a carpenter who appears often in Scipione's accounts from about 1616 and who is credited with designing all of the Cardinal's buildings in the 1620s and 1630s. The attribution to Soria was first made by his colleague, the artist/historian Giovanni Baglione. In a review of patronage under Paul V, Baglione noted that Soria was the restoration architect of S. Crisogono and S. Gregorio Magno. Soria's first biographer, Lione Pascoli, also credited him with the church and emphasised his close association with Cardinal Borghese. Howard Hibbard, however, was unable to find Soria in the records, and named Sergio Venturi and Giovanni Maria Bolin as the signatories of Scipione's architectural documents in the 1620s. Lorenzo Salimbeni pointed out that the signatory at the end of misure e stime was not necessarily the designer - the architetto di casa could be an

8"Questa mattina è stato Consistorio et dopo essere stata aperta la bocca al Cardinale Borghese datogli il titolo di S. Grisogono, ne che teneva Nostro Papa": avviso of 17 August, 1605, Urb. Lat. 1073, 457r.
9Urb. Lat. 1073, 632v.
10Avviso of 25 November, 1606, noted the retinue that attended Borghese's service was virtually the whole of Curia, the sort of crowd Cardinal Aldobrandini used to attract: Urb. Lat. 1074, 596v-97r. There are carpentry accounts, for example on 22 November, 1608, for making a platform for musicians in S. Crisogono: ASV AB 4173.
11Baglione was one of the many artists, along with Cigoli, Reni, and Passignano, brought across from the Cappella Paolina in the Palazzo Quirinale to work at Scipio's short-lived garden palace (he sold it to Duke Altemps in 1616): Joan Lee Nissman, "Domenico Cresti (Il Passignano) 1559-1638. A Tuscan Painter in Florence and Rome", Phd Diss., Columbia University, 1979, 438.
12"S. Grisogono in Trastevere...il quale con ornamento di soffitto dorato, con pitture, con ciborio, e con portico lo fini di nobilitare. E vi edifico il monistero de'Frati con buona habitazione...Restaurò la devotissima chiesa di S. Gregorio...e di queste due fabbriche Gio. Battista Soria ne fu l'architetto": Baglione, 97.
14Howard Hibbard, "Scipione Borghese's garden palace", 174; also Hibbard, Carlo Maderno, 205.
administrative position, such as *misuratore*. In fact Soria does not appear in the records as an architect until 1626, alongside Bolin, Venturi, and later Stefano Finchietto and Michele Cappucino. Ringbeck, noting the confusion of signatories to various building documents, opted for the simplest solution, one adopted below in relation to the Caffarelli chapel. That is, any attribution for designing at S. Crisogono before 1621 must be granted to Giovanni Vasanzio (d. 1621), who took over as Cardinal Borghese's house architect after Ponzio's death in 1613. Fumagalli agrees with Ringbeck that the restoration was begun under Vasanzio, although she suggests that he designed not only the ceiling but also the entire redecorated clerestory. From 1622, however, Soria took over the artistic management of Borghese's buildings, perhaps following the recommendation of his colleagues in the Academy of St. Luke. To the above argument one qualification should be added: if the staged construction suggested in the text is correct, then Vasanzio's direction was largely confined to the ceiling and clerestory, which was probably close to being finished by the time of Vasanzio's death. Therefore, Soria's post-1622 design was not completing Vasanzio's work, for the restoration of the lower part of the church in mid-1620s was an independent stage of the building chronology.

**Building Chronology and Documents**

Most of the building documents relating to the restoration of S. Crisogono have been published and analysed by Ringbeck. The first is a *misura* for the period 23 April, 1618, to 26 January, 1623, detailing work of the *muratori* Master Marco Antonio Fontana and company, and Master Castello del Porto and company, namely: dismantling and rebuilding of the

---

15 Salimbeni, "Giovanni Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese", 403-4. Salimbeni, 403, suggests the ceiling may have been designed by Lanfranco, citing the attribution of the anonymous author of *Opere di diversi architetti, pittori, scultori, et altri bellingegni fatti in Roma...*, c. 1660 (Urb. Lat. 1707, 63). At that stage, however, Lanfranco is not in the record, and does not appear until he is paid for painting in Scipione's villa on the Pincio in 1625 (ASV AB 6089, 145v, n. 4).

16 Ringbeck, 38-9.

17 The life of Vasanzio (Jan van Zanten, or Giovanni Fiammingo) was recorded by Baglione, *Le vite*, 175-6. His modern biography is inadequate. G. Hoogewerff attributed four major works to him: the casino of the giardino on the Quirinale (which Hibbard, *Carlo Maderno*, 192, agrees was at least the execution of Vasanzio); the fountain of the Acqua Paolo near the Ponte Sisto; the alterations to the Villa Mondragone; various works in Montefortino (for which, see above I.5 n.59): "Giovanni Vansanzio fra gli architetti romani del tempo di Paulo V", *Palladio*, 6 (1942), 49-56; see also the same author's "Architetti in Roma durante il pontificato di Paolo V Borghese", *Archivio della R. Deputazione romana di storia patria*, 66 (1943), 135-47; Ringbeck, 28-30; Antinori, 106-7.

18 Fumagalli, "Le fabricche", 473-6.
roof; rebuilding the facade and aisle walls and inserting windows; strengthening the clerestory and inserting fourteen rectangular windows; stucco decoration of the aisles; strengthening the wall in the chapel of St. Francis; rewalling behind the seven side altars in the aisles; installing marble architraves on the impost of the aisle vaults.  

The only account for stone-work before 1623, unnoticed by both Ringbeck and Salimbeni, details an aspect of the above. It dates from 4 September, 1619, and records the transportation of materials and the making of the travertine/marble architraves and travertine pilaster bases in the aisles, along with the travertine architraves around the new windows in the aisles and clerestory:

ASV AB 4174
A Di 4 7bre 1619
-M.ro Giuseppe di Iacomo e Compagni devono havere dall'Ill.mo S. Card.le Borghese p(er) lavori di scarpello fatti alla chiesa di S.to Grisogono in Trastevere p(er) come qui sotto il sino al p(rese)nte Giorno p(er) scandaglio.
-Il lavoro di scarpello di trevert(in)o e marmo cioè l'architrave di marmo della doi nave piccole q(ua)le la meta è in operà l'altra per del operà il basamento di tevert(in)o sotto li pilastri di dette et mezan li di d(et)te nave piccoli et finestroni della nave grande d(i) tevert(in)o q.li importano in tutto incima...550.00
-E più p(er) la valuta d'carett(at)a 127 di tevert(in)o rustichi quali sono denanzi la chiesa sud(ett)a nella piazza che agl. 26 la carett(at)a...330.20
-E più p(er) la portatura della sud(ett)i tervert(in)o fatti portare dalla Traspontina vecchia a d(ett)a locale 40 la carett(at)a...50.80
-Che ins(iem)e somma...931.00
[signed by Ant.o Gio. Battisti (scandaglio) and Gio. Maria Bolin]

The total of the two accounts for muratore and scarpellino was 4540.70 scudi, about one third of the amount spent on the church between 1618 and April, 1623.  

19Ringbeck, doc. 2 (AB 5549), 154-6
20Around 14 000 scudi, based on the calculations of Reinhardt, 63-75
1618, 4408.80 scudi were paid to workers at S. Crisogono, 500 scudi to Soria for the soffit (first payment, 6 September, 1618) and most of the remaining to Fontana (first payment 15 June, 1618) and Zaccaria, the ferraro, whose work was not specified but possibly included installing the brackets to support the ceiling; from January to September (there is a gap in the record from October to December), 1619, of the 2080 scudi spent, 1700 was to Soria for the ceiling; from 1620 to 1621, 5250 of the 5450 scudi spent related to the ceiling. The account book for 1622-23 show payments continued to be dominated by the ceiling until early 1623.

On 25 June and 31 August, 1622, Giovanni Francesco Barbieri (Guercino) was paid in 50 scudi installments for S. Crisogono in Glory, the central panel of the ceiling. Absent from the accounts, however, is the Cavalier Giuseppe Cesare d'Arpino, who painted the Virgin and Child in the central panel of the transept ceiling.

Two more documents from August and October 1623 record the stonework (by Giuseppe di Giacomo) in the transept, including old marble architraves, imposts, and pilaster bases, and the fitting of glass in the eighteen windows. By the end of 1623 enough was done to justify the dedicatory inscription on the internal facade wall.

Despite the dedication inscription, there is a flurry of documents from 1624 recording work inside the church. The major account of 13 April was for the stucco work in the clerestory, made by the muratore Marcantonio Fontana, including the elaborate window surrounds, the vine motif in the colonnade frieze, and the decoration of the proscenium arch. The stucco work resulted in the partial removal and plastering over of the thirteenth century frescoes. There is also an entry for relaying (with the Borghese arms) some of the pavement at the head of the nave.

---

21 ASV AB 7929.
22 ASV AB 7931.
23 ASV AB 7933. The account of 6 October, 1622, for Soria's carpentry on the nave and transept ceiling came to 5432 scudi: ASV AB 4173, published by J. Mandl, Die Kirche des hl. Chrysogonus, n. 17. Durante's account for the nave ceiling, valued at 1168: ASV AB 4172 (cited idem). Fumagalli discovered the two major accounts, with a total value of 4501.40 scudi, for the painting and gilding of the nave and transept ceiling by Giovanni Battista Ferrari, Lorenzo Verri, Fausto Rucci, and for Annibale Durante: ASV AB 4170, in Fumagalli, "Le fabbriche", 479.
24 For the indoratore, ASV AB 7931, nos. 356, 360, 361, etc.; for Guercino, AB 7933, nos. 493 and 621. According to Paola della Pergola, however, Guercino was paid 300 sc. for the work between 25 June and 2 October. The painting in the church is a copy. The original was bought by the British government in 1914 and is now in Lancaster House, London: Stone, Guercino, 103
25 Ringbeck, docs. 3-4 (AB 5549), 156-8
26 Ibid., doc. 6 (AB 6043), 159-63
Payments for the paintings above the seven existing side altars were also made in 1624. These included: Paolo Guidotti's *Meeting of Saints Francis, Dominic, and Angelo* (first on the left) and *Crucifixion* (fourth on the right); Giovanni San Giovanni's *Three Archangels* (second on the right); Giovanni Battista Mercatti's *St. Charles* (fourth on the left); Ippolito Provenzale's *St. Francesca Romana* (third on the right); Belardino Parasole's *St. Albert* (present whereabouts unknown); Domenico Valeriani's *St John the Baptist, St. Catherine of Alexandria, and St. Barbara* (first on the right). With the exception of Guidotti, little is known of these painters. There are in fact eight side altar paintings - one remains unidentified: *St. Mary Magdalen with two Carmelite saints* (second on the left, partly destroyed (a church-guide attributes it to Giovanni Coli and Filippo Gherardi). The artists were paid just 30 scudi for each painting.

In 1625 work moved outside the church with the erection of a *pietra rustica* architrave around the side entrance. This was followed in 1626 by the building of the new facade and portico, reusing the four medieval columns with new bases and capitals. A year later the belltower was restored, which included a stucco rendering of the brickwork.

 Restoration continued inside the church for another few years, including the refurbishment of the chapel of the Madonna, which had its vault and walls remade; the stucco work in the apse, including the angels in the side spandrels, the decoration on the underside of the arch, and the reliefs in the apse of the martyrdom of S. Crisogono and prospects of palaces and temples, all executed under Marcantonio Fontana. In 1627 the old ciborium was dismantled and moved to the convent and a new ciborium was erected over the altar. The ciborium includes eight marble *puttini* by the sculptor Domenico Prestinaro.

---

27Ibid., doc. 8 (AB 6089), 163-4.

28Guidotti (1569-1629) was a favorite of the Borghese. He had made a statue for Scipione, who showed it to Paul V, who was so impressed he made Guidotti a Cavaliere of Christ, and allowed him to take the name of Borghese: Baglione, 303-4; D'Amico, "Su Paolo Guidotti", 71-102. Ippolito Provenzale may have been related to the Marco Provenzale who made the little mosaic pictures (including a portrait of Paul V) now in the Museo Borghese.

29Ringbeck, doc. 10 (AB 6048), 165-6.

30Ibid., docs 11-12 (AB 6050 and 5557), 166-8.

31Ibid., doc. 13 (AB 6053), 171. The render was removed in 1937: Salimbeni, "Giovanni Battista Soria e il Cardinale Borghese", 402.

32Ibid., doc. 12, 168-70. On 20 April, 1624, Gio. Battista Ferrari, *indoratore*, was paid 138 scudi for "indoratore à tutta robbia spese fattore parte dell fenestroni et arconi nella chieas di S.ta Grisogono ...sopra li lavori di stucco...": AB 6046, n. 203,

33Ibid., docs. 13-14 (AB 6053 and 6052), 172-3

34Ibid., doc. 15 (AB 6052), 173.
Finally, the twenty two medieval marble capitals of the nave columns were encased in festooned plaster Ionic capitals. The bases of the columns were also replaced. The medieval composite capitals on the pilasters at the foot of the nave, and the Corinthian capitals on the porphyry columns at the head of the nave, were restored and left in place.

By 1629 work on the church had finished and the last documents describe the new oratory built for the Carmelite friars, with the final document detailing the glass bearing the Borghese arms inserted in the facade window of the oratory.

Note: In 1997 a gilded timber candelabrum, over two metres high, was placed in the centre of the right aisle. The feet of the candelabrum are in the form of the Borghese emblems and it is possible this is one of the original furnishings of Scipione’s renovation. If so, it must have been one of the later items of work, as no reference to the object was found in either the carpentry or gilding documents for the years 1607-23 (ASV AB 4170 and 4173).

The Restoration Complete

Cardinal Borghese spent around 40 000 scudi over ten years on S. Crisogono, his most expensive exercise in church building. Seventeenth century views of S. Crisogono show some slight differences to its present-day appearance. Falda’s image of c.1665 suggest the main changes have been to the street alignment, the finish of the bell tower, and the addition in 1707 of the portico’s iron gates. Most of the guide-books of the seventeenth century simply added one or two sentences about the restoration to the end of the standard description of the church. The updated edition of Baronio’s Descrizione di Roma Moderna went into more detail:

...The church was restored through the generosity of Scipione Borghese, titular Cardinal, nephew of Paul V and Grand Penitentiary. A beautiful timber ceiling was carved, all finished in gold, and ample windows were inserted down the side walls; the church was provided with sacred furnishings, the choir was adorned with gilded stucco, and the facade and portico were remade...The interior has three aisles divided by two

---

35Ibid., doc. 17 (AB 6058), 174.
36Ibid., doc. 18 (AB 6055), 175.
37Ibid., docs. 19-21 (AB 6062, 6061, 6064), 176-77.
38Reinhardt, 98.
rows of beautiful antique marble columns, similar to those of S. Maria in Trastevere. Cavaliere d'Arpino painted the Blessed Virgin and Child on the ceiling near the tribune, and Guercino made the image of S. Crisogono in the middle of the main ceiling.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{40}"Scipione Borghese Cardinale Titolare, e Penitentiero, Nipote di Paolo V la rese con la sua generosità, fra l'altre chiese, assai; riguardevole, facendovi un bellissimo soffitto intagliato, tutto meso à oro, e lati ample funestre; edificò ancora nella medesima, il coro adorno di stucchi dorati; rifece il portico, e la facciata della chiesa, provedendola di molte suppellettili sacre...Contiene tre navi, divese da due ordini di colonne bellissime di marmo antico, nella guisa di S. Maria in Trastevere. La B. V. con il bambino, dipinta nell'accennato soffito, verso la tribuna, e del Cav. d'Arpino, il S. Crisogono, espresso nel mezzo di esso è del Guercino": Cesare Baronio, Alfonso Ciaconio, Antonio Bosio, Ottavio Panciroli, \textit{Descrizione di Roma Moderna, Formata Nuovamente}, Rome, 1697, 140.
II.4.
Caffarelli Chapel, S. Maria sopra Minerva.
[figs. 38-40]

The chapel is the second on the right as one enters the church. It was built in 1498 for Prospero Caffarelli (1440s-1500). From 1522 the altar was dedicated to S. Antoninus, the illustrious Dominican archbishop of Florence; in 1670 it was re-dedicated to St. Louis Beltran following his canonisation by Clement X. Scipione's father, Francesco, died in 1615 and as a Caffarelli was to be entombed in the family chapel. Some time after Francesco’s death Cardinal Borghese paid for the installation on the chapel’s side wall of a commemorative inscription on marble, featuring the Caffarelli arms breaking through the segmental pediment of the aedicule surrounds. This small monument would seem to be the motivation for initiating a more extensive ornamentation of the chapel.

On 12 June, 1620, Cardinal Borghese’s account book records the first payment of 100 scudi to the stone-mason Master Giuseppe di Giacomo "a buon’conto dell’altare che facciamo fare nella cappella de S[ligno]ri Caffarelli nella chiesa della Minerva...". Soon after, there is record of the Cardinal buying seven (presumably antique) columns for use in the altar, two of

1J. J. Berthier, L’Église de la Minerve a Rome, Rome, 1910, 67-71, is the most useful guide to the chapel; Giancarlo Palmiero and Gabriella Villetti, Storia edilizia di S. Maria sopra Minerva in Roma, 1275-1870, Rome, 1989, 146-7, discuss the chapel briefly, ignoring Cardinal Borghese’s intervention (the same authors’ Santa Maria Sopra Minerva in Roma, notizie dal cantiere, Rome, 1994, with details of their latest research, contains nothing in relation to the chapel). Cardella (above, I.1, n. 1) noted Borghese’s intervention in the chapel, but it escaped the attention of both Reinhardt and Ringbeck (although as it is unlikely to be a work by Soria this is not a fault of Ringbeck’s monograph). The architect Giuseppe Paglia restored the chapel and that adjacent for the Caffarelli in 1670-71: Stefano Forte, "Il dominicano Giuseppe Paglia architetto siciliano a Roma (1616-1683)", Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum, 33 (1963), 294. Most of the details of the following were discussed with Fabio Barry, who visited the chapel with me and provided numerous references.

2The inscription reads: D O M/FRANCISCO CAFARELLO/ROMANO/HORTENSIAE/Pauli V Pont./Max/SORORIS VIRO/NOBILITATIS IUXTA/AC/PROBITATIS ANTIQUEAE/QUI CANDOREM/ANIMI ET AM IN SENILI/PRUDENTIAM/ET IN OMNI FORTUNA /MODERATIONEM SUI/TENVIT/OFFICIA IN/AMICOS/AUXIT/OBIIT ANNO DOMINI MDCXV/III IDVS AVGVSTI/VIXIT/ANNOS LXIII/MENSES II DIES XX/SCIPIO CARD BVRGHEIVS/PARENTI POSVIT: Forcella, Iscrizioni, vol. 1, 488. Although dated 1615 the inscription could have been made sometime after; the funerary inscription in S. Trinità dei Monti, for example, for the Cardinal’s mother Hortensia (Forcella, vol. 3, 148-9), was made in 1611 and pre-dated to 1598 (the stima for the inscription of 11 December, 1611, in ASV AB 4174, unfol.).

3ASV AB 7931, n. 218. Further 100 scudi payments on 11 August (n. 310), 5 September (n. 342), 5 and 31 October (nos. 364 and 390), 14 December (n. 434); in 1621, on 28 January (n. 54), 27 February (n. 93) and the last payment on 11 September (n. 469). These were not the full payments for the scarpellino work in the chapel; a subsequent account valued the work at 1158. 20 scudi: ASV AB 6043 (undated, but 1624).
green marble, two of yellow marble, and three of granite. It is likely that the green marble was cut down for the fascias surrounding the altar painting, while the two yellow columns remain intact. The builder and foreman for the project was the Cardinal’s usual muratore Marcantonio Fontana, who was surely paid more than the lone 100 scudi payment recorded on 11 September, 1620.

It is unknown who designed the altar (and possibly the wall monument around Francesco’s inscription). Stylistically, the altar could be attributed to either Carlo Maderno or Girolamo Rainaldi (1570-1655), neither of whom were normally in the service of the Cardinal, though both had worked in the Borghese ambit. Giovanni Battista Soria is another candidate, for the aedicule comprised of Corinthian columns supporting a segmental pediment is similar to his only surviving altar in the Franciscan church of S. Maria di Gesù in Montefortino. At this stage, however, it is almost certain that Soria was employed solely as a carpenter. The most likely designer is the incumbent architect, Giovanni Vasanzio. Unfortunately, there are no comparable works in Vasanzio’s accepted oeuvre, although the altar is similar to an attributed altar of his master, Ponzio, altar in the baptistery of S. Maria Maggiore, which in turn closely recalls Domenico Fontana’s altarpiece (c. 1589) in the Peretti chapel of S. Susanna (where Ponzio had assisted Maderno).

It is not clear how much of the stucco work results from the Borghese intervention and how much from the embellishment of 1671. Marcantonio

---

4 On 26 September, 1620, the Cardinal paid “Al R. P. Abbate dell ord.e Olivetano in S. ta Maria Nova [S. Francesca Romana] di Roma 180 sc(udi) m(one)ta sono, cioè 150 sc. per il prezzo di 2 colonne di marmoro verdone et 30 sc. per altre 3 colonne di granito che e ha venduto per l a servitio n.ro. Con ricevuta a di Monte Cavallo ...[in the margin, colonne p(er) la cappella Caffar. nella Minerva]” (ASV AB 7931, 62, n. 354). On 6 March, 1621, the account book records the buying of another two columns for the chapel: ”...Vi piacerà dar credito a R. R. frati di S.to Giorgio di centocinquanta m(one)ta [scudi] che sono p(er) la valuta di tre colonne venduteci p(er) uso...doi di marmoro giallo et una di Porta santa...[in the margin, 3 Colonne, 2 C(appell)a Caff(arelli)i, et una P(orta) Pincio].” (ASV AB 7931, 94 n. 104) Unfortunately I could not find the vital misura e stima for the chapel, which one would normally expect to find in either ASV AB 4174 or 6043 (building accounts for the period 1607-24).

5 ASV AB 7931, n. 463.

6 Apart from St. Peter’s, Hibbard, Carlo Maderno, 192, suggests Maderno had some part, albeit possibly minor, in the design of Scipione’s Giardino casino on the Quirinale. In 1612 Borghese had engaged Maderno to work on the design for the cathedral in Bologna (Antinori, 279-308). Both Maderno and Rainaldi worked at the Palazzo Borghese. In addition, Rainaldi had assisted in the Pauline chapel in S. Maria Maggiore: cf, for example, the present altar with the central aedicule of Rainaldi’s unexecuted design for the Tabernacle of the Virgin (Berlin, Kunstbibliothek, Hdz 574).

7 The chapel was restored again in 1848 and in 1855 by Gaetano Caffarelli: Palmiero and Vitelli, Storia edilizia di S. Maria, 148. The grisaille paintings on the lateral walls are likely from this period.
Fontana would later be responsible for the stucco decoration in S. Crisogono, and the stucco ovolo mouldings in the lunette above the altar of the Caffarelli chapel, including the surrounds and volutes of what was once the central window, is consistent with his work. The decoration on the underside of the chapel's entrance arch, showing the virtues of Fortitude, Faith, Hope and Justice, is also similar to that on the proscenium arch of S. Crisogono (note in particular the seraphs punctuating the larger panels on both arches). The marbled and stucco edged panels on either side of the altar, in the chapel's four corners, and on the pilasters flanking the main arch are integrated into the broader architectural frame of pilasters, bases, and entablature, work that results from the remodelling of 1671.

The present painting by Baciccio of St. Beltran replaced an original altarpiece by the Cavaliere d'Arpino, depicting St. Dominic with the Virgin and angels. Its present whereabouts is unknown. The painting of a standing St. Dominic now in the central panel of the lunette above is usually attributed to d'Arpino, although for what reason is unclear. It was not cut down from the original altar painting, unless the only known description of d'Arpino's altarpiece - by Giovanni Baglione, who described S. Dominic as kneeling before the Virgin - is wrong. Baglione, and the account of 1624, mention two other side oil paintings by d'Arpino, which are probably the poorly preserved figures on either side of the lunette panel.

---

8 Fontana's stucco work in S. Crisogono is recorded in documents published by Ringbeck, 166-70.
9 Two 100 scudi payments were made to Cavaliere Giuseppe Cesare d'Arpino on 20 February and 6 April, 1621, "à conto del quadro che deve fare di pittura per uso della cappella del SS.ri Caffarelli...". ASV AB 7931, 89 n. 88 and 102 n. 158. According to an entry of 10 August, 1624, D'Arpino's account increased to 400 scudi and included two side paintings as well as the altar: "S. re computista mon.sre magg(tordomo) ha ordinato che si faccia un mandato di cento scudi m.ta al S.r Cavaliere Giuseppe Cesare d’Arpino à conto dell’iquatrocento scudi m.ta ch’importa il prezzo del quadro grande dell’altare della cappella de’SS. Caffarelli nella chiesa della Minerva con l’altre doi quadri laterali fatti, e da farsi in detto luogo, che con altri dogento m(one)ta...[?]...a d(et)to conto fanno in tutto trecento che detto S.re Cavalier hà ricevuti per dette pitture q(uest)e di 10 Agosto 1624." (ASV AB 6043, n. 394). While working in the Caffarelli chapel d'Arpino was also engaged to paint the central panel of the transept soffit in S. Crisogono. On Baciccio's 1671 painting, see Robert Enggass, The Painting of Baciccio. Giovanni Battista Gaulli, 1639-1709, Pennsylvania State University State, 1964, 144-5. Enggass does not, however, mention the existing altar or d'Arpino's original painting.
10 For example, by Berthier, L'Église de la Minerve, 68; and the information on the chapel in Rome's Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e Documatazione. The 1973 exhibition catalogue edited by Röttgens, the closest thing to a comprehensive monograph on D'Arpino, makes no reference to the Caffarelli chapel.
11 "Qui alla Minerva nella prima cappella a man diritta de'Signori Caffarelli fece il quadro di S. Domenico ginocchione con una Madonna e Angeli; con due Santi da lati, a olio": Baglione, Le vite, 373.
12 Just as the central panel is normally attributed to d'Arpino, so the normal attribution of these side paintings is to Gasparo Celio (1571-1640). According to Baglione, Celio worked in the Caffarelli chapel above the cornice, "e vi ha fatto diverse historie de'fatti di San
anatomies of the figures, symmetrically arranged and seated in pronounced *serpentinate* poses, are consistent with d'Arpino's style.\(^\text{13}\) One cannot seriously assess the significance of an unseen painting, but the cost and the location would at least suggest it was major late work by this prolific and highly regarded artist.\(^\text{14}\) D'Arpino's painting of the Virgin in the transept ceiling of S. Crisogono (c.1621) shows he still favoured elegant figural attenuation, muted colour harmonies, and balanced composition at around this date.

---

\(^{13}\) The figure is so common in d'Arpino's work one need only cite one example: the twin angels supporting S. Benedict (Naples, Capodimonte, c. 1621), illustrated in Röttgens, *Cavalier D'Arpino*, pl. 53.

\(^{14}\) 400 scudi for the three paintings would place d'Arpino's work close to the top bracket of artists' prices. As noted above (II.3) minor painters such as Ippolito Provenzale, Berlardin Parasole, and Paolo Guidotti were paid just 30 scudi for their altarpieces in S. Crisogono.
II.5
Facade of S. Maria della Vittoria
[figs. 67-70, 73-80]

The church of the discalced Carmelites, on the western side of the city towards the Porta Pia, was built between 1608 and 1620 from the designs of Carlo Maderno. In plan it is a small version of the hall churches popular at the time, with lateral chapels on either side of the nave, culminating in a simple transept and apse. A small dome, encased on the outside in an octagonal drum, sits over the crossing. The church was originally dedicated to St. Paul but was renamed S. Maria della Vittoria in 1622 in honour of the small image of the Madonna found in a castle of Pilsen, which Ferdinand II had credited with enabling the Catholics to defeat Protestant Prague in 1620.

Borghese undertook to build a facade on the church following his acquisition late in 1619 of an antique hermaphrodite sculpture found on the Carmelites' property. On 6 January, 1625, Cardinal Borghese paid Andrea Appiano, scarpellino, the first installment of an account for the facade, drawn up by the misuratore, Giovanni Maria Bolin. Baglione attributed the design of the facade to Soria, which has never been contested. Work on the facade continued until mid-1627. Thereafter the final documents record payment to Domenico Rossi for the marble relief sculpture of the Nativity above the central door. The total cost of the facade was 7962 scudi.

Giovanni Maggi's view of 1625 shows the front of the church (still described as S. Paolo) set back and separated from the via Pia by the monastery's property wall. This extremely shallow atrium (it probably extended to the edge of the present day footpath) had already been removed by the time of Falda's view of the church (Il nuovo teatro..., 1665-67, vol. 3) and was probably demolished in the course of building the new facade.

---

1See Guglielmo Matthiae, S. Maria della Vittoria, (Le chiese di Roma illustrate), Rome, 1965; Hibbard, Carlo Maderno, 140
2The incident is discussed in the text, eh. 3 n. 63.
3Idem.
4Ringbeck, docs. 30-36 (AB 6044, 5553, 5557, 6053, 6056, 6059), 185-7.
5Reinhardt, 99.
II.6
Convent and Facade of Santa Chiara a Casa Pia
[fig. 81]

The convent and church dedicated to St. Claire were built c.1582, one block behind the Pantheon. The establishment had been founded by Carlo Borromeo under Pius IV (1559-65). The church, including the facade, has been ascribed to Francesco da Volterra; the convent was built after 1612 under Carlo Maderno's direction.1

Borghese was the protector of the convent, a position he probably acquired after the death of Cardinal del Monte in 1626.2 Ringbeck published two documents which record changes to the complex made under Soria's direction and at Cardinal Borghese's expense.3 The first was for building by Marcantonio and Pietro Fontana, and Benedetto Drei, done between 13 August, 1627, and 22 March, 1628. This included dismantling and rebuilding the roof of the rooms beside the church, and remaking the walls of some of its passageways. The second document, dated 28 January, 1628, is for stone work by Andrea Appiano, including a new door decorated with the Borghese arms on the monastery facade, and a stairway in front of the church entrance. The changes can be seen in Vasi's eighteenth century engraving of the church. The church and monastery were demolished and rebuilt between 1883 and 1890.

---
1 Hibbard, Carlo Maderno, 204-5.
2 Above, ch. 4 n. 15; below, III.3.
3 Ringbeck, 75-6; docs. 37-8 (AB 6059), 187-90.
II.7
The Organs of S. Maria Sopra Minerva
[figs. 82-83]

In 1562 an organ was installed in the northern arm of the transept of S. Maria sopra Minerva, above the pier that separates the passageway from the Cappella dei Frangipane. In 1628 the Dominican fathers requested alms for the amplification of the organ and Cardinal Borghese, the protector of the order, was the chief benefactor.¹ Most of the documents for this work are missing, although Ringbeck publishes two, from 30 July 1629 and 9 April 1630, which record work on the stucco arms and marble inscription by Domenico Prestinaro.² In early 1630, Borghese paid for a duplicate organ on the south side of the transept, a now disused instrument with at least two badly damaged pipes. The organ was probably finished by 1632 and involved a number of artisans working under Soria's direction, including Andrea Appiano the scarpellino, Ennio Bonifatio the organ maker, and Giovanni Maria Carrara and Fausto Tucci for painting and gilding.³ The builders Marcantonio and Pietro Fontana made a bellows' room above the Altieri Chapel. Reinhardt estimates that the Cardinal spent 4772.54 scudi on the organs between 1628 and 1632.⁴

²Ringbeck, 112; docs. 53-4 (AB 6063-4), 205-6.
³The registro dei mandati for 1630-32 records the first payment for the new organ of 200 scudi to Appiano on 12 January 1630: AB 6093, 6r. Ibid., docs 56-62 (AB 6064, 6068, 6093), 206-8.
⁴Reinhardt, 99.
The sixth century church was demolished, c. 1106, to make way for the present basilica (which was extensively remodelled in the eighteenth century). An anonymous drawing, c. 1573, shows the facade and forecourt of the church, just before the monastery was given to the Camaldolensians.¹ The view from within the atrium in the 1588 edition of Le cose maravigliose... shows a facade, possibly constructed after 1573, with an open lower level of paired Ionic columns supporting a closed upper level.² Tempesta's map of 1593 depicts a grand stair leading to a single story forecourt, with possibly an arcade on the entrance side.

On 30 June, 1607, Cardinal Borghese was commended the abbey and completed the decoration of oratories beside the church begun by Cardinal Baronio (see II.1, above). In mid 1629 Borghese initiated the reconstruction of atrium and facade in front of the church itself.³ When the Cardinal died in 1633, the stairs and the facade had been completed, but the portico was unfinished and work continued under Scipione's commenda successor, Cardinal Pietro Maria Borghese.

The building documents were first published by Ringbeck and then again by Pedrocchi. The first is a measure of work done by the muratori, Marcantonio and Pietro Fontana (28 June, 1629), for the fortification of the foundations and walls of the existing facade and atrium.⁴ A later muratori account (12 January, 1633) records the rebuilding of the courtyard, including the construction of the eight cloister pillars and the dismantling of the projecting interior portico.⁵ Other documents for the intervening period record the work done by Andrea Appiano, scarpellino, on the facade, cloister, and grand stair.⁶ The signatories to the building documents were Giovanni Maria Bolin and Soria; the latter is universally credited as the designer. According to Reinhardt, 4786.87 scudi were spent on the church between 1630-33.⁷ This is considerably less than the 14 230.71 scudi total of the accounts published by Ringbeck, which suggests the majority of the

¹Stuttgart, Kupferstichkabinett, 5783r, reproduced in Egger, Römische Veduten, vol. 1, pl. 100.
²Roca de Amicis, "Studi sul città", 27.
³Ringbeck, 84-5; Pedrocchi, San Gregorio al Celio, 133-6.
⁴Ringbeck, doc. 39 (AB 6066), 190-1.
⁵Ibid., doc. 43 (AB 5570), 195-98.
⁶Ibid., docs. 40-2 (AB 5564, 5570, 6070), 191-98
⁷Reinhardt, 89-95.
accounts must have been settled by Marcantonio Borghese, the executor of the Cardinal's estate. In fact, the final *misura e stima* for stonework, unnoticed by either Ringbeck or Pedrocchi, was made after the Cardinal's death and includes some of the heraldic work done near the sacristy, the inscription under the loggia before the church, and the making of the two steps leading to the loggia.

---

8 According to Pedrocchi, *San Gregorio*, 136, the payments end in June 1631.

9 "A di 9 Febraro 1634. Misura e stina dell' lavori di scarpello fatti di tutta robba da M.ro Andrea Appiano in finire la facciata, e Portico della Chiesa di S. Gregorio vivente la B. M. dell’Em.mo Sig.re Cardinale Borghese Misurati e stimati da me sotto scritto doppo l'altre misure fatte di detta facciata dalli SS. ri Gio. Batta Soria, et Gio. Maria Bolina...194. 58 scudi. " ASV AB 6660. The account was settled on 16 June, 1634, with the payment of the above amount, "...per resto saldo, et intero pagamento di tutti li lavori fatti à tutta robba sua in finire la facciata, e portico della chiesa di San Gregorio...": ASV AB 6095, 55r.
II.9
S. Maria di Gesù, Artena (formerly Montefortino)
[figs. 88-94]

About fifty kilometres south of Rome and five kilometres south-west of Valmontone, at the foot of Montecalcare, lies antique Artena dei Valsci, renamed the castle and town of Montefortino in the Middle Ages, and now simply called Artena. In the fourteenth century the castle was owned by John Hawkwood and in the sixteenth century by the Colonna, who rebuilt it after 1565. On the 7 January, 1612, Giulia Colonna, in the name of her husband Marzio, sold the estate to Cardinal Aldobrandino. But the heirs and debtors of the Colonna (who were virtually bankrupt) annulled the sale because of irregularities. The debtors demanded a further sale and the son, Pier Francesco, sold the estate for 346 000 scudi to Cardinal Borghese on 30 May, 1614. On 21 August, 1615, Camillo and Valerio Massimi also sold their shares of Montefortino to Scipione for a further 78 000 scudi.¹

Works in the Town

Soon after acquiring Montefortino, Scipione initiated an extensive programme of architecture within the town itself, including a renovation of the signorial palace, and the construction of premises for the resident governor, a granary, an osteria, a new street, and town gateway. These buildings have yet to be studied in any detail. In the existing literature it is assumed that most of the works were undertaken before the death of Paul V and under the architectural direction of Giovanni Vasanzio. For Johannes Mandl, the extensions to the Palazzo Borghese (formerly Palazzo Colonna) should be attributed on stylistic grounds to Vasanzio.² Daria Borghese-Olsoufieff also credits Vasanzio as the architect, suggesting that the civic work began immediately after the Cardinal acquired the town, referring to a particular misura e stima and crediting Giovanni Vasanzio as the architect responsible.³ The account she refers to, however - for Dominico Andreotta, scarpellino, valued at just 100 scudi and dated 30 November, 1615 (ASV AB 4174) - is for insignificant work. Moreover, the payments for works in the town before 1622 (Vasanzio died in August, 1621) are very minor. As it was

¹Daria Borghese-Olsoufieff, "Opere d'arte ignorate ad Artena", Studi romani, 7 (1959), 192; Attilio Cadderi, Artena (già Montefortino) delle origini alla fine del secolo XIX, Rome, 1973, 113-4; Reinhardt, 105 n. 81 and 92.
³Borghese-Olsoufieff, "Opere d'arte", 193.
not normal practice to wait years before settling an artisan's account, one must assume that little work was actually carried out before the death of Paul V. (The date 1623 in the frieze of the palace courtyard tells us neither when the work began nor finished, for it could have been inscribed at any point during construction.) After 1622, the documents indicate that works in the town were undertaken simultaneously. The major *misura e stima* for building by Marcantonio Fontana and company on the palace, piazza, *palazzetto*, granary, stalls, osteria, and new street (but not the Arco Borghese) is dated 23 March to 11 May, 1624, valued at 6092.79 scudi, and signed by Giovanni Maria Bolin, Sergio Venturi, and Antonio de Battista; *a* a second account is dated 30 December, 1624, valued at 4067.50 scudi, and signed by Bolin. The major account for tufa and peperino stonework by Andrea Appiano and Niccolo de Jacobis is dated 24 October, 1623, to 10 May, 1624, valued at 2114.31 scudi and signed by Bolin; *b* the second account, for stone work by Appiano only, valued at 487.29 scudi, signed by Bolin. *c* A major stone masonry account for the osteria, dated 5 September, 1623, and valued at 1351.23 scudi, is preserved in the earlier volume of accounts. *d* In relation to the Arco Borghese, no documents relating to its construction could be found. According to Mandl and Cadderi, who both cited an eighteenth century description of the town, lead lettering on the rear frieze originally recorded the date of 1620. *e* There is no record, however, of payment for the arch in the relevant *registro dei mandati*. Moreover, such an early date would place it during the lifetime of Paul V, when Scipione was still the cardinal-nephew, and one would thus expect the papal keys and not the cardinal's cap to be mounted above the escutcheon. *f* This leaves the question of the architect. It remains possible that some of the design, particularly the arched loggia of the palace and the gateway, was conceived under Vasanzio. Vasanzio was succeeded as house architect by Sergio Venturi, although, as Ringbeck argues, it was Soria who designed for the Cardinal throughout the 1620s. *g* Ringbeck, however, does not consider the Montefortino buildings, apart from the Franciscan church, in her monograph on the architect. An attribution to Soria on stylistic grounds

---

*4* ASV AB 6043, n. 357.  
*5* ASV AB 6048, no. 467.  
*6* ASV AB 6043, no. 351.  
*7* ASV AB 6048, no. 476.  
*8* ASV AB 4174. According to Reinhardt (73-83, 110 n. 189 and n. 203), Borghese spent at least 31000 scudi on works in the town between 1622 and 1627.  
would be problematic, both because the ornament of the buildings is so minimal and because what can be established about Soria's style in this period is limited to his work in S. Crisogono. Nevertheless, he remains the only obvious candidate and must therefore be credited with the projects.

The Church

The foundation stone of the Franciscan church and convent, dedicated to Santa Maria di Gesù, was laid on 21 October, 1629. Ringbeck published the main misura e stima, which show the usual building team under Soria's direction. The complex was largely finished by March, 1633.¹¹

As shown on an early plan of the property, the church originally faced a crucifix (in the position of the present broken column) across a small piazza. The original facade is largely intact, although it is possible the giant pediment replaced an earlier segmental pediment.¹² The interior retains its original disposition, a barrel vaulted hall with three chapels on either side and tribune extending behind the high altar screen. Almost all the interior decoration, however, dates from the eighteenth century or beyond, and all references to Borghese have been removed. The aediculed high altar is in place, although its original white plastered appearance was transformed by marbling, probably during a restoration c. 1735. The current altarpiece, a Virgin and Child with John the Baptist, Elizabeth, and Anne, also dates from the eighteenth century restoration. A manuscript of 1677 describes what was likely the original altarpiece painting, noting Jesus jocking with John the Baptist.¹³ The description also notes the arms of the Cardinal (since

¹¹ Ringbeck, 18-93; and docs. 45-47 (AB 5568, 5569, 6072), 198-201; and 89-93. The value of these misure e stime was 15 686.78 sc., which is unlikely to represent the total cost of the complex; an avviso of 27 October, 1629 (Urb. Lat. 1099, 687r), reported the Cardinal's intention of spending 40 000 scudi on the project (avvisi, however, tended to exaggerate or report the inflated estimates of the patrons officials). The registro dei mandati for these years (AB 6093) records only a fraction of this amount, and the much of the payments were made after Scipione's death: for example, Ludovico Bosio, muratore, was paid 200 scudi for work at the church on 31 July and 26 August, 1634; Agostino Butio, scarpellino, 100 scudi on 31 August (AB 6095, 65r, 68v, 70v).

¹² Ringbeck, 92, publishes late seventeenth century drawing (Archivio di San Francesco a Ripa, MS 13, f. 626) showing a segmental pediment, thus duplicating the outline of the central window, which she suggests may have been destroyed by an earthquake. Though not unknown, giant segmental pediments were rare in the 1620s-30s and only became more popular later in the century. Moreover, the present triangular pediment forms a typical alternate rhythm with the aedicule of the door. Finally, a drawing such as this is normally of questionable reliability, with many of the details composed (or invented) from memory. Nevertheless, this particular drawing is accurate in so many of its minor details (such as the three steps leading to the church door, or the arched and stone edged openings to the monastery) that Ringbeck's conjecture is plausible.

¹³ Caddei, Artena, 205-7.
removed and replaced with another escutcheon) under the cornice of the altarpiece. On the rear of the altar screen is a Reni-like Crucifixion with the Virgin, Mary Magdelen and S.t John the Evangelist, surrounded by grisaille decoration, all of which, according to Cadderi, was painted c. 1842.\textsuperscript{14}

The two storey (an extra level has since been added to the western wing) monastery attached to the church was designed on a palazzo plan, with a succession of rooms wrapped around a square arcaded courtyard. Lunettes in the cloister have frescoes by Giovanni Maria Carrara and Marco Tullio Montagna.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14}Idem. The painting is possibly a copy after an original, for the composition is typical of 1620s-30s. Compare, for example, the painting of the same subject in Alvito (\textit{la chiesa di madre di S. Simone}) by Flaminio Allegrini, who worked for the Cardinal in S. Sebastiano: illustrated in Röttgens, \textit{Il Cavalier D'Arpino}, fig. 38.

\textsuperscript{15}Ringbeck, 92 n.370.
II.10
Santa Maria Assunta in Monte Compatri
[figs. 95-99]

Monte Compatri is in the Alban Hills south-east of Rome, about six kilometres past Frascati on the road to Rocca di Priore. A castle is recorded there under the control of the Annibaldi from 1090; from the fifteenth the area was owned by the Colonna, then the Cornaro, and later the Altemps.1 On 29 November, 1613, Monte Compatri was sold to Cardinal Borghese, along with nearby Monte Porzio.2 A month later Paul V made Monte Compatri a principate.

Following a papal visitation in 1629, which found that the town's existing church was inadequate, the foundation stone for the new church, dedicated to Santa Maria Assunta, was laid on 5 May, 1630.3 Ringbeck was unable to find any misure e stime relating to the project and published only the suggestive entries from the Cardinal's registro dei mandati for 1630-33.4 These show the usual workmen involved - Fontana the muratore and Appiano the scarpellino. Ringbeck also published accounts which show the Cardinal bought and demolished two houses in the area of the new church.5

The relevant masonry (though not carpentry or building) account, however, is preserved not in the Cardinal's records but in those of his heir, Marcantonio - indicating, despite the inscription on the facade, that work on the church continued after Scipione's death. The account (transcribed below) records Appiano's stonework for the interior column plinths, bases, capitals, and chapel arches. It also itemises the details of the facade.6 Although there is no documentary confirmation, Soria, as the Cardinal's house architect, has always been presumed to have designed the church.7

The church was greatly altered in 1876 with the addition of large transept and apse extending at the rear.8 A plan drawn before some proposed (and unexecuted) extensions of 1828 shows that the church was originally on a simple rectangular plan, which corresponds to the present nave hall before

---
1 Saturnino Ciuffa, Monte Compatri e i castelli limitrofi, Vignanello, 1927, 23-47.
2 Ibid., 50.
3 Ringbeck, 94.
4 Ringbeck, 95, n. 377; and docs. 48 and 50 (AB 6093), 203-4
5 Ibid., docs. 52-3 (AB 6068), 204-5
6 Further payments to Appiano were on 17 and 27 May, 1634; the account book entry refers to the scarpellino account in the church as valued at 1428.73 scudi (not, that is, 1275.78 scudi as per the quoted account): AB 6095, 52v. and 54v.
7 Ringbeck, 95.
8 Ciuffa, Monte Compatri, 66.
the crossing.\textsuperscript{1} The pilasters of the hall can all be identified in the \textit{misura e stima}, as can most of the other \textit{asprone} details described in the document, including the plinths, bases, capitals, architraves, and window surrounds. The opening items of the account (\textit{per il zoccolo di detto pilastro che rivolta verso la tribuna}) indicate a high altar and tribune, beginning under the main arch at the end of the original nave, shown in the 1828 plan of the church as a simple semi-circular apse.\textsuperscript{9} Unfortunately the plan does not indicate whether the high altar was free-standing under the arch (possibly with attached altar screen) or flush against the apse wall. The written description accompanying the plan noted that the church "è coperta a soffitto di legno". The present barrel vault springing from the Greek-Revival cornice (a cornice was not listed in the stonework account, which suggests it may originally have been plastered brick) dates from the nineteenth century.

The facade is unchanged with all the elements of the account still present; two storeys of rendered brick with \textit{asprone} Doric pilasters, large volutes linking the two levels, and capped by a giant pediment. The large iron hook in the tympanum indicates the past location of an escutcheon, almost certainly with the Borghese stemma. The frieze has the inscription: \textit{SCIPIO EPIS. SABIN S. R. E. CARD. BURGHESIUS. M. POENITEN. A. DOM. MDCXXXIII.}

\begin{itemize}
\item [\textit{ASV AB 6660}]
\item [A di 14 febbraio 1634]
\item [\textit{Misura e stima delli lavori di scarpello di asprone fatti di tutta robba da M.ro Andrea Appiano scarpellino nella Chiesa nova nel Castello di Monte de Compatri dell'Ecc.mo Sig. Principe Borghese, fatti detti lavori vivente la B. M. dell'Emin.mo et R.mo Sig.re Cardinale Borghese, misurati, e stimati da me sotto scritto Archit.o....}]
\item [- Per il zoccolo sotto il pilastro del cantone sotto l'arco dell'altar magg.e verso la casa della Compagnia...]
\item [- Per il basamento sopra d.o]
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{9}ASV AB 555, int. 315; Ringbeck, pl. 98. The description of the church (partly transcribed by Ringbeck, 96, n. 386) that accompanies the plan points out that the church was too small for the community: "è di forma rettangolare da una sola navata con tre cappelle per parte e con tribuna semicircolare nel lato posteriore ov'è l'altar maggiore, ed è coperta a soffitto di legno. La lunghezza nell'interno, è di palmi 87.1 e la sua larghezza è di palmi 53 di modo chè secondo il confetto calcolo di prattica può contenere circa 545 persone. Ova la popolazione di Monte Compatri essendo di 1638 individui...".
- Per il zoccolo di d.o pilastro che rivolta verso la tribuna...
- Per il basamento simile sopra d.o....
- Per il zoccolo sotto li pilastri nella tribuna...
- Per il basamento simile sopra d.o...
- Per il zoccolo sotto li pilastri che accompagnano il sud.o
- Per il basam.o simile sop.a d.o...
- Per il zoccolo dell’altro pilastro del cantone di d.a tribuna...
- Per il basamento simile sopra d.o...
- Per il zoccolo della rivolta di d.o...
- Per il basam.o sopra d.o simile...
- Per il zoccolo sotto li pilastri a mano manca nell’entrare in sagrestia...
- Per il basamento simile sopra d.o...
- Per il pilastro sopra d.o...

[there follows a listing for each of the twenty one pilasters and bases that surround the nave, chapel, and internal facade walls]

- Capitello sopra il pilastro a mano manca dell’altare mag.re verso la chiesa...
- Capitello della rivolta con il membretto verso la cappella...

[there follows items for the pilaster capitals]

- Imposte olii archi delle cappelle n.o 12...
- Stipiti delle 2 porte dalle ...?... dell’altar magg.re in faccia...senza l’orecchie...
- Architravi 2 a d.e porte...
- Cornice sopra d.tti n.o 2...
- Cornice abozzata attorno alla chiesa longo in tutto...
- Dentello sotto d.a nelli cantoni dell’altar maggiore...
- Stipiti della porticella che escie in piazza dalla chiesa in faccia...
  l’orecchia...l’architrave...fregio...
- Cornice sopra d.tti...
- Frontespitio di d.a...segue il timpano...
- Per la fattura delle 2 cartille sotto l’orecchie di d.e...
- Soglia che fa scalino a d.a...con le rivolte e cordone...
- Porta del cimiterio di vano...
- Finestre n.o 4 nelle facc.a dentro di d.a chiesa...
- Cantonata da d.a parte...
- Finestre dalla sagrestia n.o 2...
- Per haver quad.to li stipiti delle finestre di cantina dell’arciprete e fattoci n.o 14 bugi et quad.o li conci della fin.tra della stanza dell’arciprete...
- Per haver fatto il cordone con l’intaccat.e alli scalini della scala dell’arciprete...
- Per haver fatto n.o 3 scalini di nuovo in d.a scala sim.e...
- Per haver fatto un stipito et l’architrave al camino nelle dette stanzie dell’arciprete...
- Per la pietra in faccia a d.a camino...
- Per haver quadrato et repicchiato in parte li stipiti et archi della porta che entra in d.a stanza di vano...
- Per haver rifatto doi fin.e della scala di vano...
- Per haver quad.o li stipiti delle 2 porte di d.a scala e fatto l’architrave et soglia ad una di d.e...
- Per haver quad.o et repicchiato li conci delle porte di cantina a piedi di d.a scala di vano... et repicchiato quadrato et rifatto li conci della porta che escie in strada da d.a scala di vano...
- Per haver fatto la soglia di novo alla porta in cantina...
- Per haver fatto l’incastro per il telaro delle ferrate a n.o 6 fin.e del cimiterio di vano...
- Per doi giornate d’un mastro in accomodare li balustrate dalle bande dell’altare ind.a cimiterio...
- Per haver fatto li piani del 2 sedini dalle bande dell’entrone della terra e tagliati a grossezza...

Facciata della Chiesa

- Architrave...
- Capitello del pilastro in d.a verso il palazzo...
- Capitello in ...?... acanto d.o...
- Capitello del pilastro attaccato al risalto...
- Capitello del pilastro del risalto accanto d.o...
- Capitello del pilastro accanto la porta...
- Capitello che accompagna il d.o dall’altra parte della porta...
- Capitello accanto il d.o...
- Capitello attaccato al d.o...
- Capitello del cantone...
- Capitello della rivolta...
- Pilastri in d.a facc.ta...
- Pilastro del cantone nella rivolta...
- Pilastro dell’altra rivolta...
- Base sotto d.tti pilastri...
- Ripieno tra d.e base...
- Zoccolo sotto d.e base...
- Guida sotto d.tti lavorato p. 2 facciate...
- Cantonata sotto d.a ...
- Le nicchie in d.a facc.ta n.o 2...
- Stipiti della porta modinati in faccia...
- Architrave...
- Membretti...
- Fregio sopra di trevert.o....piano portato da Roma...
- Cornice sopra d.o...
- Frontespitio sopra d.a...
- Timpano...
- Per le 2 cartelle di trevert.o sopra li membretti...con le sue cimasette sopra...
- Per li 2 zoccoli sotto detti stipidi et membretti di trevert.o...portati da Roma...
- Soglia di d.a porta che fa scalino...
- Per il fregio di trevert.o in d.a facciata...lavorato piano in faccia fatto portare la Sua Emin.za

... Sommano intera tutti li soprad.i lavori di mille duecento settantacinque [scudi] et 78 [giulii]. 1275.78
Io Gasparo [de] Vecchi mano
Appendix 1 to the Catalogue
Checklist of the Artisans employed on Cardinal Borghese's Ecclesiastical Building Projects

Masons

Andrea Appiano: S. Crisogono; S. Maria della Vittoria; S. Chiara a Casa Pia; Organs of S. Maria sopra Minerva; facade of S. Gregorio Magno; S. Maria Assunta, Montecompatri; S. Maria del Gesù, Montefortino.

Agostino Butio: S. Maria del Gesù, Montefortino.

Gironimo Falciani: S. Sebastiano (from 1613). Also worked on the Villa Borghese and Palazzo Borghese in Monte Compatri

Armenio de Giudici: oratories of S. Gregorio Magno; S. Sebastiano.

Giuseppe di Iacomo: S. Crisogono; Cafferelli chapel, S. Maria sopra Minerva.

Agostino Radij: S. Crisogono

Antonio Ruzzi: S. Sebastiano (from 1613).

 Builders

Ludovico Bosio: S. Maria del Gesù, Montefortino.

Marcantonio and Pietro Fontana: S. Crisogono; Caffarelli chapel, S. Maria sopra Minerva; S. Chiara a Casa Pia; facade of S. Gregorio Magno; bellows room for the organ above the Altieri chapel, S. Maria sopra Minerva; Montefortino; Monte Compatri. Also worked in the Cappella Borghese and sacristy in S. Maria Maggiore, Palazzo Quirinale, Acqua Paola, the tabernacle of S. Agnese.

Iacomo Mola: S. Sebastiano.

Castello del Porto: S. Crisogono.

Domenico Selva: oratories of S. Gregorio Magno; S. Sebastiano.

Carpenters

Vittorio Roncone: oratories of S. Gregorio Magno; S. Sebastiano.

Giovanni Battista Soria: S. Crisogono; organs, S. Maria sopra Minerva.
Glassworker
Bastiano Aldigieri: S. Sebastiano.

Excavators
Giovanni Antonio dell'Aquila: S. Sebastiano; S. Crisogono.

Ironworker
Giovanni Maria Zaccaria: S. Sebastiano, S. Crisogono.

Sculptors
Niccolò Cordier: busts of Saints Peter and Paul, crypt of S. Sebastiano.

Domenico Prestinaro: S. Crisogono.

Domenico Rossi: relief above the facade door, S. Maria della Vittoria.

Painters and Gilders
Francesco Albani: fresco in crypt of S. Sebastiano ([?] destroyed).

Flaminio Allegrini: side altarpiece fresco of S. Francesca in S. Sebastiano.

Giovanni Francesco Barbieri (Guercino): oil painting, S. Crisogono in Glory, in the soffit of S. Crisogono.

Antonio Carracci: frescoes in the crypt of S. Sebastiano.

Giovanni Maria Carrara: gilding of organs, S. Maria sopra Minerva; frescoes in cloister of the S. Maria del Gesù, Montefortino.

Giuseppe Cesare (Cavalier d'Arpino): oil painting, Virgin and Child, in the soffit, S. Crisogono; altarpiece oil on canvas, Virgin and Child with St. Dominic, and oil on wall of angels in lunette, in Cafferelli chapel, S. Maria sopra Minerva.

Rinaldo Corradini: gilding of soffits in S. Andrea and S. Silvia (oratories of S. Gregorio Magno).

Domenichino: fresco of Martyrdom of St. Andrew, S. Andrea (oratory of S. Gregorio Magno).

Annibale Durante: soffit of S. Sebastiano; soffit of S. Crisogono.

Giovanni Maria Ferrari: soffit of S. Crisogono.

Paolo Giudotti: side altar paintings of Crucifixion and S. Angelo in S. Crisogono.
Giovanni San Giovanni: side altar painting of Angels in S. Crisogono.

Giovanni Lanfranco: fresco in the crypt of S. Sebastiano.

Giovanni Battista Mercatti: side altar painting of S. Carlo Borromeo in S. Crisogono.

Marco Tullio Montagna: ceiling fresco in sacristy, S. Sebastiano; frescoes in the cloister of Frati Minori church, Montefortino.

Belardino Parasole: side altar painting of S. Alberto in S. Crisogono.

Ippolito Provenzale: side altar of S. Francesca in S. Crisogono.

Guido Reni: frescoes in S. Andrea and S. Silva (oratories of S. Gregorio Magno); supervised frescoes around the crypt of S. Sebastiano.

Archita Ricci: side altarpiece frescoes of S. Carlo Borromeo, S. Girolamo, and S. Bernardo (now obscured by an easel painting of St. Francis by Muziano [?]) in S. Sebastiano.

Fausto Rucci: soffit of S. Crisogono.

Innocenzo Tacconi: fresco on wall altarpiece of Crucifixion, S. Sebastiano.

Domenico Valeriani: side altar painting of Four Saints in S. Crisogono.

Lorenzo Verri: soffit of S. Crisogono.
Appendix 2 to the Catalogue
Checklist of Cardinal Borghese's Palaces and Villas

The following list limits itself to the barest details; bibliographic references are only a guide to more comprehensive secondary sources.

1. Villa Torlonia (near Monte Porzio, formerly Villa Como).

2. Villa Pinciana (now the Villa Borghese).

   Granted to Scipione in 1609 by his uncle Giovan Battista Borghese (governor of the Borgo), who had bought the palace the year before from the Campeggi. Decorations by Cigoli, Annibale and Rinaldo Corradini. The palace was the initial home of the Cardinal's art collection, later located in the Villa Pinciana. Scipione moved from the palace in 1621; in January, 1623, it was granted for life to Cardinal Pignatelli (avviso, Urb. Lat. 1093, 53v). The Borghese sold the palace in 1638: Fumagalli, "Le fabbriche dei Borghese", 332-41.

4. Garden Palace on the Quirinale (il Giardino, now Palazzo Rospigliosi-Pallavicini).

4. Villa Mondragone (near Monte Porzio).

5. **Villa Vecchia** (near Monte Porzio, formerly Villa Tuscolana) acquired from Altemps in 1613 as part of the sale of Mondragone and incorporated into the estate of the larger villa: Franck, *The Villas of Frascati*, 56; Fumagalli, "Le fabbriche dei Borghese", 507-8.

6. **Palazzo Borghese in Monte Porzio**.

7. **Villa Borghese** (near Monte Porzio, also known as Villa Taverna).
Acquired from the Taverna in 1614; expanded under Giovanni Vasanzio: Franck, *The Villas of Frascati*, 78-80; Fumagalli, "Le fabbriche dei Borghese", 508-12.

8. **Palazzo Borghese in Montefortino** (now Artena), acquired in 1615; expanded 1617-25 under Vasanzio and Soria(?): Johannes Mandl, "Jan Van Santen in Artena un Cecchignola. Beiträge zur Bautätigkeit des Cardinals Scipione Borghese", *Mededeelingen van het Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome*, 18 (1938), 126-36; Daria Borghese-Olsoufieff, "Opere d’arte ignorate ad Artena", *Studi romani*, VII, (1959), 192-95. (The existing dating and attribution of the alterations to the palace are problematic; discussed in detail above, II. 9.)

9. **Palazzo Borghese** in Campo Marzio.
PART III
DOCUMENTS

1. Cardinal Borghese according to the Venetian Ambassadors.

Among the most interesting dispatches written from the papal court are those of the Venetian ambassadors.¹ The 5000-10000 word reports typically described the personality of the pope, the state of his armory and finances, his disposition towards the various European States, especially Venice, and profiles of the principal cardinals and their factional affiliations. Naturally in reports written during the time of Paul V, descriptions of Scipione are prominent, and in fact many historians have based their assessments of the Cardinal on the Venetian accounts.² Following is a selection of some of the portraits of Cardinal Borghese, chosen for their diversity, for the way they demonstrate the development of his statue in the Roman court, and for their importance to later historians.

i. The report of Francesco Molin, Pietro Duodo, Giovanni Mocenigo and Francesco Contarini, extraordinary ambassadors to the Court of Rome in 1605.

Il cardinal Borghese, che è di età di 26 anni [sic.]³ di molto et di ottima volontà, amatissimo sopra tutti dal Pontefice per haversolo tenuto sempre appresso allevatolo, mantenuto in studio a Perugia, messolo in habito, datole il suo capello et le sue entrate ecclesiastiche, et fattole rinontiar al cognome de Caffarelli et assumer quel de Borghesi con gran gelosia de' fratelli, et del cugini Vescovo di Montalcino; non ha sin qui alcuna autorità nè ardisse aprir bocca, con tutto che di volontà del Papa recevi tutti quelli honorj, che sogliono i nepoti de Papi Capi delle consulte et che hanno il

¹The reports are preserved in the Vatican Library. They were an important source for Leopold Von Ranke, who published numerous extracts in the appendix volume of documents of his History of the Popes (first published in German, 1834), London, 1913, vol. 3. The complete reports were published in N. Barozzi and G. Berchet (eds.), Le relazioni della corte di Roma. Lettere al senato dagli ambasciatori Veneti nel secolo decimosettimo, 2 vols., Venice, 1877; part III of the monumental Relazione degli stati Europei. Lettere al senato dagli ambasciatori Veneti nel secolo decimosettimo, Venice, 1856.²


³On Scipione’s age, see above eh. 1 n. 8.
governo in capite perché tutti gli Ambasciatori et chi ha negotio dopo le audienze di Sua Santità vanno da lui et li comunicano ogni cosa però non risponde mai determinatamente, nè risolve da lui alcuna cosa, nè meno promette di intromettersi per coadiuvar li negotii. Non alcun altro Cardinale, come ho detto poco fa, non havendo ardire di impedirsi oltre il proprio carico né curandosi di andar a negotiar con Sua Santità se non hanno occasione, per le loro chiese, o per protetzioni che habbino di Provincie et Republiche o di Religione, et se bene si credeva, che al Cardinal Arigoni\(^4\) delle condizioni che ho detto di sopra et che ha le stanze in palazzo, havesse qualche particolar affetto, et che potesse ricercar et ricever qualche parer da lui, si è poi scoperto che sebbene mostra amarlo et stimarlo tuttavia dalli negotii della Dataria\(^5\) in fuori essendo egli Datario si impedisce poco piu oltre; la somma è che ancora li cardinali stanno assai ritirati et in officio poco, sperando di ottener gratie da lui, favori, o per loro stessi o per i suoi, anzi temendo ognuno del suo rigore...

(Lettere..Roma, vol. 1, 62)

Cardinal Borghese is 26 years of age and of great and excellent good will. He is loved above all others by the Pope, who has always kept him, having raised him, maintained him in his studies in Perugia, had him ordained, given him his cardinal's hat and other ecclesiastical benefices, and made him renounce the family name of the Caffarelli and assume that of the Borghese, to the great envy of his brothers and his cousin the bishop of Montalcino.

He does not yet have any authority nor has he dared to open his mouth, even though by will of the Pope he receives all those honours that papal nephews are accustomed to receive as chief advisors and as people who hold government in capite. All the Ambassadors and anyone who has business to transact go to him, after His Holiness's audiences, and inform him of everything, but he never gives a firm answer nor does he resolve

\(^4\)Pompeo Arrigoni (1552-1616), created cardinal by Clement VIII in 1596. After the death of Clement VIII Arrigoni was touted as the next pope, but he ended supporting the successful nomination of Alessandro de Medici. With the ascension of Paul V, Arrigoni remained in favour and was granted various posts and benefices. For some unknown reason, at the end of 1607 he fell into disgrace and was removed from the datary. Thereafter he concerned himself exclusively with his diocese of Benevento, although he did sit on the tribunal that first examined Galileo's position in May 1611: G. De Caro, "Arrigoni, Pompeo", DBI, Rome, 1962, vol. 4, 320; Cardella, Memorie, vol. 6, 41-4.

\(^5\)The datary distributed vacant offices and conceded pensions and benefices. It grew out of the chancery and became a separate office in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Pompeo Arrigoni was the Pro-datario from May 1605 to February 1607: N. Del Re, La curia romana, 256-63.
anything by himself, nor does he even promise to intervene in the negotiations with any other cardinal. [This is] because, as I said a moment ago, he does not dare to involve himself beyond his proper authority. Nor does he wish to go and deal with His Holiness [on behalf of those who] do not have the opportunity [to plead] on behalf of their churches, or on the petition of their provinces and republics or orders. Although it was believed that he bore particular affection towards Cardinal Arigioni (of the condition I have described above, and who has rooms in the palace), and that [therefore it was thought] he might seek and receive some opinion from him, it has turned out that although he seems to love and esteem him, nevertheless except for the business of the Chancery (since he is the Datary), he does not venture much further. The conclusion is that even the cardinals keep away and come rarely to his office hoping to obtain favours from him, either for themselves or for their dependents. Rather each fears his rigour....

ii. Report of Giovanni Mocenigo, ordinary ambassador, 1609-12

Il Cardinale Borghese è bella presenza, di naturale molto cortese e benigno, ed avendo in sé tutte quelle migliori qualità che possono essere in un gran personaggio, come egli da al Pontefice ed a tutte la corte ogni più desiderata soddisfazione, porta grande rispetto e riverenza al Papa, mostrando di non desiderare alcuna cosa che non sia di suo compito gusto; ed ancorchè con ogni ragione potesse avere grande autorità con la Santità Sua, e perciò ognuno in tutti gli affari gravi faccia capo con sua Signoria Illustrissima, niente di meno dispone con gran misura in tutte le cose che non promettendo ad alcuno della volunta del Pontefice, con umanissima maniera rende ciascuno soddisfatto almeno di buone parole; serve il Pontefice con gran diligenza e fedeltà, e con grandissima pazienza attende alli negozii che gli sono dalla Sua Santità raccomandati, che sempre passano con sommo contento, soddisfazione e riputazione di lui.6 Nel resto egli è anche umanissimo e cortessissimo con tutti e con la sua gentilezza acquista la benevolenza di tutta la corte. E perché il Papa non può a tutti soddisfare e tutti non possono compiacersi del suo governo, (come accade a tutti di Principi, dove si tratta di tante cose, per compiacere al gusto degli uomini

---

6This positive assessment of the Cardinal confirms an earlier report of October 1605, sent by Battista Ceci to the court of Urbino: "[The Cardinal] è di natura superbo, come sono ordinariamente tutti questi Romani; ne si vede in lui gravita naturale in qualunque attione, che faccia, ma l'arte supererà la natura": Urb. Lat. 837, Relazione dell qualità et Governo della Città di Roma et dello Stato ecclesiastico, 433r.
che è vario, bisognerebbe che tutte le virtù che sono sparse tra molti fossero raccolte in lui solo, per ciò occorrendo che resti alcuna persona mal soddisfatta), supplisce il cardinale colla sua maniera graziosissima, e con le sue buone parole, facendo tutte quelle grazio e favori che può per rendere il Pontefice benevolo, e Sua Signoria Illustrissima è stimata e rispettata da oguno. Per questo Sua Santità l’ama con straordinario affetto, essendo il Papa di natura tale che non vuole per alcuna passione far cosa che possa essere stimata provenire da alcuna mano che dalla sua e dal suo giudizio particolare; Sua Santità arricchisce il Signore Cardinale disegna di appoggiarlo a parentadi e ad una buona banda di cardinali sue creature, ma però studia di farlo con quella miglior maniera che si può affinché non gli si partorisca invidia, giocando a questo effetto la modestia e umiltà con la quale vuole Sua Santità che viva tutta la sua casa lontanissima, della alterezza. Si trova Sua Signoria Illustrissima finora un gran seguito di cardinali, e vivendo come egli spera il Pontefice, è per accrescere con nuovi promozioni maggiormente la sua fazione colla quale potrà fare un Pontefice suo confidente, interesse ed ambizione che è stata sempre nelli nipoti dei Pontefice.

Prima di questa promozione, avria potuto Aldobrandini impedire assai li disegni del Cardinale Borghese, ma con tal promozione sormonterà esso Borghese in maniera, con la sua fazione, che si crede potrà egli far Papa chì vorrà, e intorno al soggetto pareria che non fosse ora da discorrere, perché, il parlare del futuro Pontefice, mentre vive il Papa tanto sano, viene da ognuno stimato discorso molto difficile e lontano, tuttavia li soggetti stimabili e miscibili sono Pallotta e Sauli.

Ha il cardinale fino a 140 mille scudi d’entrata dei beni di chiesa, oltra li quali questa casa si trova finora avere grande quantità di oro, grandi entrate ed una quantità grandissima di preziose suppellettili.

Questo Cardinale procura di imitare il Papa in ogni cosa, ma principalmente nel mostrarsi neutrale tra il Francesi e li Spagnoli, professando di non aver altro per fine che il servizio della sede Apostolica, e di ben servire Sua Santità. Lo ho scoperto molto affezionato a questa Serenissima Repubblica....

(Lettere...Roma, vol. 1, 96-8)

Cardinal Borghese is very handsome, naturally very courteous and benign, and has in him all the best qualities that there can be in a great person, as he gives the Pontiff and all the court every satisfaction they most desire, and he bears great respect and reverence to the Pope, seeming to
desire nothing that is not to his complete taste. And even though with good reason he could have great influence with His Holiness, and on that account everyone in all important matters goes to His Illustrious Lordship first; nevertheless he deals very cautiously with everything, and while not promising anyone the Pope's good will, in a most humane fashion he at least satisfies each with good words. He serves the Pontiff with great diligence and loyalty, and with the greatest patience he attends to the business entrusted to him by His Holiness, which is always carried out to his pleasure, satisfaction and good name. In the rest of his dealings, he is also most humane and courteous with everyone, and with his civility he gains the good will of the entire court.

And because the Pope cannot satisfy everyone, and not everyone can be pleased with his rule (as happens to all Princes, where so many things must be dealt with, to the satisfaction of the different tastes of men, that it would be necessary for the virtues which are scattered among many to be gathered into one alone, with the result that it would be necessary for some people to be left ill-satisfied), the Cardinal with his most gracious manner fills in for him, and with his good words performs all the graces and favours that he can to render the Pontiff benevolent, so that His Illustrious Lordship is esteemed and respected by all.

On account of this His Holiness loves him with extraordinary affection, for the Pope is naturally one who does not like any person to do anything that might be regarded as originating from any hand except his own and his particular decision. His Holiness enriches our Lord Cardinal, he schemes to support him with family connections and with a good band of cardinals of his creation; but, however, he tries to do it in the best way possible so that he does not give rise to envy of him, and to this end he plays on the modesty and humility in which His Holiness wants all his household to live, as far as possible from pride. His Illustrious Lordship has had until now a great following of cardinals, and while (as he hopes) the Pope lives, he is moving by new promotions to increase greatly his faction, by means of which he will able to make one of his trusted men Pope, which has always been an interest and ambition of nephews of the Pontiff.

Aldobrandini would have been able to impede greatly Cardinal Borghese's plans before this promotion, but with this promotion Borghese and his faction will overtake him in such a way that it is thought that he will be able to make Pope whosoever he wishes. And on this subject it would seem that it were not the right moment to discuss further because talk of the future Pontiff, while the Pope is alive and healthy, is regarded by
everone as a very difficult and distant topic; nevertheless Pallotta and Sauli are subjects that could and might succeed.

The cardinal has an income from church property of up to 140,000 scudi a year, besides which his family already possesses a great deal of gold, large revenues, and a huge quantity of precious furnishings.

This cardinal tries to imitate the Pope in everything, but principally in seeming neutral between the French and Spanish, claiming to have no other aim but the service of the Apostolic See and His Holiness. I have found him very well-disposed to our Most Serene Republic....

2.3 Report of Renier Zeno, ordinary ambassador to the Roman Court, 1621

[Note: Zeno's reports were written during the pontificate of Gregory XV, when Borghese was a recalcitrant element in the Roman court (above, ch. 3). Perhaps the Cardinal's behaviour in these years influenced Zeno's hostile assessment, which contrasts so markedly with other views.]

Vivono hoggi sessantauno Cardinali. Io nel dare conto di loro seguirò l'ordine dell'antichità, prima pigliando licenza di parlare di quattro solamente, i quali per haver annesso alle persone loro alcune principali dignità della Corte,...Questa quattro dignità sono, Sommo Pentitentiero, Vicecancelliere, Vicario del Papa et Camerlengo.

E il grado di Sommo Pentitentiero eminentissimo et largamente s'estende all'assoluzione d'un infinità di colpe commesse dalle humane fragilità e malitie, si devolve alla sua autorità... Ha per ciò molti ministri sotto di sè,...[i.e. vice pentitentiero, e il prelato che tiene il sigallo]. Vi sono dei Theologi, i Procuratori, i Pentitentieri et i scrittori, che tutti assistono a questo servito, et il medesimo Pentitentiere talvolta ascolta nelle Basiliche7 aciò deputate le confessioni dei penitenti. E stata questa carica dalla prudenza deli Pontefici ordinariamente conferita a soggetti più eminenti del Collegio. Paolo quinto, guidato da questa ansietà d'arricchire la casa, che per esser stata in lui un sommo eccesso, ha oscurato la fama della sua moderatione, la pose in testa del Cardinal Borghese suo nipote, nel quale, attesa la mediocrità del sapere et la vita molto dedicata a'piaceri e passatempi, così mal si conveniva, come mal si converrebbe una ricca sella ad un vil giumento. Sei mille scudi frutta questo offitio et questo emolumento gli fece chiudere gli occhi a quei rispetti, che a far scelta di soggetto idoneo a grado tale lo dovevano

7Of St. Peter's, S. Giovani in Laterano, S. Maria Maggiore, and S. Paolo fuori le mura.
persuadere; sedici anni ha regnato Borghesi con una felicità non mai interrotta fuorché dall'indisposizioni contratte dalla soverchia morbidezza e dal troppo amore di sé stesso. Inestimabile sono le ricchezze accumulate in così lungo tempo, come per relationi d'allora havera intesso Vostra Serenità. Provò Borghesi qualche vicenda di fortuna sotto il governo di Ludovisio, a cui non ostante gli obblighi che dovutigli pretendeva, visse così poco grato che non solo d'ottenere gratie non presunse, ma ricevette in quel tempo di quando in quando qualche disgusto et male sodisfattione. Diede causa a quest'avversione d'animo non tanto la rimembranza dei mali trattamenti fatti ai molti Cardinali lasciati in abbandono in tempo suo quando nella beneficenza del zio devevano ragionevolmente sperare, quanto il ricordarsi che lo stesso Cardinale Ludovisio, vecchio provveduto dell'arcivescovato di Bologna quanto al titolo, ma assorbitesi Borghese l'entrate lo lasciò in un indecorosa tenuità, mancamento ascritto più al nipote che al zio, che alle relationi di questo si riportava, et inoltre la parentela contratta da Gregorio con gli Aldobrandini, fu di non leggier momento a disunir gli affetti, havendo quest'istessa casa produttrice delle grandezze dei Borghesi provato anche essa sotto Paolo quinto una certa ingravitudine. Borghese nel resto non si mantiene in quel concetto di riputatione, ch'è stato solito seguitare li Cardinali nipoti dei Papi che hanno lungamento vissuto. Nasce ciò così dal suo poco spirito, come dall'essere tuttavia recente la memoria del leggier profitto che trasse la Corte dal suo governo, che non lo vide liberale fuorché con alcuni stretti affezionati suoi. Corre voce che il Papa sij per restituire il cappello in persona nominata da lui, il che è credibile per la buona natura di Sua Santità molto inclinata alla gratitudine, ma nel fare scelta del soggetto, doverà pensar Borghesi di non urtar nei disperati, ai quali in questo genere s'avezzò sotto il zio per la circospettione con la quale il Papa da segni di voler procedere nel conferir quella dignità. Fa Borghese dello sviscerato con tutti li principi, et parla in modo di Vostra Serenità, che mostra di stimarla al pari d'ogni altro. Sarà ben veduto in questo Pontificato, ma non adoperato, né può haver vita molto lunga per essere di complessione molto stemperata, sì che, o sincero o fintamente che parli, poco bene si può sperare o poco male si può temere da lui.

(Lettere...Roma, vol. 1, 158-9)

---

8Possibly a reference to Borghese's renunciation in 1612 of the archbishopric of Bologna, though he maintained possession of the frutti riservati deriving from the office (see above, ch. 2 n. 121).
There live today seventy one cardinals. In giving an account of them, I will follow the order of their antiquity, first asking permission to discuss four only, who have attached to their persons the principal dignities of the court....These four high offices are the Grand Penitentiary, the Vice Chancellorship, the Vicar of the Pope, and the Carmerlengo.

The rank of Grand Penitentiary is of the highest eminence and is extended largely to the absolution of an infinity of blows caused by human weakness and malady; this is devolved to his authority....he has for this many ministers under himself...[i.e. the Vice Penitentiary, and the signatory prelate]. There are also theologians, procurators, penitentiaries, and scribes to assist in this office, and the same Penitentiary occasionally listens to the confessions of penitents in the basilicas. The prudence of the popes has ordinarily meant this position has been granted to the most eminent subjects of the Sacred College. Paul V, however, anxious to enrich his house, which was for him an excessive preoccupation, obscured the renown of his moderation by putting in the position Cardinal Borghese his nephew, to whom, given the mediocrity of intellect and his life long dedicated to pleasures and pastimes, the position was as ill-suited as a rich saddle would be to a wretched nag. His appointment yields 6000 scudi and this emolument made him shut his eyes to those concerns which should have persuaded him to chose someone suitable for such a rank. Borghese reigned for sixteen years in happiness uninterrupted except by indispositions contracted from the excess of soft living and by too much self-love. The riches accumulated in such a long time are inestimable, as Your Serenity will have heard from reports of the time. Borghese experienced some difficulty of fortune under the rule of Ludovisio, with whom, in spite of the obligations which he claimed owing to him, he lived in such ill-accord that not only did he not presume to obtain favours, but also occasionally received in that period dismay and dissatisfaction. The cause of this dislike was not so much the memory of ill-treatment meted out to many Cardinals left abandoned during his heyday, when they might reasonably have hoped for the benificence of his uncle, as the memory that although the same Cardinal Ludovisio had been provided with the Archbishopric of Bologna, Borghese indecorously absorbed the entries left to him [that is, from when the diocese was Borghese's], a fact ascribed more to the nephew than to the uncle, which was reported in dispatches of the latter. And besides, the relationship formally established between Gregory [XV] and the Aldobrandini family was not unimportant in dividing affections [from Scipione], since this family, which had provided much of the greatness of the Borghese, had also
experienced under Paul V a certain lack of gratitude. Borghese, for the rest, is not held in that high repute that usually follows the cardinal-nephews of popes who have lived for any length of time. This results as much from his lack of spirit as from the still recent memory that the Court derived little profit from his government, and did not find him liberal except with a few of his closest associates. It is rumoured that the Pope is about to restore his right to nominate someone for the cardinal’s cap. This is plausible, given the His Holiness’s good nature, much given to gratitude, but in choosing the subject, Borghese will have to be careful not to give offence to those who have lost hope, to whom in this respect he made himself dear under the uncle by means of the restraint with which the Pope [Paul V] indicated he wished to proceed in bestowing that dignity. Borghese is unrestrained with all princes, and speaks about Your Serenity in a way that shows that he ranks you along with the others. He may be well-regarded in this Pontificate, but not used, nor can he have a very long life as he has a distemperate complexion, so that, whether he speaks sincerely or falsely, one can hardly fear him, or hope for little good coming from him.
III.2
Instructions to the Spanish Agent.

The following letter, transcribed from the Cardinal's book of copies, was originally encoded, a standard practice when sending delicate information abroad.¹ The Cardinal of Lerma referred to in the second cypher is Francesco Rojas di Sandoval, chief minister to Phillip III.² As discussed above, Lerma's desire to be recognised as His Excellency (or His Most Excellence) may have been behind the king's request in April, 1618, that Marcantonio present the chinea.³ The second part of the cypher reveals that Lerma's promotion to the sacred college in the first place was enlisted in the Borghese strategy to have Marcantonio made a Spanish grandee, an ambition pursued more successfully (given Lerma's downfall later in the year) through the canonisation of the Spanish peasant, Isidoro, and the granting of the red cap to Phillip III's ten year old son, Fernando.⁴

ASV FB II 432, 606v-608v.

Al Sig. Giovanni Antonio Verderlet

Habbiamo avviso dell'arrivo di V. S. a Madrid, benché da lei non si siano ricevute lettere, le quali s'aspettano con grand.mo desiderio. Intanto io ho voluto significarle quel, che contingono le incluse due cifre e per fine le desidero ogni contento. Roma 27 di Maggio 1618.

Io sto con molto desiderio d'haver da lei qualche nuova circa la persona sua, e gli altri particolari. Al Si.re Card.l di Lerma V. S. mi ricordi serv.re sviscerat.me.

Cifra

Dovrà passare da Barcellona a Madrid il Duca d'Alburquerque,⁵ prima che venga a questa ambascieria di Roma, alla quale è destinato. V. S. vada a visitarlo, dopo ch'egli sia arrivato costà, e procuri d'entrar in discorso con lui sopra le cose di questa corte, e poi distramente cerchi d'andarlo disponendo a voler intendersi bene con me, e con questa casa, rendendolo

¹The original letter was possibly composed by Mario d'Ilio, from 1609 the principal secretary of cyphers: Semmler, Das Päpstliche Staatsssekretariat, 95.
²Lerma's political significance is discussed above, ch. 1 n. 57.
³Ch. 1 n. 43. Gigli, Diario romano, 113, recorded on 10 June, 1630, that Urban VIII eventually upgraded the title of a cardinal to include Eminence, as mere Illustrious had been devalued by all the minor prelates adopting it.
⁴Ch. 1 nos. 24, 48, and 73.
⁵Brettando de Queva, who did not actually arrive in Rome until 17 November, 1619: Orbaan, Documenti, 30.
certo, che sempre havrà una pienissima correspondenza di sincero affetto, come l’hanno havuta gli altri ambas(ciat)ri di Spagna, che hanno tenuta con noi buona intellegenza, la quale V. S. potrà mostrare al Duca di quanto grand’importanza, et utile possa essere per il buon servitio di S. M. con soggiungere, che per fondar questa intelligenza bisogna ch’egli si prepari a non credere alle maligne suggestioni che gli saranno fatte al suo arrivo qua, e specialmente dal Cardinale Aldobrandino, e da altri, i quali sono mal’affeti verso di noi; ancorche non habbiano cagione di portarci mala voluntà, ma per loro interessi odiano questa casa, e procurano di dar disgusti a Nostro Signore per abbruciar la vita a Sua Santità Vostra Signoria dovrà anco dire al Duca, ch’Aldobrandino tenterà ogni possibil mezzo per acquistarselo, et haver corrispondenza con lui come professa d’haverla con Savoia, a Venetia, e come già l’hebbe col Conte di Castro. Sarà bene, ch’V. S. insieme rappresenti al Duca le molte malignità, che regnano in quest corte, e che perciò è necessario ch’egli vada cauto, e si guardi di non pigliar l’impressione per i mali uffici che si faranno con lui. Et in somma ella faccia quanto potrà per guadagnarlo, e per renderlo certo della sodisfazione, ch’egli riceverà dalla benigna natura di Sua Santità e dal mio procedere candito, e schietto, con inculcargli efficacem.te che l’intendersi bene con noi gli sarà di grandissima utilità nelle cose del servitio di S. M. e nella proprie di lui stesso; assicurandolo, ch’egli in ogni occasione conoscerà quanto la casa nostra sia devota di cotesta Corona confido che V. S. con la sua prudenza saprà adoprarsi come si desidera per il fine predetto, e l’istesso mi promette la sua amorezzo terza verso di noi.

Cifra

Qui s’è parlato molto della pretensione del S.re Card.l di Lerma d’esser trattato d’Ecc(ellentissi)mo. Io ho stimato di non haver darli altro titolo, che quello d’Ill(ustrissi)mo e Rev(erendissi)mo che di al Cardinale di Savoia, et ad altri, i non essendovi nè anche parso bene di dar cagione al sacro collegio d’alterarsi; oltre che di già si scopriva, che alcuni Prencipi grandi se ne sarebbono sdegnati: e di più il Card.l Tressio m’ha detto, ch’esso Cardinale di Lerma, non pretende da i Cardinali altro titolo che d’Ill.mo e Rev.mo. Havrà caro che V. S. procuri di saper di certo se Mon(signo)r Nuntio l’ha trattato d’Ecc(ellen)za e lo faccia con distrezza, senza scoprisi d’haverne havuto ordine.

Vorrei che V. S. insieme cercasse come da se di chiavirsi se facendosi instanza dell’honor di Grande in persona del Prencipe di Sulmona, il negotio fosse per riuscire, perché non si vorrebbe domandar cosa ch’non fosse riuscibile. In caso che si opponessi il punto dell’esempio per gli altri
nipoti di Papi; V. S. potrebbe rispondice, che niun'altro Papa haverà un Duca di Lerma da promuovere al Cardinalato. Mi rimetto all'altre cose, ch'io qui le dissi, et alla sua prudenza.

To Signor Giovanni Antonio Verderlet

We have noted the arrival of your lordship in Madrid, although we have not received any letters from you, which are waited upon with great interest. Meanwhile, I wanted to convey to you that which is contained in the two enclosed cyphers, and I wish you every contentment. Rome, 27 May, 1618.

I greatly desire something new in regards to yourself, and the other matters. Remember to impress upon the Duke of Lerma that I remain his devoted servant.

Cypher

The Duke of Alburquerque will have to go from Barcellona to Madrid before he comes to the Roman embassy, to which he is destined. Your lordship must go and visit him after he has arrived there, and arrange to enter into a discussion with him regarding the matters concerning this court, elliptically intending him towards a favourable disposition to me and this family, assuring him that he will always have a very full correspondence of sincere affection, as have had all the other ambassadors of Spain that held with us a sound understanding, the importance of which your lordship should demonstrate to the Duke. Also useful for the sound service of His Majesty is to add that to establish this relationship it is necessary that he prepare himself not to believe the malicious suggestions that will be made to him on his arrival here, and especially those coming from Cardinal Aldobrandino and others, who are poorly disposed towards us; they have no reason for their ill will towards us other than their antagonism to this family, and always give disrespect to Our Lord so as to make life unpleasant for His Holiness. Your lordship must also tell the Duke that Aldobrandino will try every means possible to win him over for himself, and have close contact with him, as he claims to have with Savoy and Venice, and as he surely once had with the Count of Castro. It will be good as well for your lordship to point out to the Duke the malignancies that reign in this court, and that for this reason it is necessary he proceeds carefully, and guards against being impressed by the bad offices some will make with him. In short you should try to win him over, and make him certain that he will receive satisfaction from the benign nature of His Holiness and my own sincere and candid style, efficiently inculcating him
with the knowledge that making good with us will be very useful in the matters of His Majesty and himself, assuring him that he will in every issue know just how devoted is our family to that Crown. I trust that your lordship with his prudence will employ himself to this end as best as he thinks fit, pledging the same fondness to us as he does to myself.

Cypher

Here much is spoken of the pretensions of Cardinal di Lerma to be regarded as His Excellency. I have decided not to give him any other title than that of Illustrious and Reverend, which is held by the Cardinal of Savoy and others, there not being any advantage to the sacred college in changing it. Besides, as has already been discovered, some great princes would be offended. Moreover, Cardinal Tressio told me that the other cardinals do not think he should be granted a title other than Illustrious and Reverend. Take care that your lordship knows for sure if the nuncio has treated him as his Excellency, and feign distress [about the decision], without letting him discover how it was ordered.

I would also like your lordship to find out if they will be granting the honour of Grandee to the Prince of Sulmona. If, that is, it were at all a possibility, for one would not like to ask for something not possible. In case there is opposition on the basis of the example of other nephews of the popes, your lordship could respond that no other pope will have a Duke of Lerma to promote to the Cardinalate. I return to the other matters I mentioned here, and trust to your prudence.
III.3
Cardinal Borghese's Offices and Protectorships

The following is a transcription of the inventory "Officii et protettioni dell'Ill.mo et R.mo Sig.r Card.le Borghese", ASV FB I 535. The volume is undated, but as it includes S. Chiara a Casa Pia, which came under Borghese's jurisdiction after Cardinal Del Monte's death in 1626 (above, ch. 4 n. 15), but does not include the bishopric of Sabina, awarded August 1629 (above, ch. 4 n. 31), it must be c.1627-29.

Uffici
Penitentiaria
Segnatura di Gratia
Archipresbitirato di S. Pietro nel Vaticano

Commendatarii
S. Sebastiano fuor delle mura
S. Gregorio nel Clivo di Scauro

Protettori
Ordini religiosi
Di S. Domenico
Di Monte Oliveto

Casi religiosi
Santa Casa di Loreto
Capella Borghese in S. Maria Maggiore
Santa Maria della pietà di pazzarelli
S. Rocco à Ripetta
Casa de'poveri preti secolari [a hospice near S. Andrea della Valle]
Camposanto [Santa Maria di Campo Santo nel Vaticano - a German cemetery]
L'Anima [S. Maria]
La Madonna delle Monte
Casa de'catacumene [next to S. Giovanni in Mercatello]
Casa delle Catacumene
Casa Pia
Nationi [for which he protects the associated sacred places in Rome]

Germania

Fiandra col hospidale di S. Giuliano a Cesarini

Armenia con S. Maria Egittiaça

Persia

Schiavoni à Loreto

Abissini à S. Stefano nel Vaticano

Bergamaschi à S. Bartolomeo alla Guglia

Città, paesi, castelli

Ragusa [the Priori and officials of S. Maria]

Avignon

Perugia [the head of the cathedral]

Corneto

S. Severino

Diserta, overo Disitis ne Grisoni

Collegi

Germanico al Apollinari

De Neofiti [near Minerva]

Monasteria e conventi

Santa Susanna

Santa Marta

Santa Anna

Santa Maria Maddalina à Monte Cavallo

Santa Catermina da Siena

Monte Magnanapoli, ò di S. Sisto

Annunciata à Torre de Conti

Santa Chiara

Confraternite

Santa Maria del Suffragio

S. Sacramento alla Minerva

Annunciata alla Minerva
S. Sacramento a S. Lorenzo in Lucina al suo Oratorio
La Madonna del Carmine a S. Grisogono
San Giuseppe di terra santa alla Rotonda
S. Sacramento al suo oratorio di S. Andrea dalli Fratti
S. Rosario nella Minerva
S. Sacramento in S. Giacomo Scossa cavalli

*Universite*
Credentieri a S. Elena
Mercari et altri a San Sebastiano de' Mattei
Hosti et Albergatori à S. Giuliano in piazza di pietra
Lavoranti di Pianellari a S. Aniano vicino scola greca
Angelo Cardi's detailed physical assessment (over 300 pages) of the Cardinal, written in 1627, is the first half of a comprehensive medical report (part two is missing). Such reports were common. The staple compositions of Giulio Mancini, for example, someone better known for his writings on art, were diagnoses of the Barberini.¹ The most striking aspects of the following report are the predominance of astrology and the debt to the Galenic tradition of physiognomic literature. Cardi's diagnosis proceeds from an understanding of the Cardinal's temperament in terms of the four humours. The humours were the foundation of nutritional theory, explaining how the world's four elements passed into the body. Good health was ultimately a matter of balancing the contraries that were embodied by the humours. These contraries - warm and cold, dry and humid - were seen as primary qualities (not, that is, as subjective sensations). As the following extracts clearly demonstrate, they were forever struggling - against poor diet, living out of step with one's temperament, the portents of the stars, and so on - to be maintained in their proper equilibrium. The individual parts of the body partook of this struggle, forming and being formed by the on-going process of the human's fashioning.²

The original text has generally been simply transcribed, with some modification to the punctuation and the omission of the abundant marginal citations (to Aristotle, Avicenna, Pontano, the School of Salerno, and above all Galen); their explanation would be the task of a critical edition. Although the meaning is usually clear, the combination of sometimes opaque technical description, archaic medical terms, and ill-formed rhetoric make Cardi's Italian difficult to render literally in English; brackets indicate the necessary interpolations. The selected passages provide an outline of the Cardinal's character and the physiognomical significance of his individual features. Except where directly relevant to physiognomy, the astrological material has been excluded. Included are sections on the Cardinal's temperament; the concept of the body's spirits, both in general and in relation to the Cardinal; the concept of

¹BAV Barb. Lat. 4315 and 4317.
²Cardi's views can be considered representative of his profession. For a more detailed background of the medical beliefs that inform the treatise, see Owsei Temkin, Galenism, Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy, Ithaca/London, 1973.
the body's humours, in general and of the Cardinal. In the second distinction the parts of the body are considered; included here are those on the Cardinal's head, eyes, nose, ears, tongue, and mouth.
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Parte prima

Idea della sanità e del male. Cavata dal progresso della vita dell'III.mo S.re Cardinale Scipione Borghese.

Discorso fisico, astronomico. Del Sig.re Angelo Cardi [1627]

... Distintione Prima

[30v] Cognitione ottava. Del temperamento particolare e universale delle parti similari di V. S. Illust.a

Perché il temperamento particolare delle similari, come primiero d'origine, precede al temperamento universale. Perciò in V. Sig. Ill.ma lo consideraremo nel primo luogo. Queste adunque nelle spermatice è freddo, e secco, con qualche subdominio d'umidità, vedendo la facilità, che hanno queste parti, e massime nelle giunture d'imperdirle il moto, e di lederli il senso. Le sanguigne doppoi eccedono in buona parte nell'umidità, si come si discerne dalla sua obesità, nel resto godano un'intera salute e per conseguenza il temperamento loro [31r] è naturale vedendo noi che tutte le funzioni de muscoli, de quali queste son parti e instrumenti necessarij, si eseguiscono conforme al debito della natura.

Il temperamento doppoi universale, che resulta in V. S. Ill.ma dalla colleganza de tre sopradetti temperamenti, cioè dell'influente, dell'attuato, e della mutua attione, e repassione delle parti. Questo in lei eccede in due qualità, cioè nel calore, e nel humido in modo però che non trascende i termini della sanità.

Il che si raccoglie manifestamente dall'habito pingue, e carnoso, dalle vene larghe da polsi pieni, dal calor del tutto, dal color suo rosso, dalla mollitie della carne da peli neri, dall'appetenza del fresco, dall'abborrimento del caldo, dall'indagine della mente, dagl'habiti virtuosi dell'animo, come di Religione, di carità, di [31v] magnificenza l'opere dell quale, Nec ventura silebunt saecula. Nec ignota rapiet sub nube vetustas.
Tutto questo si conferma dalla Crase calda, e humida del fegato havendone lasciato scritto Galeno, che dal temperamento del fegato ne segue necessariamente somigliante il temperamento del tutto.

E se ella mi domandasse, qual di queste due qualità eccedino in lei, il caldo cioè o l'humido, io le risponderei, che in quanto alla mole fusse superiore l'humido, mà che in quanto all'attione doppoi fusse maggiore il caldo, osservandosi in lei effetti di molto calore, e mole di soverchia humidità.

E se inoltre ella mi domandasse, di quali humori sia composta questa copia d'humidità, io le risponderò che in lei nel primo luogo vi si ritrova l'humidità del sangue, havendo imparato noi da Avicenna, [32r] che del sangue sopra gl'altri humori se ne conservi in noi trenta tre parti. Nel secondo luogo subentra l'humidità della pinguedine, e nel terzo quella della pituita, redondando questa in lei, e per le stemperanze simili dello stomaco, e per la discratia della testa.

Adunque il temperamento suo à predominio sarà caldo, e humido, cioè sanguigno nel modo detto, non già polyemico di sangue sincero, mà meschiato, il subdominio sarà bilioso, cioè caldo, e secco, come si raccoglie dall sete, che lo molesta, dall'aridità delle labra, dalla veste biliosa della lingua, e delle gengie, dalla solertia dell'ingegno, dall'acume de sensi, e dalla brevità del sonno.

A questo succede l'ultimo subdominio melanconico, di malinconia però naturale nata dall'esustione della bile flava, come si raccoglie dalla sua cuntatione, dal suo timore, dall'animo pensieroso, e da altri [32v] segni diagnostici, ch'io per brevità intendo per hora di tralasciare.

Siche se tutto il suo corpo sarà di peso 200 L.l [libbre] circonscritta la parte spiritosa che noi cerchiamo tra gl'humori la trigesima quinta parte [34v] e del sangue, come vuole Arist.e quattro parti di pituita, che renderanno nove, di bile tre che saran sei di melanchonia una si che gl'humori saranno di peso 51 Ll. L'ossa sono quasi eguali di peso agl'humori in huomo pingue laonde saranno cinquanta. Le carnose nel medesimo huomo obeso saranno al doppio un centinaro; per la qual cosa s'il calore è la settimarte degli'humori e delle carnose; in lei ci saranno venti due gradi di calore che possano giustamente col pabulo proporcionato dell'humido primigenio conservarla felicemente fino all'ultima vecchiezza.
Distintione II


Havuta la cognitione universale delli spiriti, veniamo di presente à riconscere quelli di V. S. Ill.ma. E prima la quantità, e doppoi la qualità loro. Et in quanto alla copia io trovo che Galeno in tutte l'altre cose naturali, loda molto la mediocrità, mà in questi non biasima l'abbondanza, mà più tosto il difetto loro. Però che si come questa argumento, debolezza di [4Ir] virtù, così quella galiardia, è forza di natura. Hora, ch'in lei vi si trovi gran copia di spiriti lo potiamo raccorre, e dal discorso, e dal senso, imperciòche, essendo in lei potenti le cagioni materiali, e le efficienti, come dirò una grandissima affluenza di sangue, una gran vedondanza di calore innato, ed influente, un facilissimo oppulso d'aria, potiam credere ragionevolmente che si produchino gl'effetti abbondantissimi. Se discorriemo doppoi delle prime qualità de medesimi, tutti universalmente eccedeno nel calore e nell'humido, derivando dà eccesso di simili principii. Se ragioneremo delle seconde, hanno del crasso, e del terreo, si gli Animali per la soprabondanza d'escrementi flemmatici della testa. E si ancho, i naturali per l'esuberanza della pituita, che si trova meschiata col sangue nata dall'intemperanza simile dello stomaco. Se parliemo [41v] della loro constitutione naturale potiam dir con ragione, ch'eglino sieno sani. Si per il lor servitio e buono, si ancho perche i fonti d'onde derivano son buoni: il sangue, cioè, il calor naturale, e l'Aria. E questo sia detto delli spiriti suoi in universale, se vorremmo doppoi ritrovare le particulari spetie, gli animale in stanno in stato naturale, mentre le funtioni delle facultà principii alle quali serveno, s'esequiscono bene, quindi immagina sottilmente, discorre prudentemente, si ricorda tenacemente, liberamente si muove, e perfettamente sente in tutti i sensi. I vitali godeno ancho la medisima felicità, mentre che i polsi l'hà pieni e la respiratione libera, ed espedita. I Naturali finalmente sono sanissimi, facendo ella buona chilificatione, meglier sanguificatione, ottima nutritione, anzi augmentatione, e desideratissima espulsione di tutti gli'esermenti.

... 

[42v] Cognitione Quarta. Degl'humori in universale, che son le seconde cause interne della sanità. 

Le seconde cause naturali, che constituiscono la sanità, habbiam detto di sopra, essere gl'humori. Questi non sono altro che i quattro principij, dà quali

Cognitione Quinta. De gl'humori che si ritrovano in V. S. III.ma, cioè della quantità, e della qualità loro.

La constitutione naturale adunque degl'humori, come cause continenti della sanità, non si potendo discernere, nè vedere con gl'occhi corporali, è necessario d'usar [46r]le cognetture per rintracciari, delle quali appunto ci serviremo in V. S. III.ma per ritrovar lo stato degl'humori, che dominano in lei. E perché queste si traggono dalle cause che li generano, dalle cose che li giovano, ò che li nuocono, e da gli effetti. Noi per tanto incominceremo dalla materia, e dall'efficiente. Quella sono i cibi, e le bevande le quali in lei essendo d'ottima sostanza e di bonissima qualità non potranno produrre altro che humori buoni; cioè caldi, e humidi, e massime nel fegato di somigliante temperatura. Che perciò si producano ancho nello stomaco humori pituitosi, havendo questo una medesima dispositione. A questa materia è proporcionato l'efficiente, cioè il calor del fegato in generar la massa sanguigna, e la freddezza dello stomaco in suppleditar pituita. A queste interne s'aggiungono l'esterne [46v]cagioni, si come è l'aria di Roma calda, e humida atta di per se ad'accrescere le sopradette stempuranze.
L’altre cognetture si traggono dalle cose che apportano, usate, o, nocemento, o gravamento alcuno, quindi à lei nuocono le cose fredde, agri, e terre, e le giovano doppiò le cose humide, calde, e dolci, che per tal rispetto si dilettà dell’aria di Nettuno, et hà particolar contento della temperie della primavera.

Gli effetti delle medesime cagioni dimostrano in lei il medesimo predominio, cioè il color rosso del corpo, il color delle membra, la mollittie della carne, i peli castagnioli, l’orine colorite, gl’eserimenti cotti, formati, e tinti moderatamente.

Considerando doppiò gl’altri humori in particolare, e prima la flemma, o pituità, che dir vogliamo, havendo le cause materiali, [47r] efficienti meno potenti di quelle del sangue, se ne produrrà per ciò in lei minor quantità, e di qualità megliore.

Dietro alla Pituita, vien la bile flava, che per non haver ne le cause materiali, ne le efficienti molto potenti, o gagliarde, se ne genera in minor quantità, che non si fa della flemma.

Dà questo che fin qui s’è detto, potiamo ragionevolmente conchiudere, che per essere in lei le cause efficienti degl’humori (se bene stemperate però dentro à termini, et à confini della sanità) e per esser nel medesimi, ch gl’humori suoi si trovino anch’essi in stato di perfetta sanità, si come io hò proposto di mostrarle da principio.

Perchè con la verità consentono tutte le cose quello, che ne hà dimostrato in V. S. Ill.mi la natura, lo conferma anco il cielo impercioché raccogliendosi la condizione de gl’humori da segni [47v]del Zodiaco, e da pianeti tutti conspirano in quello, che gli hò dimostrato fin qui. Perché Giove e Venere, che per la temperanza salubre che hanno de raggi loro in risguardo dell’humido e del calore sono state giudicate presidenti, e dominatrici dal sangue. Per questo nello stato, che si troveranno, poten credere che si ritrovi anche il sangue suo. Hora nella revolutione Giove è poste in Vergine, che per esser Casa di Mercurio che prende le conditioni de pianeti vicini potien credere che questo anchora si sia mutato nella natura di Giove che lo domina, Venere doppoi e posta in libra segno come lei appunto caldo, et humido, che perciò à ragion si potrà credere, che essendo ben posto Giove, e Vernere cagioni del sangue, e che questo ancho in lei stia in ottima disposizione. E tanto più che queste stelle ancho nella genitura Crano benissimo collocate.
Se considereremo doppoi la flegna, questa viene [48r] indicata dalla Luna astro di natura sua freddo, et humido, che per essere in Tauro segno pur humido accresce non che conserva in buona parte questo humore, e tanto più che a ne ho nella genitura si ritrova nell'istesso segno.

Marte presidente dell humor bilioso, e Saturno Prône della malinchonia, per esser questi nella revolutione in vergine, e nella radice in Capricorno in casa sua e dell'istessa sua natura dimostra ch'in lei predomini assai, e similmente per esser marte in ammendue le figure in vergine in segno freddo, e combusto significa generarsi si bene dell’humor collerico in lei, mà attemperarsi, e correggersi dal predomino dell humido del sangue, e del freddo, della pituita, e della malinchonia ch'è appunto quello, che ne ha dimostrato la natura del suo temperamento.

[67r] Distintione Quarta. Della sanità delle membra particolari.

Havendo noi veduta la sanità universale di tutto il suo Corpo, le cause, e gli effetti della medesima, è necessario adesso (per dar compimento à questa prima parte), che noi consideriamo i membri particolari, e ritroviamo la sanità, le cause, e gli effetti suoi ne medesimi.

[70v] Cognitione Terza. Della sanità, cause e effetti del cerebro di V. S. III.ma

In quanto appartiene alla forma, come dire alla figura, alla superficie, alla magnitudine, al numero, al sito, e all’unità del cerebro di V.S. III.ma, io non dirò altro di più di quello, che habbia detto di sopra al Cap. 1.,’Della cognitione della sanità delle parti instrumentarie sue’. Solo considerarìò il temperam.to [71r] quale, com’io hò detto, et accennato di sopra lo stimo freddo, e humido. Il che si cava dalle cose che nuocono, ò giovono, che però nocendo à lei, l’Aria austrina, e piovosa, e per conseguenza l’Autunno, e l’Inverno. Facilmente, è per qualsivoglia causa casca nè descensi, come pure la maggior parte de suoi mali, son derivati de questi principî. Si cava il medesimo dagli escrementi che evacua dalle narici e dalla bocca, essendo di somigliante natura. Mà à tutto questo son molto contrarie alcune sue operationi, come ch’egli facilmente apprenda. Il che nasce dalla mollitie, e dall’umidità, che s’egli havesse eccesso non apprenderebbe così facilmente anzi che sarebbe stupido, si come fa il sangue.

Similmente ella è molto ingegnosō, e solerte, effetto che nasce dalli spiriti più tosto caldi, secchi, e lucidi, che da Crassi, e turbidi, e così più dalla
siccità, e dal calore, che dal freddo, e dal humidó, d'onde deriva più tosto la pigritia, e la [71v] tardenza. Hâ parimente la memoria buona, il che agumenta l'humidità temperata. Per che l'eccedente serve per l'apprentione non per rettione. Finalmente se parliamo de sensi, in lei vi sono esquisiti, non hebiti e tardi, quali produce l'humido. Le vigilie superano il sonno, il sonno non è molto profondo, il moto voluntario è presto, e sollecito, tutti effetti chiari di calore. Però non nego, ch'ella non ami la quiete el'immobilità del corpo.

Con tutto questo io so di pensiero che vi sia nel cerebro la sopradetta humidità, e freddezza mà perchè non è eccedente, stando egli molto tempo dell'anno bene, e forse non è assolutamente essentiale, mà per il consenso dello stomaco humidó, e freddo, e de cibi, e del bevande simili, l'humidità delle quali per forza del calor del fegato elevata al cerebro, lo stempera. E tanto più che questi escrementi doppoi non si fermano, mà o s'evacuano per i luoghi già detti, o si trasmettendo [72r] alle giunture in ogni mutatione dell'anno; e così restando nel cerebro un temperamentamento caldo, et humidó naturale, può far le attioni delle sopradette facultà esattamente.

...[73r] La figure di tutta la testa non è perfettam.te sferica, ne ovale, mà depressa alquanto nelle tempie, e similm.te la sua mediocre quantità ne danno segne della buona constitutione della sostanza del cerebro, e per consequenza della bontà dell'ingegno.

Se rimiraremó doppoi il cielo vedremo, ch'il sole al quale per giusta ragione le vien soggetto il capo come à capo de pianeti, e come à quello che tiene l'imperio sop.a l'ingegno, e dispone naturalm.te della facultà animale, e gli vien posto nella rivolutione in cadente, et in mezo delle fortune, d'onde s'argumenta che egli sia alquanto offeso in riguardo della genitura.

La luna similmente posta nella revolutione in Tauro segno freddo, e humidó, denota la stemperanza fredda, e humida del suo cervello poiche come dice il Pontano, ita se havet cerebrum [73v] ad cor ut ipsa ad sole luna. Il medes.a conferma l'Ariete, che per esser in decima, nel suor del Cielo, e per haver seco la parte della fortuna congiunta, ne significa generalmente l'ottima sua disposizione. Humida però alquanto.

Questo istesso finalmente attesta la prirm.a casa tanto della revolutione, quanto della genitura. Poiche quella hà seco il Leone Ascendente con una sapetta sestile del sole suo sig.re e un trino di Giove, e della Luna. E la Radice hà la Vergine fortissima, e p. le stelle erranti, e per le fisse. Da che si dimostra
chiaramente la perfettione naturale della Testa. Intemperata però nel freddo, e nell'humido.

... 

[77r] Cognitione Quinta. Degli occhi di V. S. Illma

Poiché noi abbiamo veduto fin qui le cose universali de gl'occhi, descendiamo a considerar le particolari in V. S. Ill.ma e prima la sanità, poi le cause, e doppo gl'effetti.

E in quanto alla sanità de suoi occhi, [77v] parte è per consenso dal cerebro, e da nervi, e parte per essentia. Se parleremo di quella per consenso, essendo il suo cerebro freddo, e humido, e per conseguenza i nervi anco debili, sarà della medesima natura ancho l'occhio. L'istesso si raccoglie ancho dà quelle cose, che gravano o nuocono, essendo communi ad ammendue: e questo, si raccoglie dà communi escrementi.

Di poi parleremo della sanità essentia, questa ò si considera nella forma, o nella materia. In quanto alla forma, come abbiamo mostrato di sopra, la gode perfettissima, si in riguardo della figura, si della superficie, si delle cavità, si della magnitudine, si del numero, sì del sito, e si ancho dell'unità.


Il medesimo si raccoglie dall'attione, che è la vista, la quale è imperfetta, poiche e non vede da lontano assai, non discerne le cose prossime, come sono, e non sostenta gli obietti validi, quindi ella ha preso l'uso degliocchiali, i quali con la densità loro resistono alla luce esterna, uniscono li spiriti visivi, e con diafaneita, e crassitie, rendono l'obietto maggiore, e più chiaro, e così più atto da vedersi.


[78v] La figura de suoi occhi è rotonda, la grandezza è mediocre, il colore è rosso, il moto è celere, lo sguardo molle, e piacev.le. Di maniera che denot.o appunto dell'animo la bontà, la modestia, e l'affabilità sua. A gl'occhi trà le case
della fig.a celeste gli sopra stà la p.a havendo piena iurisd.e sopra tutte le parti tanto interne quanto esterne del Capo. Trà segni del Zod.o gli è superiore l'Ariete, e per la ragion che habbiam detto dominare à tutto il capo, e per che in questo segno vi s’esalta il sole, e negl’occhi vi si discerneno i raggi delli spiriti visivi e della luce, di modo che son detti bene spesso da poeti soli ebene spesso à guisa del sole illustr.o l’Aria, si che alcuni con la luce loro sola vedevano nelle tenebre... Tra pianeti l’occhio destro è dedicato al sole, il sinistro alla luna....

Hora stando beniss.o e la casa e il segno, et i pianeti si nella revoluzione, come nella radice sua potiam credere à ragione che anco i suoi occhi stien bene. Ne si deve tener cura del difetto delli spiriti visivi, mentre che deriva dall’età a staticata, come sè detto.

[81r] Cognitione Setta. Dell’odorato di V. S. Ill.ma.

Come stia la sanità di V. S. Ill.ma le cause della sanità e gl’effetti della sanità, e in quanto à processi mammillari, e in quanto al naso, è tanto noto, che non occorre, ch’io m’affatichì in dimostrarlo. Poiché la sola attione dell’odorare essendo perfetta in lei, dà segno, che il tutto ancho stia bene.

La medessima facilità d’odorare, d’evacuar l’escrementi, di parlare, e d’alitare, denotano la perfettione delle narici.

La figura del suo naso e retta, dritta, elevata dalla faccia grosso però, e nelle narici aperto, tutti segni di complession forte, e gagliarda.

Trà case della figura celeste sovrasta alle narici la p.a anchora, che per haver in se il Leone [81v] animale di nari aperte denota appunto quello che s’è detto, la facilità che ella può le havere à sdegnarsi. Ariete pur segno dominante à queste parti havendo come vuole Arist.e il naso grosso, et elevato non senza ragione potrà denotar il suo.

Venere che domina il senso dell’odorato, come vuole il Pontano haverà la cura del naso, si come Merc.o delle narici...

Si che essendo l’un e l’altro di questi pianeti assai ben collocato potrà denotar facilmente l’ottima constitutione di queste parti.

[83v] Cognitione nona. Dell’orecchie di V. S. Ill.ma

In queste non occorre molto dimorare, per che [84r] ella gode una buona sanità, e in riguardo delle cause, e degli effetti, sentendo ella esottissimamente.
Di maniera che la compostion loro in quanto à tutte le sue parti è di mestieri, 
che sia perfetta.

La figura loro è ovata, longa però e retta, le cartilagini in se son grandi, e 
bene scolpite: il addito quello che molte volte s’è detto la diuturnità della vita, 
e la bontà de costumi.

All’orecchie tra le case gli sovrasta la prima è trà segni il già detto Ariete. 
Se doppi consideraremos i pianeti. Io trovo che à Saturno è dedicata 
l’orecchia destra, à Marte la sinistra. La prima ragione è che Saturno è di 
condition diurna e seguita il sole, e Marte è di condition notturna e seguita la 
luna. La seconda ragione è perché per lunga osservanza s’è veduto, che dalle 
cattive costellazioni di Marte, e di Saturno derivano tutte l’Infermità 
dell’orecchie.

[88r] Cognitione Undecima. Della lingua di V. S. Ill.ma

In quanto alla sanità della lingua di V. S. Ill.ma. Se parliam per 
consenso del cerebro, e de nervi, non si può l’havere se non eccesso 
d’humidità, se per essentia la composition della lingua, in quanto alla materia, 
cioè la temperie eccede nel humido. Se parliam della figura è naturalissima, 
se della superficie stà parimente bene solo gli progiudica la testura, che hà di 
materie pituitose, e biliose insieme. La magnitudine è giusta, sospetto solo, che 
sia troppo denza e così che non lo lasci formar bene alcune parole, aggiunto il 
difetto naturale della basezza denti, [88v] ne quali dovendosi fermar la lingua 
per formare lett. scorrendo vi aggiugne la l, per esser più facile à formarsi. Il 
numero, e l’unità anche sono in stato naturale.

... 

Se parliam degli effetti, e prima della loquela, in lei è perfettissima, 
solo è imperfetta nella formatione d’alcune parole, come habbiamo detto. Se 
parliamo della mollitie o durezza, in questo c’è eccesso bene spesso di 
scarbrosità per i vaporì asciutti del fegato, e del tutto.

Il colore è naturale, fuori però di quello, che gli dà alcuna vaga la veste 
della bile [89v] flava. In quanto poi agli escrementi, in questo ci è eccesso si per 
la copia della saliva, e si ancho per la copia del catarro, che descende dalla testa.

[91v] Cognitione III Decima. Delle labbra, bocca e palato di V. S. Ill.ma.

Di queste parti in V. S. Ill.ma non c’è da dire cosa alcuna, godendo elle non 
la dovuta sanità. Solo c’è da considerare la magnitudine delle labra: poichè
quello di sotto è un più grosso di quello superiore, e quello di sopra più asciutto, e più corto, che non s’unendo bene insieme, non lasciano proferir naturalmente alcuni voci, rendendole, o più acute o meno dolci, di quello che non si doverebbe. Hora questo deriva da principi della sua generatione, havendo il Padre suo ancho havuto le medesime affettioni nelle labra. La figura loro da natural, cioè il semicircolo, grossi negl’angoli tirati l’inferiori mag.re del superiore, grandi et alquanto aperti, il che significa, in quanto alla complessione longevità, inquanto all’animo timore senza malitia, in quant all’ingegno velocità d’apprensiva.

Mercurio poscia in bilancia nella revolutione per esser segno mobile retto della triplicità aerea e sanguigna diviso con la figura del segno denota la forma, e la division della bocca, con la triplicità e rettitudine, la quantità delle labra, quella della bocca, con la mobilità la separatione dagli angoli.

Neci dobbiamo maraviliare che da Tolom.o sia stato eletto Merc.o per dirigere e muover le labbra, imperciocche mentre che egli è presid.te [92v] della loquela, questa non si puol mai effettuare senza l’aiuto delle labbra con le quali con la lingua, e condenti si vanno formando le parole et articolando le voci.

....
First Part

The Idea of Health and Illness, Derived from the Progress of the Life of the Illustrious Signor Cardinal Borghese

Physical and Astronomical Discourse. By Signor Angelo Cardi (1627)

Distinction I


As the particular details of the temperament precede the general, we will therefore consider them first. In the spermatic channels these are cold and dry; and, noting the mobility of these parts, there is some sub-dominance of humidity. However, too much [humidity] in the joints impedes their movement and damages their feeling. Blood generally flourishes in humidity, as can be discerned from his obesity. The rest [of his temperament's details] enjoy complete health by consequence of his temperament, [31r] and it seems natural to us that all the functions of his muscles, of which these are part and are necessary instruments, conform themselves to his nature.

The universal temperament that thus results in Your Illustrious Lordship from the collection of the three above mentioned temperaments (that is the influx, the actuation, and the mutation, and then the repression of the elements) is excessive on two counts: that is, in its warmth and in its humidity, though in a way that does not transcend the bounds of good health.

[His temperament] collects manifestations derived from his corpulent and fleshy habit, from the large veins of his full wrists, from his overall warmth and his red colour, from the softness of his flesh and his black hair, from his taste for fresh weather and his loathing of heat, from the inquisitiveness of his mind and the virtuous habits of his soul, including his religiousness, his charity, and [31v] his magnificent works, of which Nec ventura silebunt saecula. Nec ignota rapiet sub nube vetustas (They will be neither silenced by the winds of ages, nor will the mist of age obscure them).

All this is confirmed by the warm mingling of his humours and the humidity of the liver; as Galen wrote, the temperament of everything else can be deduced from the disposition of the liver.

And if you were to ask me which of these two qualities exceed in him, that is warmth or humidity, I would respond to you that, in relation to his bulk, humidity would be superior, but that in regards to his movements then
the greater would be warmth, observing in him the effects of great warmth and the massiveness of excessive humidity.

And besides if you were to ask me which of the humours causes this abundance of humidity, I will respond that in the first place humidity is found in his blood, Avicenna having taught us [32r] that the blood above all the other humours is conserved in us in thirty three parts [that is, one third]. In the second place there is the humidity of his corpulence, and in the third there is humidity in pituitary, causing the similar intemperance of the stomach, and the disequilibrium of the head.

His temperament, therefore, will be mainly warm and humid, that is, sanguine; not quite of straight blood, but mixed, where the sub-dominance will be bile, which is warm and dry, as is gathered from the thirst that bothers him, from the dryness of the lips, from the bilious coating on his tongue and gums, as well as from the thoroughness of his wit, from the sharpness of his senses, and from the brevity of his sleep.

The final sub-dominance is melancholic, although it is a natural melancholy, born from the burning of the yellow bile, as is gathered from his procrastination, from his fearfulness, from his thoughtful soul, and from other [32v] diagnostic signs, that for brevity's sake I now intend to overlook.

... His body (leaving aside the spirituous part), therefore, will weigh 200 libbre [about sixty eight kilograms]. Among the humours, thirty five [34v] parts are of blood; four, according to Aristotle, are of pituitary, which makes nine; three are of bile; and there will be six of melancholy. The humours therefore will be 51 libbre of weight [sic]. In a fat man the bones are almost of equal weight to the humours - therefore, there will be fifty. The flesh in the same obese man will be double this - that is, a century. The warmth is one seventh of the humours and the flesh combined; in him there will be twenty two degrees of warmth, which will, with nourishment proportionate to his primitive humidity, justly and happily conserve him until an old age.

....

Distinction II

[40v] Third Cognition. Of the Type and Quality of the Spirits of Your Illustrious Lordship.

Having made a general consideration of the spirits, we are in a position to understand those of Your Lordship. First we will consider their quantity,
followed by their quality. In regards to their quantity I find that Galen, as in all natural things, praises moderation - although an abundance of spirits is not blameworthy, he is critical of their lack. According to this argument, weakness of virtue, [41r] like great strength, is due to the force of Nature. Now then, the great quantity of the spirits that can gather in him are indeed found in him; that is, of discourse and of the senses, there being in him those material causes and influences that result from a generous circulation of the blood, an innate warmth, and an easy pulse of air, which can be reasonably believed produce such abundant effects in him. If we were to discuss the primary qualities of the same things, that is, all the things that are very warm and humid, [we will see that when] they are excessive provide similar effects. If we were to discuss the secondary qualities, that is, those that have density and are of the earth, [they would be] those animals with a super abundance of phlegmatic elements from the head. An exuberance of pituitary, which is found mixed with blood, gives birth to a similar intemperance of the stomach. If [41v] their natural constitution were spoken of it could be reasonably said that they are healthy, for they function well and the sources from whence they derive are good; that is, the blood, natural warmth, and the air. It is said of the spirits in general that if we want to find particular types of animals in their natural state, with their faculties functioning principally for the purpose for which they serve, then imagine subtly, discuss prudently, remind oneself tenaciously, move oneself freely, and feel perfectly with all the senses. The vital forces [of Cardinal Borghese] also delight in the same felicity, while he also has full pulses, and his breathing is free and quick. Finally, his natural processes are extremely healthy, he makes a good chylification, even better blood-making, the best nutrition, or rather augmentation, and the desired expulsion of all the excrements.

...  

[42v] Fourth Cognition. On the Universal Humours, which are the Internal Causes of Health.

As already mentioned, the second natural causes that build health are the humours. These are nothing else other than the four principles that derive from the similar parts of man and of all other sanguine animals. They grow from the material substance of our food and drink; Avicenna defined them as Corpora liquida in quae primo esculenta, e poculenta convertuntur (Flesh and bodily fluids were first food and drink, before they were converted). Our food and drink are basically composed from four elements, fire, air, water and earth.
Therefore it can reasonably be said [43r] that our bodies are indirectly composed of those [elements]. The effective causes spring from natural warmth, and from a similar temper that is found in the liver, which generates blood, bile, and melancholy. The other [humour] is found in the stomach, where it makes pituitary, which then enters the liver, where it concocts with and perfects the body's production of blood. They are similar to the elements, not only in their number, but also in the first and second qualities: that is, bile is warm, dry, transparent, and thin, like fire; blood is warm, humid, and light, like the air; pituitary is cold, humid, and viscous like water; melancholy is cold, dry, dense, and opaque, like the earth. Of these, blood is the most abundant in us, being warm and humid, and all vegetative life depends upon it, according to Aristotle. Pituitary follows next, [43v] in third place comes bile, and the last is melancholy....

[45v] **Fifth Cognition.** Of the Humours that are found in Your Illustrious Lordship; that is, their Quantity and Quality.

The natural constitution of the humours, as causes of stable health, cannot be discerned simply from visible signs, but only deduced through conjecture, which we will use to discover the state of the humour's that reign in Your Illustrious Lordship. These are drawn from the causes that generate them, of the things that improve or damage them, and from the effects. We will begin from the material itself and the effective causes. They are the foods and drinks, which in him, being of the best substance and finest quality, could not produce anything else other than good humours; that is warm and humid humours that mass in the liver of a similar temperature. They also make in the stomach the pituitary humour, this having a similar disposition. To this subject is proportioned efficient cause; that is warmth of the liver makes a lot of blood, and the coldness of the stomach sufficient pituitary. To this is added the external causes, [46v] because the air of Rome is warm and humid, which acts to increase the above mentioned dilution.

The other matters to keep in mind are those things which are damaging to him, such as cold bitter things, and those from the earth; therefore humid, warm and sweet things are useful, and in this respect the air of Nettuno is good, and is particularly pleasant in spring.

The effects from the same causes show in him the same predominance; that is, the red colour of the body, the colour of the limbs, the softness of the
flesh, the chestnut skin, the coloured urine, and the hard excrement, which is shaped and slightly tinted.

Considering, then, the other humours. The first is phlegm, or pituitary, of which we want to say that, as it has material causes, and [47r] effects less powerful than those of the blood, only small amounts will be produced in him, and it will be of good quality.

After pituitary comes yellow bile, which because it does not have material causes has neither potent nor vigorous effects, and even smaller amounts than phlegm are made.

From this it can be said, it can reasonably be concluded, that in regard to their efficient causes the humours in him (if properly dissolved inside, and contained by good health) are in a perfectly good state, as I proposed to show at the beginning.

The truth of all this, which Your Lord's nature demonstrates, is also confirmed in the heavens by the gathering together of the humours from signs [47v] of the Zodiac, and of the planets, all conspiring in that I have demonstrated here. Because Jupiter and Venus, which for healthy temperance have their rays caring for [the body's] humidity and warmth, have been judged the rulers of the blood. For this condition, which they find themselves, it could also be believed that his blood will be found in the same condition. Now in the revolution Jupiter is positioned in Virgo, which is the house of Mercury and which takes the influences from the nearby planets, thus it can also be believed that Jupiter's nature will be affected. Venus meanwhile sits in Libra, a sign that he is warm and humid; which gives reason to believe, as Jupiter and Venus are both well-posted in regards to blood, that the blood in him is also in premium condition. Moreover, these planets are well placed for mental liveliness.

If we then consider phlegm, this is [48r] indicated by the moon, an astral body that by nature is cold and humid. When it is in Taurus it is a sign of growing humidity. This humour does not preserve itself well, and there is much more [regarding this humour] than I have discussed when it finds itself in the same sign.

Mars is president of the bile humour, while Saturn protects melancholy, and for these to be in the revolution in Virgo, and in the root in Capricorn's house, shows that they are quite strong in him. Similarly, for Mars to be in Virgo is a cold sign and signifies the generation of the choleric humour in him, but it is tempered and corrected by the predominance of the blood's humidity,
and the coldness of the pituitary; melancholy is demonstrated by the nature of its temperament.

[67r] **Fourth Distinction.** Of the Health of the Individual Parts of the Body.

Having regarded the general health of his body, and the causes and effects of the same, it is now necessary (to give completion to this first part) to consider the individual members [of the body] to determine their health, and their causes and effects.

...[70v] **Third Cognition.** Of the Health, and the Causes and Effects of the Cerebrum of Your Illustrious Lord.

In relation to matters belonging to the form (that is to say the shape), surface, size, number, position, and unity of the cerebrum of Your Illustrious Lord, I will not say anything more than that which was said above in Chapter 1, 'On the understanding of the Health of His Instrumental Parts'. I will only consider the temperament [of the cerebrum], [71r] which, as I said and referred to above, I regard as cold and humid. In relation to the things that are either harmful or beneficial: the southern air is damaging to him, as is the wet, so autumn and winter are bad. Any reasons for his decline, as also for the majority of his maladies, are derived from these principles. The same is discovered from the excrements that come from the nostrils and mouth, they being of a similar nature. But to all this many of his functions are contrary, as he easily understands. This derives from the softness and humidity, which if he were to have an excess of (as might be produced by blood) he would not learn so easily, so that he would be stupid.

Similarly he is very ingenious and diligent, an effect that comes from the warm, dry and lucid spirits, rather than from the heavy, turbulent [spirits]; and so much more from dry weather and heat than from the cold and humidity, which easily breeds laziness and [71v] tardiness. He seemingly has a good memory, which points to moderate humidity, for which the surplus serves apprehension and not retention. Finally, if we speak of the senses, in him they are exquisite (not dull and slow), which are produced by the humid [condition]. His wakefulness is greater than sleep, for his sleep is not very profound, while
he wakes early and quickly, all clear effects of warmth. I do not, however, deny that he is not fond of quiet and restfulness of the body.

Although I am aware that there is humidity and coldness in the above said cerebrum, because it is not excessive (he being a long way from old age) it is perhaps not so crucial, but by the consent of the humid and cold stomach, and of similar food and drink, it is moderated by the humidity which rises to the cerebrum by force of the liver's warmth. So much so that those excrements, rather than being blocked, are either evacuated via the said places or transmitted to the joints in the changes of the year; as such a warm temperament and natural humidity is reestablished in the cerebrum, which makes the actions of the above mentioned faculty exactly right.

....

[73r] The shape of the head [of Cardinal Borghese] is not perfectly spherical, nor ovular, but depressed somewhat in the temples; similarly its average size suggests the sound state of the contents of its cranium, and consequently of the excellence of his intellect.

If we marvel again at heaven we will see that the sun for good reason is the head of the all the planets, and as such holds reign over the wit, and naturally arranges the animal faculties. It is for him declining in the revolution, and in the middle of providence, whence it could be argued that he was somewhat harmed in regard to the time of his birth.

The moon similarly placed in the revolution in Taurus indicates coldness and humidity, denoting a cold intemperance and humidity of his brain, since, as Pontano said, *ita se havet cerebrum* [73v] *ad cor ut ipsa ad sole luna* (Therefore to be healthy the brain must be master of heart, just as the sun is of the moon). Aries confirms the same, which being in the tenth, in heaven's sister, has joined with it the area of Fortune, generally signifying the best for his disposition. It is, however, somewhat humid.

Finally this same bears witness to the first house of the revolution, in regards to his birth. Since that has with it the ascendant Leo, with a known sextile from the lord sun, and a triune of Jupiter and the moon. From which the natural perfection of the head is clearly demonstrated. It is intemperate, however, in the cold and humidity.

....

[77r] Fifth cognition. The Eyes of Your Illustrious Lordship.
Up till now we have only considered the universal matters regarding the eyes, and now we will consider the particular issues for Your Lord; first health, then the causes, then the effects.

In regards to the health of his eyes [77v]; it is agreed that it [the health of the eyes] is part dependent on the brain and nerves, and in part on the quality of the eyes themselves. If we speak of what is agreed upon, that is that his cerebrum is cold and humid, consequently the nerves are weak, and the eye will also be of the same condition. The same is gathered from those things that are burdensome or damaging, being communal to both [the cerebrum and the eyes]. This much is gathered from the excrements.

When we speak of the essential health [of the eyes] this can be considered either in relation to their form or their matter. In regards to the form, as we have shown above, they enjoy a perfect state - in their shape, surface, recession, number, placement, and also unity.

If we then speak of the matter, this is not quite perfect, but however it is such that it does not restrain the general health of the eyes. If we first consider the temperature, it is warm and humid, but less humid than it is warm. The red and clear eye colour [78r] is a sign of the abundance of his spirits and of the eye’s mobility: the largeness of his veins and the magnitude of the eye also give an indication of warmth and humidity. The colour black, or a tendency to deep blue, are also signs of the same temperament.

The same is gathered from the action, that is, the view, which is imperfect. Rather than not seeing the things far away, he has trouble making out things nearby, so therefore he has taken use of eyeglasses, which because of their density resist external light, shutting out the visible spirits; but by their diaphaneity and thickness they make the objects larger and clearer, and as such easier to see.

A defect in the eyes can also be contracted from errors of living, and in the use of Venus. This same defect can also be derived from one’s relatives, both being the cause of sight defects.

[78v] The shape of his eyes is round, the size is average, the colour is red, the movement is quick, the gaze soft and pleasing. They are of a style that signifies his bountiful soul, his modesty, and his affability. To the eyes, among the celestial houses above, the first has complete jurisdiction over the internal and external parts of the head. Among the signs of the Zodiac the superior one is Aries, by reason of which we have already spoken; it dominates the head, for
the sun exalts in this sign, and the visible spirits and the light can be discerned in the eyes, so that the poets have often said that the sun is often in the guise of Aries, and that some of them [Ariens] with their light alone can see in the shadows....Among the planets the right eye is dedicated to the sun, the left to the moon....

Now the house, sign, and the planets, are well positioned in the Revolution and the root, and his eyes can be regarded as being in good condition. He has to tolerate the defect of the visible spirits, which derives from his inactive age.


As is in the health of your Lordship, in the causes and effects of health, and in regard to the mamillary processes, so also in respect of the nose; for, as is well noted (and I cannot tire of demonstrating it), the simple act of smelling being perfect in you is a sign that all is well.

The same ease of smelling, of evacuating the excrements, of speaking, and of breathing, signifies the perfect state of the nostrils.

The shape of his nose is straight, but elevated from his large face, with open nostrils, all signs of a strong and robust complexion.

Among the constellations that dominate the nostrils, the first is the Lion, an animal with open nostrils, denoting what was said above, that is the facility that one can have of being disdainful. Aries dominates these parts, for according to Aristotle it had a large and elevated nose, and so it is not without reason that it could denote the nose.

Venus dominates the sense of smell and Mercury the nostrils...

Since both these planets are still well placed it should indicate the excellent state of these parts.


Of these there is not much to say as they are in such good condition, in respect of the causes and effects, and in their composition and crafting they are perfect.

Their shape is ovoid, long and straight; the cartilaginous parts are large and well sculpted, which, as has been said many times, means longevity of life and the excellence of manners.
Among the houses that reign over the ears the first has already been mentioned - Aries.

If the planets were considered I would find that Saturn is dedicated to the right ear, and Mars to the left. The first reason is that Saturn has a diurnal condition and follows the sun, and Mars is nocturnal and follows the moon. The second reason comes from long experience, which tells us that the bad constellations of Mars and Saturn cause all the ears' infirmities.


In regards to the health of the Your Illustrious Lord's tongue. If we speak of the agreement of the cerebrum and the nerves, it cannot in itself be excessive in humidity, if the essential composition of the tongue, in regards to its substance, has a softness in excess of the humidity. If we speak of the shape of the tongue, then it is natural and the surface, judging from the structure alone, is good, having on it both pituitous and bilous matters. The magnitude is normal, except that it is a little dense, which does not allow it to form some words properly. This combines with the natural defect of the lower teeth ([88v] used to stop the tongue to enable the formation of letters); therefore the [letter] l is added to make [words] easier to form. The number and unity are in natural condition.

... In regard to the effects, and firstly of the manner of speech, this is perfect in him, with only some imperfections in the formation of certain words, as we said. In regard to its softness or hardness; there is often an excessive roughness caused by the dry vapours from the liver, and from everything else.

The colour is normal, except that occasionally it is dressed with [89v] yellow bile. In regards to excrements, there is an excessive amount due to the abundance of saliva and of catarrh, which falls from the head.

... [91v] Thirteenth Cognition. Of the Lips, Mouth, and Palate of Your Illustrious Lordship

Of these parts of Your Illustrious Lord there is nothing in particular to say, as they enjoy the required health. There is only to consider the magnitude of the lips, since the bottom one is larger than the one above, which is drier and shorter, so that [92r] the lips do not fit together well, and do not naturally make some sounds, instead rendering them sharper or not as sweet as they
should be. Now this comes from the principles of his generation, his father also having had the same type of lips. Their figure is natural, that is semi-circular, large at the corners and turned down, of good size, and somewhat open, which signifies longevity in regards to his complexion, fear without malice in regards to the soul, and quick apprehension in regards to the intellect.

Mercury, in balance in the revolution, is a mobile sign direct from the ariel and sanguine triplicity, divided with the shape of the sign that denotes the form and division of the mouth, with the triplicity and uprightness pointing to the quantity of the lips and the mouth, with the separation of the corners pointing to the mouth's mobility.

We have to marvel that, according to Ptolemy, Mercury was elected to direct and move the lips, in so far that, although he is president of elocution, he cannot do this without the help of the lips in concert with the tongue and the teeth, all working together to form words and articulate voices.
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1. S. Gregorio Magno, detail of Antonio Tempesta, La Pianta di Roma, Rome, 1593.
3. S. Gregorio Magno, church and oratories.
4. S. Gregorio Magno, oratories (l. to r.) of S. Barbara, S. Andrea, and S. Silva.
5. S. Gregorio Magno, S. Silva.
6. S. Gregorio Magno, ceiling of S. Andrea.
7. S. Gregorio Magno, interior of S. Silva.
8. S. Gregorio, plinth on the steps to the oratories' forecourt.
9. S. Gregorio Magno, portal to the abbey garden at rear of the oratories.
12. S. Sebastiano, ambulatory and rear entrance to the crypt.
13. S. Sebastiano, rear facade.
14. S. Sebastiano, detail of rear facade.
15. S. Sebastiano, interior, view to high altar.
16. S. Sebastiano, interior, view to entrance.
17. S. Sebastiano, side altar dedicated to S. Carlo Borromeo.
18. S. Sebastiano, interior door.
19. S. Sebastiano, ceiling.
20. S. Susanna, ceiling, Carlo Maderno, 1597-1603.
21. S. Sebastiano, high altar chapel, view to dome.
22. S. Sebastiano, high altar.
23. SS. Nero ed Achilleo, interior; Letarouilly, Édifices, vol. 3, pl. 266.
24. S. Sebastiano, facade.
25. S. Sebastiano, exterior of fourth century clerestory and seventeenth century facade.
27. S. Bibiana, facade, Gianlorenzo Bernini, 1624-6; Giovan Battista Falda, Il
nuovo teatro delle fabbriche et edificij..., 1665.
28. S. Sebastiano, portico, seventeenth century Ionic capital (left) and
fourteenth century Ionic capital (right).
32. S. Agostino, facade, Giacomo da Pietrasanta, 1480.
33. S. Susanna, facade, Carlo Maderno, 1597-1603.
34. S. Susanna, exterior door flanking facade.
35. S. Susanna, interior door.
36. S. Susanna, interior, keystone of proscenium arch, 1605.
37. S. Sebastiano, detail of interior door.
38. S. Maria sopra Minerva, Caffarelli Chapel (Istituto Centrale per il
Catalogo e la Documentazione).
39. S. Maria sopra Minerva, Caffarelli Chapel, monument to Francesco
Caffarelli.
40. S. Maria sopra Minerva, Caffarelli Chapel, detail of altar.
41. S. Maria in Trastevere, interior.
42. S. Maria in Trastevere, detail of ceiling (Kelly Sullivan).
43. S. Crisogono, interior.
44. S. Crisogono, nave ceiling.
45. S. Crisogono, detail of nave ceiling.
46. S. Crisogono, detail of transept ceiling.
47. S. Crisogono, nave colonnade and clerestory.
48. S. Crisogono, elevation of colonnade and clerestory.
49. S. Francesca Romana, interior.
50. S. Francesca Romana, exterior detail of clerestory.
52. S. Crisogono, interior; Letarouilly, Édifices, vol. 3, pl. 343.
53. S. Crisogono, detail of proscenium arch.
54. S. Crisogono, apse.
55. S. Crisogono, detail of entablature and Ionic columns in the nave.
56. S. Crisogono, ciborium.
57. S. Crisogono, facade.
58. S. Crisogono, medieval portico, Le cose meravigliose dell'Alma Città di
Roma, 1625.
59. S. Crisogono, narthex.
60. S. Crisogono, door within narthex.
61. S. Crisogono, internal door within aisle.
62. S. Crisogono, candelabrum.
63. S. Crisogono, external side door.
64. S. Crisogono, external side door, detail of Corinthian columns.
65. S. Crisogono, detail of cosmatesque pavement in the nave.
66. S. Crisogono, pavement, detail of seventeenth century tessellation.
68. S. Maria della Vittoria, facade.
69. S. Maria della Vittoria, facade.
70. S. Maria della Vittoria, facade detail.
71. S. Caterina dei Funari, facade, Guidetto Guidetti, 1564.
72. S. Maria dei Monti, facade, Giacomo della Porta, 1580.
73. S. Susanna and S. Maria della Vittoria.
74. S. Susanna and S. Maria della Vittoria, view east along Via Pia.
75. Piazza of S. Bernardo, view of S. Susanna, S. Maria della Vittoria, and Acqua Felice.
76. Piazza of S. Bernardo, schematic plan.
78. S. Maria della Vittoria and Acqua Felice, view from Via Barberini.
79. S. Maria della Vittoria, facade detail.
80. S. Maria della Vittoria, facade detail.
82. S. Maria sopra Minerva, first organ in north arm of the transept.
83. S. Maria sopra Minerva, organs in the transept.
84. S. Gregorio Magno, facade.
85. S. Gregorio Magno, atrium, view towards medieval portico.
86. S. Gregorio Magno, atrium, view towards seventeenth century facade.
87. S. Gregorio Magno, facade detail.
88. Artena (formerly Montefortino), S. Maria di Gesù.
89. Artena, S. Maria di Gesù, monastery courtyard.
90. Artena, S. Maria di Gesù, monastery courtyard.
91. Artena, S. Maria di Gesù, facade.
92. Artena, S. Maria di Gesù, interior.
93. Artena, S. Maria di Gesù, high altar.
95. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta, plan of original church as at 1828, ASV AB 555, n. 315.
96. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta, facade.
97. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta, facade detail.
98. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta, view of nave and nineteenth century crossing and apse.
100. Monte Porzio, Palazzo Borghese.
101. Monte Porzio, rear of Palazzo Borghese.
102. Monte Porzio, town gateway and entrance to Palazzo Borghese.
103. Monte Porzio, detail of entrance to Palazzo Borghese.
104. Artena, site plan and elevation of main piazza.
105. Artena, Palazzo Borghese.
106. Artena, Palazzo Borghese, 1620s entrance.
107. Artena, Palazzo Borghese, 1620s wing.
108. Artena, main piazza, view from the top of Arco Borghese.
110. Artena, granary.
111. Artena, Arco Borghese.
112. Artena, Arco Borghese, detail.
113. Ariccia, Palazzo Chigi, remodelled by Bernini, 1660s.
114. Ariccia, entrance to Palazzo Chigi.
115. Ariccia, S. Maria dell'Assunzione, view from entrance to Palazzo Chigi.
116. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Portrait of Scipione Borghese, 1632, red and black chalk on paper, 276mm by 237mm, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.
1. S. Gregorio Magno, 1593.

2. S. Gregorio, plan and elevation.

3. S. Gregorio, church and oratories.
4. S. Gregorio Magno, (l. to r.) S. Barbara, S. Andrea, and S. Silva

5. S. Silva.

7. S. Silva.
8. S. Gregorio, plinth on the oratory forecourt.

9. S. Gregorio, portal to the rear.
10. S. Sebastiano fuori le mura, 1575.

11. S. Sebastiano, crypt.
12. S. Sebastiano, ambulatory and rear facade.

13. S. Sebastiano, rear facade.

14. S. Sebastiano, rear facade.
15. S. Sebastiano, view to high altar.
16. S. Sebastiano, view to entrance.
17. S. Sebastiano, side altar.

18. S. Sebastiano, side door.
19. S. Sebastiano, ceiling.

20. S. Susanna, ceiling.
21. S. Sebastiano, high altar chapel.

22. S. Sebastiano, high altar.
23. SS. Nero ed Achilleo.

24. S. Sebastiano.
25. S. Sebastiano.

26. S. Francesca Romana.

27. S. Bibiana.
28. S. Sebastiano, portico detail.

30. S. Sebastiano, 1625.

31. Florence, S. Maria Novella.
32. S. Agostino

33. S. Susanna.
34. S. Susanna, exterior door.

35. S. Susanna, interior door.
36. S. Susanna, keystone in proscenium arch.

37. Detail of interior door, S. Sebastiano.
38. S. Maria sopra Minerva, Caffarelli Chapel.
39. S. Maria sopra Minerva, Caffarelli Chapel.

40. S. Maria sopra Minerva, Caffarelli Chapel.
41. S. Maria in Trastevere.

42. S. Maria in Trastevere, detail of ceiling.
43. S. Crisogono.
44. S. Crisogono, nave ceiling.
45. S. Crisogono, nave ceiling.

46. S. Crisogono, transept ceiling.
47. S. Crisogono.

48. S. Crisogono, detail of clerestory.
49. S. Francesca Romana.

50. S. Francesca Romana, detail of clerestory.
51. S. Maria in Trastevere, interior.

52. S. Crisogono, interior.
53. S. Crisogono, detail of proscenium arch.

54. S. Crisogono, apse.

55. S. Crisogono, Ionic columns in nave.
57. S. Crisogono, facade.

58. S. Crisogono, medieval facade.
59. S. Crisogono, narthex.

60. S. Crisogono, door within narthex.

61. S. Crisogono, interior door.
62. S. Crisogono, candalabrum.
63. S. Crisogono, side door.

64. S. Crisogono, detail of side door.
65. S. Crisogono, detail of cosmatesque pavement in the nave.

66. S. Crisogono, detail of 17th century tesselation.
67. Piazza of S. Bernardo, 1625.
68. S. Maria della Vittoria.
69. S. Maria della Vittoria.

70. S. Maria della Vittoria.
71. S. Caterina dei Funari.

72. S. Maria dei Monti.
73. S. Susanna and S. Maria della Vittoria.

74. S. Susanna and S. Maria della Vittoria, view east along via Pia.
75. Piazza of S. Bernardo, S. Susanna, S. Maria della Vittoria, and Acqua Felice.

76. Piazza of S. Bernardo, schematic plan.
77. Piazza of S. Bernardo, 1593.

78. S. Maria della Vittoria.
79. S. Maria della Vittoria.

80. S. Maria della Vittoria, detail above door.
81. S. Chiara a Casa Pia.
82. S. Maria sopra Minerva, organ in north arm of transept.

83. S. Maria sopra Minerva, organs in the transept.
84. S. Gregorio Magno.

85. S. Gregorio Magno, atrium, view to medieval portico.
86. S. Gregorio Magno, atrium.

87. S. Gregorio Magno, atrium.
88. Artena (formerly Montefortino), S. Maria di Gesù.

89. Artena, S. Maria di Gesù, courtyard.
90. Artena, S. Maria dì Gesù, courtyard.

91. Artena, S. Maria dì Gesù.
92. Artena, S. Maria dē Gesù, interior.

93. Artena, S. Maria dē Gesù, high altar.

94. Artena, S. Maria dē Gesù, reverse of high altar.
95. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta, plan in 1828
96. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta.

97. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta, facade detail.
98. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta.

99. Monte Compatri, S. Maria Assunta.
100. Monte Porzio, Palazzo Borghese.

101. Monte Porzio, Palazzo Borghese.
102. Monte Porzio, Palazzo Borghese.

103. Monte Porzio, Palazzo Borghese.
104. Artena, site plan and elevation of main piazza; main features only, not to scale.

105. Artena, Palazzo Borghese.
106. Artena, Palazzo Borghese, 1620s entrance.

107. Artena, Palazzo Borghese, 1620s wing.
108. Artena, main piazza, view from the top of the Arco Borghese.

110. Artena, granary.

111. Artena, Arco Borghese.

112. Artena, Arco Borghese.
113. Ariccia, Palazzo Chigi.

114. Ariccia, Palazzo Chigi.

115. Ariccia, S. Maria dell' Assunzione.
117. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Bust of Scipione Borghese.

118. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Caricature of a cardinal (Scipione Borghese).