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SOMETIME before March 28, 1618, a miracle occurred near Rome. An unidentified blood relic began to liquefy just before the feast day of Saint Lawrence, and hence the blood was judged to be that of the martyr. Pope Paul V, hearing of the event, obtained several drops and added them to the relic collection of his chapel at Sta. Maria Maggiore. It was impossible to doubt the miracle because, in the words of a contemporary, “who does not know, I ask you, that Saint Lawrence is still burning?”—“Quis, inquam, nolit adhoram uri Laurentii igne.” According to tradition, the young archdeacon of Rome suffered the most painful of all tortures—“extrema omnium”—on August 10, 258, during the Decian persecutions. After having distributed the treasures of the Church to the poor of Rome, he was roasted to death on a grill over slow coals. Reportedly, he triumphed over the pain of his martyrdom. The inner fire of his love—“ardor caritatis”—conquered the fire of torture, as the Holy Fathers repeatedly assure us. At the climax of the torture, his face was transfigured and with stoic irony he told the judge, “On this side I am roasted . . . turn me over and then eat me!”—“assum est . . . versa et manduca.” The odor of his burning flesh, a stench to the pagans, was “as lovely as nectar” to the Christians: “. . . his nidor, illis nectar est. . . .” Before his death, he prayed for the conversion of Rome and by his sacrifice prepared the way for the victory of Christendom over the pagan world. He thus became the “heavenly consul of Rome,” a significant figure in the Christian idea of Rome.

Prudentius’s Peristephanon already separates the two realities of this martyrdom: the visible fire is not the true one, “for Christ is the true fire”—“nam Christus ignis verus est.” Saint Lawrence burns internally. From there it was only a small step to the view of some of the Holy Fathers, that because of his own “virtus” and the grace of God, Saint Lawrence died almost without pain. No less eminent an authority than Augustine states that the saint, being en-
flamed with love for Christ, "did not feel the tortures of fire": "Laurentius enim, dum Christi ardebat ardone, ignis tormenta non sensit." Cesare Baronius, the sixteenth-century ecclesiastical historian, accepted the fictitious Passio Polychronii and Prudentius's Peristephanon as fact. Concerning Saint Lawrence, the seventeenth century believed itself to be in possession of certified historical truth.

In Italian painting from Bernardo Daddi to Bandinelli, Salvati, and Nebbia, the scene generally depicted was Saint Lawrence's heroic speech to the judge: "assum est . . . versa et manduca." It is basically this dialogue that differentiates the martyrdom of Saint Lawrence from another prototype, that of Saint Stephen, who also sees heaven open before him as his martyrdom reaches its conclusion. In the art of the seventeenth century, the expressive dialectic between physical suffering and beatific vision in a single figure experiencing both becomes the most successful and frequently used model for depicting martyrs. In innumerable presentations, the physical phenomenon of martyrdom is given visible, supernatural meaning through the depiction of the beatific vision of the sufferer, which is often intensified by the triumphant elevation of the saint above his torturers.

This development may be found in renderings of Saint Lawrence. Titian, in the most influential painting of the subject, depicts the saint at the very moment he is being turned over. The saint's gesture, however, is ambiguous, for it seems to be directed less to the judge than to Heaven. Pasquale Catì's version of the subject of around 1574–76, painted for the high altar of S. Lorenzo in Panisperna (Fig. 1), the historical site of the martyrdom of Saint Lawrence, combines new and traditional features. His tormentors are turning the saint over, none too gently. At that moment, however, Lawrence looks toward Heaven in a beatific vision, and the gesture of his hands expresses both devotion and submission.

In criticizing these paintings on theological-moralistic grounds, Gilio da Fabriano accuses the artists of suppressing the physical aspect of the torture for reasons of artistic decorum: "I see Saint Lawrence on the grate, not burned and roasted, but white [i.e., untouched by the flames], for the sole reason that Art delights in showing muscles and veins. . . . O error without end. . . . Certainly it would be new and beautiful . . . to see Saint Lawrence on the grate, burned, roasted . . . "—"Lorenzo arso, incotto, crepato, lacero e diffirmato. . . ." Rubens handles the problem of artistic decorum in his painting of Saint Lawrence of about 1615 by emphasizing the moral aspect of martyrdom in the heroic submission of the saint; he alludes by prolepsis to the physical aspect of the torture, depicting exactly the moment before it starts.

Bernini's Saint Lawrence (Fig. 2) was not a commissioned sculpture. Domenico Bernini writes that his father created the work "for the veneration of his patron saint." However, the problems inherent in the subject Bernini chose show the real purpose of the work: mostrare l'arte. It fulfilled this goal and became a public success. Since the sculpture was conceived as a collector's piece—being only a meter wide and treating an eminently Florentine subject—it also reached the right audience, for the exiled Florentine Leone Strozzi bought it. Even more important, Cardinal Scipione Caffarelli-Borghese, nephew of Paul V, viewed it twice. This public test of talent seems to have been an important factor in the Cardinal's decision to commission the Aeneas group from Bernini in 1618.

As befits a work intended to demonstrate its creator's artistry, the invenzione of Bernini's Saint Lawrence is strikingly new. The saint is not shown in a statuesque pose with the symbols of his passio, as is usual in sculpture, but in the context of his passio, as might be expected in painting. Bernini's first sacred sculpture is a "sculptured painting." Indeed, sources for the carving are to be found in painting. Technically, it is based upon the predominantly Bacchic putti groups by Pietro Bernini, which derive from small Hellenistic and Roman prototypes and
are composed as kinds of living pictures. Because Saint Lawrence is presented not as a conventional statue, but, in a new way, as a narrative painting in sculpture, the *invenzione* in itself follows the known principle of *difficiltà*. The barriers that separate the arts are knowingly and intentionally transgressed.

The *invenzione* of the *Saint Lawrence* is the paradigm of an *invenzione*, because, as Nicolas Poussin remarks in another context, its "novelty does not consist principally in a new subject but in good and new disposition and expression, and thus the subject from being common and old becomes singular and new." The *Saint Lawrence* reflects the same technique of sculptural *invenzione* that Bernini used in the second of his early sacred figures, the *Saint Sebastian* commissioned by Maffeo Barberini.

Here, in the unconscious, limp body of Saint Sebastian, an *invenzione* in painting found in the Caravagggesque circle around 1600 has been transferred to sculpture. The Caravagggesque *invenzione* supplements the primary conception of the subject. Only in the second step, the "ordinazione delle parti," as Bernini expresses it, is the figure composed in three dimensions, in emulation of Michelangelo. Both *invenzioni* are adaptations of motifs from painting. Both are strikingly new. Their aim is *meraviglia*.

It would be somewhat difficult to conceive of Bernini’s *Saint Lawrence* displayed in a church. Its demonstrably artistic character derives from its conception as a collector’s piece. The challenge Bernini undertook in the work suggests the well-known concept in applied art theory, the *paragone*. Using the difficult medium of sculpture, Bernini depicts Saint Lawrence on the grill above the flames, as in painting, and so meets the famous “first argument” by Benedetto Varchi in favor of painting in the *paragone*, its *universalità*. In Galileo Galilei’s letter of 1612 regarding the *paragone*, sculpture is credited with being able to imitate tangible nature—“il naturale tangibile.” Sculpture depicts substance, in the physical as well as in the philosophical sense, and, therefore, in contemporary popular opinion, it possesses greater validity than the imitation or even the deception of painting. Painting, however, is capable of imitating all of visible nature—“il naturale visibile.”

That Bernini intentionally sought a *paragone* with painting in his *Saint Lawrence* is shown by his representation of fire. Fire, the most changeable element, without body or weight, born of the wind according to the opinion of the time, is visible but not tangible. For this reason, sculpture cannot imitate it, as Dion Chrysostomus and others had already stated. Painting, on the other hand, can imitate it quite well.

In one of the arguments made by Leonardo, Castiglione, Varchi, Pontormo, Dolce, Pino, and Vasari in favor of painting in the *paragone*, fire regularly recurs in lists of natural phenomena that are difficult to depict, along with light, air, and smoke. If in marble Bernini overcomes a classic *difficiltà* of painting, the intention of a *paragone* is perfectly clear. Nor is this a simple fire. The martyrdom of Saint Lawrence is not *vivimento* over a wood fire, but a slow death by roasting over glowing coals, *legitime coactus*. Prudentius embellishes this in his account of the venomous speech by the judge: “I shall give you ... long-lasting pains. Lay the coals not too hot, so that the heat shall not be too fierce. ...” Glowing coals, a basket of coal, and a shovel are therefore constant components in depictions of Saint Lawrence. This shows with full clarity the *difficiltà* undertaken by Bernini’s *Saint Lawrence*: Painting, which imitates the visible with colors, can depict glowing coals; sculpture cannot.

Bernini masters this extreme difficulty by convincing the observer of the probable—by persuasion. He represents coal with white marble, but over it he places pieces of wood, and these help to suggest the fire: If the flames burst from the wood *and* the coals, then one can imagine that even the white marble is glowing coal. The theoretical basis for this extreme
difficilà is the assumption in Italian art theory, a commonplace since Alberti, that “imitation is all the more admirable when the means of imitation are far removed from the object to be imitated”—“quanto più i mezzi, co’ quali si imita, son lontani dalle cose da imitarsi, tanto più l’imitazione è meravigliosa,” as Galileo put it in 1612.39

Are such allusions to art theory historically probable in the work of Bernini, who was then not yet twenty years old?40 One might recall significant figures in Bernini’s early milieu: His father Pietro had a Florentine background and was a student of Ridolfo Sirigatti, who was a protagonist in Raffaele Borghini’s Riposo;41 and the Florentine Cardinal Maffeo Barberini acted as the patron and apparently also the intellectual mentor of Bernini’s early years.42 Barberini was highly knowledgeable about art and, as some of his poems and epigrams show, was interested in the issue of the paragone.43 Possibly he was already involved in the genesis of the Saint Lawrence.44 Finally, Barberini’s friend Galileo may also have been influential. At the request of Lodovico Cigoli, Galileo had expressed his opinion on the paragone in a letter to Rome in 1612.45 It can be assumed that the occasion for this letter was the combined activities of painters and sculptors working in the Cappella Borghese at Sta. Maria Maggiore. It can also be assumed that Pietro Bernini was involved in this debate of 1612, as evidenced in his reliefs The Assumption of the Virgin and The Coronation of Clement VIII, which united qualities of sculpture and painting.46

At no moment in his life did Bernini have any theoretical or literary ambitions. Yet, the creation and transmission of art theory in Italy existed on three levels in his time: through the rules used and transmitted in the workshop, such as those concerning proportion, anatomy, and foreshortening; through debates and exchanges of letters between artists and critics; and through theoretical writings.47 It can certainly be assumed that in his youth Bernini was already aware of art theory through at least the first two means. Without any doubt, the most common of all commonplaces in Italian art theory, the antagonistic comparison of painting and sculpture, was familiar to him.

How to define the type and rank of his own art might very well have been an existential question for Bernini in his early period. Moreover, it seems that the paragone was one of the conceptual factors in the creation of his individual style as a sculptor. In his latest attempt to formulate his main achievement, Bernini thought in terms of the elementary clichés of difficilà and applied paragone: He “got over the difficulty of rendering marble as malleable as wax”—“vinto haveva la difficilà di render’ il Marmo piegievole come la cera . . .”—and, in his own less elegant metaphor, the stone was “like pasta” in his hands. He knew how to “fuse in a certain sense painting and sculpture”—“. . . accoppiare in un certo modo insieme la Pittura, e la Scultura.”48

Irving Lavin recognized that Bernini not only eliminated the traditional separation of the two types of sculpture, per forza di levare and per via di porre, but that in doing so he also defined a new medium.49 This new medium, “malleable as wax” and “pliable as pasta,” is already present in the Saint Lawrence. To a certain extent innovation resulted from the extreme difficilà of competing with painting in this subject. In this respect, the work is a good example of the complex interaction of theoretical commonplaces and artistic practice in Bernini’s early years.50

The depiction of physical suffering and spiritual devotion to a single figure is a problem often confronted in images of martyrdom. In Correggio’s Saint Flavia, the martyr lifts her eyes to Heaven in a beatific vision as she receives the death blow.51 The gesture of her outspread hand, with palm up, assured Heaven of her devotion.52 Her right hand, however, is stretched out in a spontaneous gesture of defense. Raphael’s Saint Stephen shows the same conflict of emotions in two contrasting gestures.53 This obvious conflict continued to be consciously expressed in
Italian art around 1600. The technique of presenting antithetical emotions is used with almost declamatory clarity in the Saint Sebastian of the school of Annibale Carracci.\textsuperscript{54} A gesture of devotion is wrung from the fettered, suffering body. An intensification of this antithesis is represented in the Saint Sebastian by Pierre Puget in the church of Sta. Maria di Carignano in Genoa.\textsuperscript{55}

It is clear that this antithesis is an essential theme in Bernini’s Saint Lawrence. The body expresses pain in its extreme torsion and in the tensed muscles of the retracted abdomen, like those of the \textit{Laocoon}.\textsuperscript{56} The saint’s head, inclined upward at an angle, follows the typology of pain;\textsuperscript{57} his twisted neck has an extensive history in Italian painting. The observer is persuaded, by the sculpture’s imitation, to picture the flames attacking the body at several points and the flesh of the martyr reddened and burned. In these ways, Bernini fulfills Gilio’s demand for a depiction of the reality of suffering, for a “Lorenzo arso, incotto” in the medium of sculpture. However, in a dialectic between “means” and “imitation”—\textit{mezzo} and \textit{imitazione}—that was probably consciously calculated, the materiality of the marble counteracts the drastic effect of the presentation and helps to maintain artistic \textit{decorum}.\textsuperscript{58} The “Lorenzo arso, incotto” is simultaneously a “Lorenzo bianco.”\textsuperscript{59}

The moment of Saint Lawrence’s physical suffering that Bernini represents is also the moment of his spiritual submission. His right hand is spread toward Heaven in a gesture of devotion. Its expression is intensified by antithesis: It is chained to the grate. Chains are a rarity in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century iconography of Saint Lawrence. This is the result of the voluntary aspect of his martyrdom, the motif of his turning—“assum est . . . versa et manduca”—as well as the historical data that the victim was held down by prongs in this type of execution.\textsuperscript{60} Probably the chain on Bernini’s Saint Lawrence illustrates a \textit{topos} from the epigram about the saint by Damasus: “Only by his faith could Lawrence triumph over the blows, the tormentors, the flames, the tortures, and the chains”—“Verbera carnifices flammass tormenta catenas/Vincere Laurenti sola fides potuit.”\textsuperscript{61} In fact, the “chains” refer figuratively to the imprisonment of Saint Lawrence; in the seventeenth century, however, they were not interpreted as a metaphor but literally, because the epigram was believed to be the subtitle of an Early Christian representation of Saint Lawrence. Maffeo Barberini, himself a religious poet using neo-Latin,\textsuperscript{62} was intensely interested in Early Christian poetry and especially in Damasus. He had an edition of his epigrams prepared by Martius Milesius Sarazani.\textsuperscript{63} It is not improbable that Barberini contributed the detail that seemed to incorporate Early Christian tradition—in other words, historical accuracy.

The same criteria of historical \textit{decorum} are visible in the physical appearance that Bernini has given the third-century Roman archdeacon. Although the literary as well as the prevailing iconographical tradition depicts Saint Lawrence as “iuvenes, sive in flore aetatis,”\textsuperscript{64} Bernini endows him with an athletic physique and a bearded face. In this, the sculpture reflects the historically plausible characterization, for example by Cesare Baronius, of the “athleta fidelis”\textsuperscript{65} who overcomes the pain of extreme torture, and it also reflects the monuments of Early Christianity, which show a bearded Saint Lawrence.

There is no doubt that Saint Lawrence’s head with twisted neck belongs within the expressive tradition of \textit{dolor}. The facial expression of the saint, however, does not. In an antithesis of emotions, which dramatically reflects the Christian opposition of body and spirit,\textsuperscript{66} the familiar expressive details of pain have been erased from the face. There is no tension in the muscles, the eyebrows are not drawn together and upward, the corners of the mouth do not turn down, the upper row of teeth is not visible. Instead, the pained posture of the head is joined to the expression of the Blessed Soul and of Saint Bibiana. Le Brun characterizes the emotional state as
“Le Ravissement.” Together with the gesture of his hands, Saint Lawrence’s expression seems to reflect Bernini’s attempt to illustrate the “inner fire,” the “ardor caritatis,” of the saint. Only a few years later, between 1622 and 1624, Simon Vouet represented a different, spiritual martyrdom, Saint Francis of Assisi tempted by a woman (Fig. 3). In order to overcome the inner fire of his senses, he prepares a bed of glowing coals, throws himself on it, and invites the woman to share it with him. The woman is converted. Saint Francis does not feel the external fire of the coals. That Vouet borrows the figure of Bernini’s Saint Lawrence for the presentation of this psychodrama is owed to the metaphor of the “external” and the “inner” fire.

The demonstrably artful character of Bernini’s work also implies emulation of an important model. In fact, the Saint Lawrence integrates and critically paraphrases a motif from Michelangelo. In 1524, Michelangelo executed the models of two river gods for the Medici Chapel (Fig. 4). They greatly influenced Michelangelo’s circle, although of course it is not always possible to differentiate this source from that of Raphael’s related, prototypical river god in The Judgment of Paris. Cosimo I gave one of Michelangelo’s models to Bartolomeo Ammanati. He in turn gave it to the Florentine Academy in 1583. There the torso, mounted incorrectly to this day, served as a teaching model until the eighteenth century. It became a sort of emblem of the Academy, and an exemplum of Michelangelo’s sculpture. When the poet Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger, a friend of Maffeo Barberini, with whom he corresponded and kept in touch all his life, had the Michelangelo Gallery in the Casa Buonarroti in Florence painted by Passignano and other Florentine painters, the torso was depicted. In 1615–16, Nicodemo Feruzzi painted the ceiling representing Florentine artists studying the works of Michelangelo. The inscription, “The highest canon, but not only for one art as Polycletus . . .”—“Non unius artis summum canona ut Polycletus . . .”—implies that the torso embodies Michelangelo’s canon for posterity. Cristofano Allori and Zanobi Rossi’s Michelangelo Writing Poetry, a painting executed in 1621–22, shows the torso in the same exemplary role.

There are several possible explanations for the fact that Bernini borrowed the famous torso, turned it to the side, fitted it into a narrative context, and completed it, adding a new gesture to the free arm and turning the head upwards. This borrowing and alteration had an inherent logic. The problem of the reclining figure in itself led Bernini to the Medici Chapel. Further, the step from there to the subject of Saint Lawrence had already been taken. In his fresco in S. Lorenzo in Florence, Bronzino made the connection between Saint Lawrence and a version of the same motif. Even the small bronze group from Florence, dating from the seventeenth century, ascribed to Ferdinando Tacca, uses the river god torso (although it is completed in a way that shows a certain misunderstanding of the piece). The torso could have appeared to Bernini as an exemplum aptum in a special way. It can be assumed that he viewed it not only formally, but also emotionally. Since the theory and practice of Italian Renaissance art did not differentiate mozione and emozione, he may have interpreted the extreme torsion as an emotional state. Further, since the emotional interpretation of the figures in the Medici Chapel, with their analogous body poses, as images of dolore and pianto was commonplace, he also probably interpreted the torso along these lines. In his poetry Michelangelo himself saw the rivers as tears. If Bernini followed the Neo-Platonic model of interpretation, then the four river gods planned by Michelangelo would have represented the four rivers of Hades according to Plato and Dante, and they would have embodied the four aspects of grief: Achéron—pentimento, Styx—tristitia, Cocytos—pianto, and Phlegeton, the river of fire, whose waves are flames—ardore.

The precise content of the idea that Bernini connected with the complex, tortured physique of the river god’s torso is not known. It seems probable, however, that the adaptation for the
subject of the externally and internally burning martyr, Saint Lawrence, fulfills one possible meaning of Michelangelo’s sculpture.

The prerequisites for this undisguised Michelangelism are to be found in the Florentine background of Bernini’s early years: his father Pietro’s artistic origins were Florentine; Maffeo Barberini was a friend of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger, and finally, there was the Florentine public in Rome itself. Leone Strozzi, who bought the work, may have been intended as the buyer right from the start. He was born in 1555, a member of the most famous emigrant Florentine family. Through the mediation of the pope, it had been possible to invest Tuscan wealth in papal territory in spite of the family’s banishment, and thus, Leone Strozzi was very rich. His father Roberto had been the leader of the opposition to the Medici. His uncle Lorenzo de’ Medici had murdered Duke Alessandro. Michelangelo was closely allied with the Strozzi. He gave the two Slaves, now in the Louvre, to Roberto. Giambattista Strozzi composed the famous epigram on the Notte. When Leone Strozzi had the family chapel in S. Andrea della Valle built, legend ascribed the design to Michelangelo. In 1612, its intended sculptures were completed; not surprisingly, all of them were bronze casts of works by Michelangelo.

Bernini saw himself as a part of the Florentine tradition: “The cavalier Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini, Neapolitan and not Florentine, as he wants to be known . . .”—“Cavaliere Gio. Lorenzo Bernini Napoletano, non Fiorentino come egli vuole . . .” The expression “Michelangelo del suo secolo” was current, although it is not known when it was first used. Domenico Bernini and Filippo Baldinucci apply it extremely early, in anecdotal form. That it must also have played a significant part in Bernini’s self-image and artistic practice can be seen in the fact that with his Saint Lawrence, he entered into a competitive relationship with the tradition of Italian sculpture.

It should be asked if the explicit Michelangelism of the Saint Lawrence does not also contain an element of criticism of Michelangelo. Bernini, who testified that he copied Michelangelo very often in his youth, was certainly familiar with the varying judgments of Michelangelo’s early and late works, of his grazia and terribilità. Later he repeated several topoi of Michelangelo criticism in conversation: Michelangelo’s works mastered disegno and anatomia, but not “the appearance of the flesh”; they contained more arte than grazia. Is it going too far to assert that the intention of the Saint Lawrence was to replace the dry, emphatic muscularity of Michelangelo’s nudes with a different modeling, which Baldinucci later called “tenero e vero,” to add “the appearance of the flesh” to the anatomia of the model?

Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius (Fig. 5) is the first in that series of brilliant, innovative marbles which Bernini executed in very rapid succession between 1618 and 1625 for Scipione Caffarelli-Borghese. The primary functional significance of the sculpture, which was publicly displayed in the official villa of the Cardinal, was historical and theological. Aeneas departs on his flight from Troy to Latium and sets out to establish the Roman people, the Roman Empire, and its future fulfillment, the Church’s “imperium sine fine,” which Virgil only divined in his poetry. Aeneas is the forefather of the Church and the Papacy. The fact that the work illustrates precisely this historical-theological commonplace of the Christian conception of Rome is shown by the strong accentuation of the “pledges of rule,” the pignora imperii, in the hands of the figures. They are derived in part from the text of the Aeneid, in part from scholarly histories. The child Julius Ascanius, predestined to found the Gens Julia and to reign in Latium—the image of the futura vita in Latium, the Church, and Heaven, in the Neo-Platonic interpretation—holds the most important pignus imperii, the eternal fire of Vesta, in his hand. He also holds the peplum of the stolen Palladium, which is not mentioned directly by
Virgil, but could be inferred from historical accounts. Anchises, who with his Phrygian cap symbolizes the origins in Asia Minor of the Roman ancestors, carries the urn, the keramos troikos with the bones, as described by Varro, and holds the penates over it. Virgil mentions them, but does not describe them. Ancient Rome had two traditions concerning the penates. According to Varro’s testimony, there were invisible “statuettes of wood, stone or clay” in the temple of Vesta. The second tradition was more vivid. Dionysius of Halicarnassus remarks upon Trojan penates in the temple on the Velia: “... two seated youths with lances of an ancient type...”—Bernini’s penates exactly.

The veils clearly show the providential sense of the group. They allude to that nocturnal scene in the third book of the Aeneid in which the penates first prophesy Italy, Rome, and the Imperium to Aeneas: “And we shall bear into the stars thy sons that are to be, / And give thy city majesty...”—“idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes/imperiumque urbi dabis.”

Aeneas clearly sees their veils: “This is not sleep, but face to face, as one a real thing sees / I seemed to see their coiffed hair and very visages...”—“nec sopor illud erat, sed coram adgnoscere voltus/velatasque comas.”

This scene, to which Bernini alludes, appears in Pictura 20 of the Vatican Virgil, housed in the Biblioteca Vaticana since 1602. The manuscript, already familiar to Raphael, had been obtained from a poet-friend of Barberini’s, Fulvio Orsini.

Connotations of this type show that someone fully conversant with literary and historical sources was involved in the conception of the Aeneas group. Maffeo Barberini wrote a historical elegy, “The origins of true religion by the princes of the Apostles Peter and Paul...”, which can be dated to the same period as the group. Inspired by the facade of St. Peter’s, just completed by the Borghese pope, Barberini praises the wonderful growth of the Imperium, which became the seat of the Church. Jupiter turns away from the clan of Priamus, symbolizing the Synagogue, and gives the Imperium “from son to son, from generation to generation” to the younger clan of Aeneas, poetically symbolizing the Church. Aeneas finds his way out of the burning city of Troy to the far Hesperia and the Imperium. This is an image of the Church, which flowers in the West after the destruction of Jerusalem—again, well-known motifs of the Christian conception of Rome.

Although Maffeo Barberini was a Francophile politically, he had good reason to be friendly to Spain. Originally a dependent of the Aldobrandini, he was made a cardinal by the Borghese pope, Paul V. He found it politically wise to attempt some kind of friendship with Cardinal Scipione during the long Borghese pontificate. Their shared aesthetic interests and possibly Barberini’s advice on artistic questions seem to have been a means to this end. Barberini was himself a noteworthy poet and, thanks to his position, he was center of a literary circle. Other members of this circle were Antonio Querengo, Giovanni Ciampoli, John Barclay, Vincenzo Gramigna, Gabrielle Chiabrera, Giacomo Cavalieri, Fabritio Verospi, Giovanni Battista Rinuccini, Paolo Emilio Santorio, and Angelo Grillo, some of them well-known literary figures. Following Barberini’s return from the episcopate of Spoleto in 1617, his palace in Via de Giubbonari had become a kind of academy. He was in the habit of taking trips to the Villa Borghese and to the Belvedere, surrounded by his literati. The roots of Bernini’s Borghese sculptures may be found in these circumstances and in this circle, which occupied itself with poetry, art, and art politics.

It is clear that the ecclesiological dimension of Bernini’s group corresponds to the rank and the role of Cardinal Scipione, who shared in the “Imperium” of the Church under his papal uncle. In fact, the sensus moralis of the antithetical configuration of son and father, youth and age, was seen not only in a familial sense, as the emblematic image of “filial love”—“pietas filiorum erga parentes”—but also politically, as a union of the strength of youth and the
wisdom of age, of action and thought, in other words, as prerequisites for good rule. Bernini's group is therefore also an emblematic image of nepotism and belongs to an entire class of representations that celebrate the role of the young nephew who assists the old pope, a relation expressed mythologically in the same metaphor of "support."  

Bernini's group alludes not only to the role, but also to the name of Scipione Borghese. *Scipio* in Latin is the "staff to lean on." This inspired the *argumentum a nomine* of the panegyric poets, that the essence of the Cardinal is shown in his name: "In truth he is Scipio, the staff of the Pope . . ."—"Et vere Scipio, et baculus pontificis est ipse. . .". In this regard, the group is a personal *impressa* of Scipione and, displayed in a near-public place, it assumes a political role. It is also a demonstration of art, and more specifically of art in competition with poetry. The selection of the subject from Virgil and from that epic "whose actual hero is Rome" seems to be related to the well-known conception of Virgil as a pictorial imagist, with the idea that his poetry is like painting. This, as well as the particular *dificultà* of translating the poetic description of the flight into marble, indicates that the persons commissioning the work intended a *paragone* between poetry and sculpture, an *ut scultura poesis*. This intention becomes perfectly clear when Bernini later on assumes the task in the *Apollo and Daphne* of representing an essentially poetic theme, that of transformation, showing simultaneously a change of location, of emotions, and—in the metamorphosis—even of physical shape, in the medium of sculpture.  

The task of depicting three male figures, of different ages and emotional states, fleeing, one carried by another, touches a whole series of problems in sculptural practice and applied art theory current since the quattrocento. First of all, there is a difficult problem of a group of three, and then the static problem of the "burdened figure," as formulated by Leonardo and depicted in a series of exemplary battle and *Rapimenti* groups in Florentine sculpture. Virgil's statement as to *how* Aeneas carried his father is not clear, since he uses the artistic plural: "I stooped my neck and shoulders . . . and took my burden . . ."—"haec fatus latos umeros subjectaque colla." This is the basis for the different traditions in showing the scene.  

Bernini's Aeneas, who bends his upper body to the side under the weight of Anchises, and is just shifting the weight from his right to his left foot as he walks, is intended as a static piece of art. The physical correctness of the "man who carried a burden upon his shoulders" and walks at the same time indicates an application of Leonardo's "Trattato," which was circulated in Rome before Francesco Barberini and Cassiano del Pozzo became active. The strict equilibrium of the distribution of the weights of both figures around a single central "linea del peso" follows Leonardo's text. Also in accordance with it, and in contrast to the tradition, Aeneas is just lifting the sole of his foot off the ground. The figure is actually walking. The center of gravity is literally moving forward. A third problem, the appropriate representation of the three stages of life in the physique, gesture, bearing, and facial expression of the three figures, is a famous *topos* of "appropriateness" or *decorum* of art theory since the Horatian verse: "So, lest haply we assign a youth the part of age, or a boy that of manhood, we shall ever linger over traits that are joined and fitted to the age"—". . . ne forte seniles/ mandentur iuveni partes pueroque viriles,/ semper in adiunctis aequoae morabur aptis."  

The *dificultà* is intensified by the fact that the figures are nude. This is justified only in part by historical probability, the *verisimilitudo*, and is essentially artistic license, *licenza del fungere*, which agrees remarkably with Virgil, who himself mixed historical fact with poetic invention. It is the license of nudity that makes it possible for the group to become the embodiment of a concept associated with the topic of the flight from Troy, that of *varietà*. The conceptual clarity
with which Bernini differentiates the body surfaces from one another is strongly reminiscent of Leonardo’s famous statement in the “Trattato” that varietà is exemplified not by the difference of sexes, as Alberti and Lomazzo define it, but expressly by the different skin textures of the three male stages of life: the delicate, rosy skin of the child, the taut muscular skin of the young man, and the rather drastically withered, wrinkled skin of the old man.

Again, the question of criticism of Michelangelo poses itself. The figure of Aeneas openly invokes Michelangelo’s famous Christ from Sta. Maria sopra Minerva. In view of the explicit varietà of the group, the question must be asked: Does it not reflect a famous topos of Michelangelo criticism, the monotony of his muscular nudes, which does not respect any difference in age or sex, and therefore differentiates itself in a negative sense from the bellezza multiforme of Raphael?

It seems that Leonardo’s “Trattato” had some significance for the Aeneas group. It is fundamental, however, for the figure of David (Fig. 6). David’s nudity is not derived from the text of the Bible, but is historically probable: verosimile. Strongly emphasized by the counter-figure of the cast-off armor, in a compositional as well as an expressive sense, the nude body suggests the biblical paradox that the unarmed man defeats the one who is armed, the humble defeats the proud, “not by tallness, but by virtue”—“non mole, sed virtute.”

David is a standard figure, the vir bellicosus of the Bible. Bernini therefore gives him the extreme proportion of a 1:10 head, Albrecht Dürer’s “Proporzi quarta decem capitum,” which Lomazzo ascribes to the martial type and the choleric temperament in his study on proportion and character: “men who are impetuous, choleric, cruel, bellicos, audacious, and irascible”—“uomini impetuosi, colerici, crudeli, bellicos, audaci e pronti all’ira.”

David is also an emotional figure. He is filled with rage, the “just rage of the young Israelite,” in Baldinucci’s words. His emotional state is shown in his extreme facial expression. The anecdote that Maffeo Barberini held the mirror for Bernini indicates two things: first, Barberini’s role in the creative process, and, second, the connection between interpretative and imitative visual art in the self-reflection of the artist outside the realm of normalcy; in other words, Bernini’s technique of miming emotions in front of the mirror. The mimicry of rage follows traditional rules, “the hair standing on end, the eyebrows low and drawn together, the teeth clenched.”

Not every feature of David’s face, however, represents an element of mimicry. The receding forehead, the protruding eyebrows, the curved nose, all follow the traditional animal physiognomy of the facies leonina appropriate to the choleric character of the vir bellicosus and the “Lion of Judah.” The combination of an emotional expression and the traditional animal physiognomy of the character is similar to Bernini’s enigmatic damnation of himself in the self-portrait Damned Soul.

The extreme movement of David’s body is commensurate with his temperament and emotional character. Bernini has carefully defined the action, the extreme point to which the arm is swung back before the throw. In postantique sculpture, there seem to be almost no throwing figures of this type. Even Giambologna did not attempt one. There is, however, a tradition of throwing figures in painting, for example in Giulio Romano’s Stoning of Saint Stephen in Genoa, with its series of Leonarquesque male figures. Bernini’s direct source is, characteristically enough, an exemplary throwing figure in the Galleria Farnese, that of Annibale Carracci’s famous Polyphemus (Fig. 7). Bernini’s critical emulation of this figure is preceded by a process of abstraction that bridges the gap between the monster of the antique fable and the prophet and forefather of Christ. The two figures share, strangely enough, social “appropriateness” or decorum.
They experience the same emotional state of rage; both Bellori and Baldinucci use the same term, "sdegno," to characterize both figures; both are depicted in the same action. But what favored Polyphemus as the model for Bernini was its illustration of theory. Bellori, whose sources of information go back to the Carracci circle, explains in detail that in this figure Annibale was giving an "esempio del moto della forza" from Leonardo's "Trattato," and he cites the text concerning the "man who wants to throw a stone with great force."\textsuperscript{138}

Point by point, however, comparison between the Polyphemus and the David shows that Bernini goes beyond Carracci's model and appeals directly to Leonardo's text in his critical emulation in order to simulate the physically correct throwing motion. There is no doubt that his statue is a three-dimensional model according to Leonardo.\textsuperscript{139} Much more radically than Polyphemus, David is a man who "twists and moves himself from there to the opposite side, where . . . he lets the weight leave his hands. . . ."\textsuperscript{140} He is the illustration of Leonardo's "man who wants to throw a spear or rock or something else with an energetic motion."

If you represent him beginning the motion, then the inner side of the outstretched foot will be in line with the chest, and will bring the opposite shoulder over the foot on which his weight rests. That is: the right foot will be under his weight, and the left shoulder will be above the tip of the right foot.\textsuperscript{141}

The first in vigor is figure A, . . . [who.] having turned his feet toward [the weight to be thrown], twists and moves himself from there to the opposite side, where, when he gathers his strength and prepares to throw, he turns with speed and ease to the position where he lets the weight leave his hands.\textsuperscript{142}

More than ten years later, in a by-product of his Leonardo illustrations, Poussin literally illustrated Leonardo's example of a man throwing a spear or a stone, in two instances placed side by side.\textsuperscript{143} In an exact parallel to Bernini, Domenichino, in accordance with a common practice of the Carracci circle, undertook Leonardo's examples in the Flagellation of Saint Andrew.\textsuperscript{144}

Bernini's David is bent so far that the upper part of his body can be seen from the front and back at the same time; the point of the shoulder is perpendicular above the navel, the head is outside the area of the supporting leg. He is an example of that extreme torsion which Alberti already called "troppo fervente e furioso" and "an impossible and inappropriate thing."\textsuperscript{145} While Carracci's Polyphemus respects artistic decorum, Bernini follows only the thematic decorum of the physically correct throwing motion. David's stretched-out left leg, which is almost lifted from the ground, and his off-center head clearly illustrate Leonardo's physical theorem that the body is in "balance above the supporting leg."

David is one of the first throwing figures of post-antique sculpture. The question is, was it possible for Bernini or his circle of patrons, who belonged to the highest social and educational stratum, to ignore the antique prototype of the thrower, the exemplum since Quintilian of the central concept of art theory, of varietas, an image indirectly reflected by Alberti, Leonardo, Michelangelo, and Vasari—namely Myron's Discobolus?\textsuperscript{146} The history of its effect varies according to artistic or literary tradition. It seems that the torsos that were handed down were not correctly identified until 1781. Although significant reflections of the Discobolus are to be found in the art of the High Renaissance, to the best of my knowledge the athlete was always reconstructed as an example of flexus, but never as a throwing figure.\textsuperscript{147} On the other hand,
Quintilian’s and Lucian’s descriptions were very well known. In the famous text of Quintilian, the Discobolus is a figure of extreme torsion: “Where can we find a more extreme and elaborate attitude than that of the Discobolus of Myron?”—“Quid tam distortum et elaboratum quam est ille discobolus Myronis?”—“But that curve, I might almost call it motion, with which we are so familiar, gives an impression of action and animation”—“... flexus ille ut sic dixerim, motus dat actum quendam et adfectum.”—“The novelty and the difficulty are praiseworthy”—“... laudabilis est illa ipsa novitas ac difficultas...”—Lucian is even more concrete: Here is “the discus thrower, who bends over and turns in the process of getting ready to throw... with his foot slightly turned in, and who will obviously straighten up again after his throw.”

Myron’s Discobolus is not only an example of varietà, but also a justification of decoro naturale. In his ugly contortion, he embodies the aesthetic paradox that ugliness, when beautifully imitated, produces pleasure. Celio Calcagnini’s epigram describes the figure as having limbs that Myron pitilessly contorted: “Who contorted so cruelly your joints? And who bent your strong limbs? This was Myron...”—“Ah quis distorsit tibi quam crudeler artus / Quis fregit miseric orta membra modis. / Ille Myron, fuit ille Myron. ...” One might think that no monster could be uglier. However, “there are certain things that are beautiful just because they are deformed, and thus please by giving great displeasure”—“Sunt quaedam formosa adeo, deformia si sint: / Et tunc cum multum displicere, placent.” Bernini’s depiction of David, the future king and ancestor of Christ, as an extremely contorted thrower with a hideously grimacing face, violates decorum and produces pleasure by so doing—the aesthetic paradox of the Discobolus.

In 1621, Bernini became Principe of the Accademia di S. Luca. Whatever this honor might have meant for the status and the self-awareness of the barely twenty-three-year-old artist, it can be assumed it produced an increased interest in the theoretical foundations of his art, in tradition, in competition with tradition, and in innovation. Given this background, it is not improbable that Bernini reflected on an antique example and on Myron, about whom Pliny says, in his art-historical scheme, that “he was apparently the first to multiply truth; he was more productive than Polykleitos, and a more diligent observer of symmetry”—“primus hic multiplicatus veritatem videtur numerosior in arte quam Polycletus et in symmetria diligentior.”

In the functional context of a villa dedicated to cultural activity and owned by a cardinal, the image of David, who enhanced the cultus divinus with poetry and music, is a model of the ecclesiastic princeps litteratus. As a patron of religious cultural activity, David stood in the first stanza of the villa. The Apollo and Daphne stood in the last room, which because of its location next to the chapel, gallery, and giardino segreto seems to have been more private. In contrast to the fatto storico sacro of David, they are a fatto favoloso, negatively accentuated by the epigram from Maffeo Barberini’s unpublished “Gallaria”: “Whoever, loving, pursues the joys of fleeting forms fills his hands with sprays of leaves and seizes bitter fruits”—“Quisquis amans sequitur fugitivae gaudia formae / Fronde manus implet, baccas seu caprit amaras.” Without a doubt, the warning about Apollo’s “bitter fruits” has two meanings. One is the brevity and bitterness of sensual pleasure, the other is the bitter fame that comes from worldly, sensual poetry, notions easily understood in a villa dedicated to cultural activity, by people familiar with Petrarchismo and Marinismo. The David is the positive counterimage. His polemical invocation is an old Christian tradition from the time of Clement of Alexandria. Jerome writes: “David, our Simonides, Pindar, Alkaicos, Flaccus, Catullus and Serenus, lets Christ sound on his lyre.” In the circle of poets and literati around Maffeo Barberini, a poesia sacra was conceived in sharp criticism of the worldly poetry of the time. Giovanni Ciampoli, in particular, wrote a theoretical work along these lines, with the help of Barberini, called “Poetica sacra,” a dialogue.
between poesia and devozione. The work is formally related to Pindarismo. Its animosity is directed against Petrarchismo, but particularly against the successful, lascivious poetry of Marino. Since 1622, Marino’s major work, “Adone,” had achieved spectacular success. It was printed fifteen times in Italy alone. In 1623, Marino returned to Italy in triumph. The anti-Marinist intention of a programmatic elegy that Maffeo Barberini later put at the beginning of his “Poemata,” with Bernini’s title page of a battling David, is unmistakable. In this elegy, he enlists support for his concept of a poesia sacra and calls upon the youth of Italy to join him “in taking up David’s lyre and driving out the monster”—“Itala tu mecum pubes cape nobile plectrum / Et monstrum Isaica peruge fugere Lyra.” Bernini’s David, with the lyre at his feet, seems to be not only an academic piece following Leonardo, and not only an ideal reconstruction of the Discobulus, but also the reflection of a struggle between opposing cultural positions, of an ecclesiastic “Kulturbach.”
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