

# Tradition, Eclecticism, Self-Consciousness

## Baroque Art and Abstract Painting

David Carrier and David Reed

*In Memoriam Nicholas Wilder*

*Whereas Raphael's art . . . was . . . a . . . conflation of elements derived from Leonardo, Michelangelo and the Antique, Correggio drew from the same three, and added another: Raphael himself . . . Correggio out-Raphaels Raphael.*

—Cecil Gould<sup>1</sup>

Unlike the art historian, the contemporary artist may wonder if Correggio's situation was entirely enviable. If Raphael's art had these three sources, and Correggio's four, then Correggio knew more than his precursor. But more knowledge is not necessarily a good thing. To be the heir to a great tradition can be paralyzing. If earlier artists have accomplished so much, how can a younger artist do anything new? Perhaps he is condemned to merely offer variations on the themes of his precursors. Maybe it is impossible to do anything new because everything interesting has been done.

We believe that a historical perspective provides the best way to understand this situation. We do that by considering an earlier period that is similar in some ways to ours. Much can be learnt about the situation of contemporary abstraction by understanding the similarities (and differences) between the situation of American art circa 1990 and that of Italian painting circa 1590. Then, as now, there was a sense that everything had been done. The natural (if unstated) implication of Vasari's *Lives* was that the cycle of birth, development, maturity, and old age could only end in decay. He describes the progressive development of art from Cimabue to Michelangelo. That cyclical model provides no place for post-Michelangelesque art. And so, not surprisingly, by 1590 artists lost interest in art theory or found that they had to invent their own anti-Vasarian theory of development, as did the Carracci.<sup>2</sup> For artists of the late 16th century Vasari played the role that Clement Greenberg plays today. Few artists or art writers still accept Greenberg's account of recent art history, whose influence nowadays is shown primarily by the fact that it continues to be denounced. And yet none of his many critics has provided a convincing alternative.

In 1990, as in 1590, the weight of history can feel overbearing. Norman Bryson describes the ways in which traditional art history fails to do justice to this situation.<sup>3</sup> Seeking the source

for an image, some art historians conceive of it as a design that an artist borrows, without considering the implications of the act of borrowing. Caravaggio's *St. John the Baptist* (Capitoline Gallery, Rome) quotes a figure from Michelangelo, but that does not tell us its meaning. Some commentators treat Caravaggio's painting as a recycling of a well-known, readily accessible motif. But perhaps it is

*a reaction to Michelangelo's veiling and sublimation of a sexual disposition that Caravaggio in his art had made overt . . . Caravaggio is awed by what provokes him to attack.<sup>4</sup>*

The problem for artists of Caravaggio's generation is acknowledging the power of the art quoted. An image that an artist creates belongs to him; an identifiable image which he borrows can be a subtle reminder that he is not self-sufficient. "By classical art we mean art that is so strong that for later generations it serves as the original."<sup>5</sup> In Annibale Carracci's *Farnese Gallery Combat of Perseus and Phineus* (1604), Perseus holds off his attackers using the petrifying power of the Gorgon's head to transform them into stone figures, into antique models and a Raphael quotation.<sup>6</sup> Too much reliance upon tradition, Annibale is saying, means that your image loses its independence. It becomes a dead copy of prior artworks. Similarly, Lodovico Carracci's 1616 *Susanna and the Elders* (National Gallery, London) shows those voyeurs viewing her as if she were a mere statue, as if Ludovico were warning Annibale's students that his cousin's Roman works were too fascinated with the antique. "Susanna's body" is like "smoothed marble"; her head, "has the artificial beauty of a piece of classical statuary."<sup>7</sup>

Domenichino's 1614 *Last Communion of St. Jerome* (Pinacoteca, the Vatican) is an obvious adaptation of Agostino's 1590s *The Last Communion of St. Jerome* (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna), as many Renaissance works are quotations from earlier artworks.<sup>8</sup> But when Lanfranco distributed an etching to prove "that Domenichino had stolen from his teacher" it was clear that artists' relation to tradition had changed. Never before had quotation been criticized as plagiarism. The modern complaint that the Carracci are merely eclectic reflects a related concern. They synthesize Raphael, Michelangelo, and Titian, but can they use these sources to create original images? What might have been a strength, their knowledge of tradition, may mean that they can only be derivative.<sup>9</sup>



Correggio, *The Vision of St. John on Patmos of the Risen Christ and Other Apostles*, 1520–21, Cupola and Pendentives, San Giovanni Evangelista, Parma.

They are not simply derivative. But this worry is important, for it reflects a real concern about the authority of tradition. Sir Joshua Reynolds, who urges that nobody “need be ashamed” of such copying since the famous older works are “a magazine of common property, always open to the public,” reveals obvious emotional ambivalence. Older works are both manure—“The mind is but a barren soil . . . unless it be continually fertilized”—and sperm, which “impregnate[s] our minds with kindred ideas.”<sup>10</sup> For a weak artist to reemploy an older image is to acknowledge that he cannot compete with tradition. For a strong artist, employment of such preexisting images may be a way of asserting his strength. He is the equal or superior of those from whom he borrows. It is no accident that we refer here to the artist as “he,” for this generational struggle in which an individual finds his identity by struggling with his father figures is a patriarchal vision of history. We seek a history of art less concerned with struggle against the past than learning from it.

The problem that arises with obvious quotations is that an image may be seen not as an (illusionistic) representation of what it seemingly depicts, but only as a simulacrum. Then the image refers not to what it depicts, but merely to another picture. Some art historians say that all art is “about art.” Perhaps that is correct, but what links artists today to the Carracci is the worry that art’s relation to tradition has become highly problematic. If

*the relationship of the Carracci to the High Renaissance is the first self-conscious confrontation, overtly admitted, with the very possibility of the influence of the recent past in the history of modern painting*<sup>11</sup>

then the relationship of abstract painting circa 1990 to Abstract Expressionism is another.

A quotation by a mannerist “is meant to be recognized by the spectator.”<sup>12</sup> By contrast, “Annibale . . . used his sources as raw material . . . and made no effort to preserve the integrity of the original images.” The mannerist artwork “is distinguished in principle from all other possibilities of seeing an object, for it . . . answers only to its own conditions.”<sup>13</sup> Such images involve a loss of contact of the picture with reality that must be intolerable for representational artists.

*Annibale’s [Parma Pieta] is designed to unite spectator and image, and to link the historical and mystical event with a present moment of worship. The foreground is open to allow the spectator entrance into the scene.*<sup>14</sup>

Annibale’s felt need to unite spectator and image is a reaction to the mannerist tradition, to “Parmigianino’s subjective relation to the external world.”<sup>15</sup> For Parmigianino the depicted body is something less than a three-dimensional form. This “mostly unreal vision conjured up on the panel” he treats as “an acceptable substitute for the coin of represented reality.” Or as Bellori says in his 17th-century account: “The artists, abandoning the study of nature, corrupted art with the maniera, that is to say, with the fantastic idea based on practice and not imitation.”<sup>16</sup>

Two commentaries on Abstract Expressionism reveal a similar situation. Meyer Schapiro wrote in 1957: “The consciousness of the personal and spontaneous . . . stimulates the artist to invent devices . . . which confer [to] the utmost degree the aspect of the freely made.”<sup>17</sup> When, by contrast and more recently, a critic speaks contemptuously of expressionistic painting employing “the authorial mark of emotion . . . as though there were nothing problematic about the formulas of feeling and their continual reuse” she expresses a common viewpoint.<sup>18</sup> Three decades later those devices that Schapiro praised are thought highly problematic. Logically speaking, this is hard to understand. Since the techniques of expressionists can always be imitated, why should doing that destroy their authority? Why should de Kooning have been free to express himself in 1957 while artists in 1990 lack that freedom?<sup>19</sup> That the expressionists of de Kooning’s generation repeated themselves is in itself insufficient to explain this sea change in how their techniques are evaluated. Still, there is a real problem here, even if such an analysis fails to correctly identify it. In 1990, as in 1590, the idea of an ongoing tradition becomes problematic. Artistic breakthrough has been followed by real uncertainty about the future of art.

**S**ince all illusionistic images are copied from others, why complain that mannerist pictures seem unreal? In Parmigianino’s mannerist *Marriage of St. Catherine*, an aesthetic “device which had originally an expressive purpose . . . suggest[ing] the closeness of the spiritual event to the spectator” now was exploited “for purely aesthetic effect.”<sup>20</sup> In mere copies of Abstract-Expressionist works, similarly, devices that had an expressive purpose now became employed for purely aesthetic goals. To speak of “purely aesthetic effect” is to acknowledge that the image is perceived as merely an image. In Parmigianino’s *Self Portrait in a Convex Mirror*, the mirror image displaces the spectator. “The whole of me is seen to be supplanted by the strict

Otherness of the painter in his Other room."<sup>21</sup> The mirror excludes the viewer from the picture space. And this spatial ambiguity, which raises questions about the identity of the painter and spectator, makes Parmigianino's relation to his precursors problematic. The task of Italian artists circa 1590 was to return to the tradition of High Renaissance painting. How can contemporary abstractionists use the achievements of Abstract Expressionism? For us the problems of artists circa 1590 are concerns about the present. If the contact with reality and with the traditions of art has been lost, how is it to be restored?

The danger Parmigianino's very beautiful work raises is that post-High Renaissance pictures could become decorative designs, not images illusionistically of an external reality. Baroque art solves that problem in several ways. Novel art forms are developed: cupola painting; genre scenes; landscapes; and caricature. Also, familiar techniques are used in new ways: mirror reflections showing the studio in which the painting is made; figures in paintings looking out at the viewer. These diverse genres and techniques all involve one concern: reestablishing that contact between viewer and spectator which threatened to be lost. Viewing Correggio's 1520s works in Parma, which inspired the Carracci, the *Vision of St. John on Patmos* and his dome of the cathedral,

*The illusion surmounts the spectator, but he is as if absorbed into it, the object of psychological and aesthetic processes that create in him a state of levitation. . . . What we perceive is the very process of transforming ascent towards spirituality . . . the spectator . . . is also a participant.*<sup>22</sup>

Here is an uncanny anticipation of baroque space, where *The beholder finds himself in a world which he shares with saints and angels, and he feels magically drawn into the orbit of the work. What is image, what is reality? The very borderline between the one and the other seems to be obliterated.*<sup>23</sup>

The spectator is drawn into the work because he is an element in that composition. The artwork thus is related to this embodied observer who brings to that work awareness of art history. All "works of art . . . are definable by their built-in idea of the spectator."<sup>24</sup> The similarities, and differences, between the concerns of Roman artists circa 1590 and New York abstractionists circa 1990 can best be understood by appeal to the presence of that spectator.

Why did these Correggios, the source for all baroque cupola paintings, have little influence until some seventy years after they were painted?<sup>25</sup> Only when the need to actively engage the spectator as a figure within the composition became pressing was the full importance of Correggio's model perceived. Genre scenes and landscapes have similar goals, and they too are systematically developed by major artists only after the High Renaissance and Mannerism. Art historians have speculated about the relationship between Caravaggio's very early genre scenes, such as the Metropolitan's *Cardplayers*, and his later sacred works.<sup>26</sup> Less has been said about the Carracci's genre scenes, and yet theirs are as remarkable. Annibale Carracci's early sacred works follow the 1583 *Bean Eater*, which by putting us "into forceful and immediate confrontation with this peasant presence . . ."



Annibale Carracci, *Crucifixion with the Virgin and Four Saints*, 1583, Santa Maria della Carità, Bologna.

also seeks "the pictorial means" for "the depiction of reality."<sup>27</sup> Caravaggio's and Annibale's genre and sacred works share a need to confront the spectator with the immediate reality of depicted scenes.

Just as the lack of early imitations of Correggio's dome works is a mystery, so too the late development of landscape painting as an independent art form has puzzled art historians. Why only with Claude and his 17th-century contemporaries did this become an established genre of art?<sup>28</sup> Again, there was a need to re-engage painting with visual reality. Like genre scenes, landscapes put the viewer in contact with what appears an immediately real scene; like ceiling paintings, landscapes exist in relation to the presence of this viewer. A similar point, finally, applies to another novel 17th-century genre: caricature. "It is a startling fact that portrait caricature was not known . . . before the end of the 16th century. . . . So simple an artistic procedure . . . was . . . unknown to . . . the High Renaissance."<sup>29</sup> Only after the techniques of representation have been fully mastered are artists ready to treat them playfully.

Like these novel genres, some Baroque techniques also show concern with contact between viewer and image. Bartolo-

meo Schedoni's *Charity* (Capodimonte, Naples) juxtaposes a blind beggar with a golden-haired child. The "two pairs of outward-looking eyes, one sightless, the other seeing, were intended to make the situation more poignant."<sup>30</sup> Representation of eye-catching figures is traditional, but what gives a new importance to such figures is this need to reestablish contact with the spectator. One model is Caravaggio's famous self-portrait in *The Martyrdom of St. Matthew*. Another, the many self-portraits within Bernardo Cavallino's work, showing him as a seemingly aloof dandy within those sacred scenes.<sup>31</sup> He catches our eye and thereby connects us to the drama. A related eye-catching device is the depicted mirror. For Parmigianino, the mirror is a way of distancing the spectator, but in several Caravaggios we see mirror images showing him at work, "poignant testimony to the importance Caravaggio attached to painting 'dal naturale.'"<sup>32</sup> In his Detroit *Martha and Mary Magdalen*, the mirror, which reflects nothing but a portion of the garments, emphasizes the anti-transcendental qualities of the scene. Instead of opening up the space, it closes off the drama, excluding any reality outside of the studio.

Until the 19th century, the Carracci and Correggio were thought great masters. But just as their loss of status at that time was influenced by inability to understand their honest visual rhetoric, so their present revival owes something to late modernism. Frank Stella's question in *Working Space*,

*Can we find a mode of pictorial expression that will do for abstraction now what Caravaggio's . . . did for sixteenth-century naturalism and its magnificent successors?*<sup>33</sup>

is ours also. But the limitation of Stella's analysis, which explains the problems of his recent art, lies in his fundamental misunderstanding of Baroque art. His formalist analysis both overestimates Caravaggio's importance and misrepresents his achievement, as when he claims that Caravaggio's pictorial space is "self-contained." It leads him to the absolutely mistaken conclusion that the goal of abstraction should be to create a literal space, like that of his recent works, which really are large-scale relief sculptures. The true power of Baroque art, and also of abstraction, is its capacity to create an illusionistic space. Stella misidentifies the spectator's role. Painting circa 1990, as circa 1590, involves the spatial and temporal relation of a spectator to the image. The aim of the Baroque was to reestablish contact with the spectator, which cannot be done within a literal space.

Stella's early black paintings remain his best works. At that time Stella argued for their literality and physicality, and the critical discourse followed his lead. But looking at the paintings, they can be read as easily as being about illusion as about physicality. Their power is in the tension between the physicality of the black paint and its illusionistic properties in concentric configurations. In his later work there is a complete separation between the physical properties of the aluminum supports and the color, which seems just added on, unrelated to the specific forms of the supports. This separation of color from form is emphasized by Stella's technical procedures. He often fabricates several identical supports, and then colors each of them in different ways. This separation of color and form drains all force from the

color. Unconnected to form, color becomes decorative, "ornament . . . or even makeup."<sup>34</sup>

Our problems with Stella's art reveals problems with his view of history. In his Bloomian account, Caravaggio and Rubens take "the step that Raphael and Michelangelo could not quite take" and provide "a firm pictorial base for their successors," including Stella's own early stripes, which "moved between Pollock and de Kooning."<sup>35</sup> Here there is too much worried concern about who is the best master, and too little recognition of how the styles of even the "great" masters are the product of a collaboration with their predecessors. Stella would isolate himself from all but a few precursors. The self-sufficient working space he finds in the painting he admires is the natural product of this impoverished view of history, which isolates a few select painters from both their collaborators and the culture in which they work. Unlike Stella, we think that Caravaggio is centrally concerned with presenting sacred narratives. What is to be learned from the Baroque is not how to construct an abstract space, but a historical perspective on contemporary art. This can show us that, although Caravaggio's pictorial devices cannot now be used in abstract painting, some of his concerns remain relevant. For example, time and narrative can also be used in abstract painting.

Art historians are familiar with the question: "Where is the depicted image?" They often describe the spatial relation between that representation and its spectator. Another less frequently asked question is "When is the depicted image?" An image that appeals to the spectator, as do many we have discussed, appears as if in the temporal present. *When* is such a painting? It is of the time, often of the distant past, of the depicted scene. But, also, it is of our immediate present. We see it as if the depicted event was happening right before our eyes. This illusion of immediacy is as important, or more important, than illusion of space. In Annibale Carracci's *Crucifixion*, the figures were painted in a brutal, direct, even "genre" way, emphasizing their physical reality and their connection to us, ordinary people watching a supernatural event. It is not a painting of one historical moment—the saints come from various eras—but the landscape behind Christ seems real, and the lighting effects, though supernatural, are based on natural phenomena. One shocking detail emphasizes the immediacy of the image. Blood is dripping from Christ's wounded hands, falling through space, landing on the veil of the Madonna, both emphasizing the physical presence of the image of Christ and connecting otherworldly time to our time here in the present.

Often in modernist painting, space is flattened to bring the painting to the surface. This creates a different illusion of immediacy. The painting is right there before us and the directness of process is emphasized to make it seem as if the painting has just been painted. One can even have the illusion that it is being painted as one watches. This flattening and emphasis on process occurs first in figurative painting, as when Matisse depicts himself in the act of making the very painting the viewer sees.<sup>36</sup> These devices are further developed in abstract painting. In Pollock's classic drip paintings, the immediacy of marking is so important that the marks are larger than gestural marks. (This also requires an increase in the size of the painting.) Morris Louis

## Present-day anxieties about the power of tradition reflect an awareness of changes in ideas of the self.

further increases the size of gesture, including flows of paint, making his works even more immediate. Another way that this sense of immediacy can be created in abstraction is through clarity of image. In Barnett Newman's paintings, one feels that the image has not only just been physically painted, but that it is mentally conceived while one is watching. This illusion that one sees the artist think, making his decisions, is a method for getting the viewer involved with the painting. This is why even the most uninformed viewer feels that he could "do that." "The onlooker who says his child could paint a Newman may be right, but Newman would have to be there to tell the child exactly what to do."<sup>37</sup>

Here a historical perspective is invaluable. Correggio's panels *Lamentation* and *Martyrdom of Four Saints* (Galleria Nazionale, Parma) are part of a complex of works rediscovered sixty years later by the Carracci. Barrocci lit the fuse; Correggio was the dynamite that exploded. And the Carracci were inspired by the works of both artists in their reform of painting. Entering San Giovanni Evangelista, one is struck first by Correggio's *Vision of St. John on Patmos* on the cupola over the main crossing. The spatial illusion is spectacular. Christ's heavy figure, suspended above the viewer, is about to descend. This is the first time such an illusion was created. The immediacy of the moment is further emphasized by Correggio's light, which strikes the spectator like a palpable force, convincing him that he is "a surrogate for the Evangelist beneath St. John's vision."<sup>38</sup> Only afterwards, when he steps to the main altar, can he see, at the edge of the cupola behind him, the representation of St. John.<sup>39</sup> St. John is hidden; the spectator stands as surrogate for him, experiencing his vision.

Correggio painted a complex of works for the Del Bono Chapel of San Giovanni, the fifth from the west end of the south aisle of the nave, near the cupola. In addition to *Lamentation* and *Martyrdom of Four Saints*, three other works are by, or after designs by, Correggio. Two are on the walls, *The Conversion of Saul* (left), and *Sts. John and Peter Healing the Cripple*, on the right; Christ is depicted above the entrance. These are site-specific works. The two panels are intended to be seen from the altar; Christ above the entrance is looking across at St. Paul being converted.<sup>40</sup> There is a complex relationship between the cupola painting and the chapel. In *Lamentation* the workman going down from the ladder is in that position which Correggio occupied when he climbed down from the scaffolding. In *Martyrdom of Four Saints* the diagonal thrust of the two weapons extends in the opposite direction, downward. The paintings are positioned so that the light coming through the small window at the end of the chapel matches the light sources for the paintings. The moment of early morning light is depicted in *Lamentation*, setting its emotional mood, drawing the spectator into the time

of the painting.<sup>41</sup> Turning, we see Christ over the chapel door, reminding us of the figure on the cupola. Inside the chapel, one is within a nexus of movements, spatial and temporal, which involve the whole church. Leo Steinberg has shown that the Cerasi chapel in S. Maria del Popolo in Rome is "a miniature Latin Cross church . . ." and Caravaggio's pictures are "composed as to promote in . . . [the spectator] a sense of potential intrusion among its elements."<sup>42</sup> These earlier Correggios achieve a similar effect. Standing at the altar of the chapel, the spectator is between two mournful scenes. Looking to the arch, he sees two miraculous images of divine intervention. Gazing upward, and walking into the center of the church, he sees the hovering figure of Christ, an image of his salvation. The Del Bono Chapel creates real spatial and temporal relations between what, in isolation, are panel paintings.

Artists today can learn from the way in which Correggio's paintings work in this environment, and use this knowledge to make works involving the spectator in a different way. Site-specific effects assume the presence of an embodied spectator who must see the relation of the panels. Leo Steinberg, the first art historian to call attention to these effects, argued in his account of the "flatbed" (published 1972) that postmodernist art cannot appeal to such a spectator.<sup>43</sup> Because of the division of labor between art historians and critics, the connection between his view of this history and what he says about contemporary art has remained unexamined. For Steinberg, the history of art is the history of changing ideas of the self. Present-day anxieties about the power of tradition reflect an awareness of such changes in ideas of the self, changes reflect in the role we take as spectators. Today, new visual media—television and film—create new relations of self to image, which we bring also to painting. This can cause anxiety, or it may be liberating. Freed from the need to place himself in a rigid way, the viewer is open to a richer experience of painting. Within a single isolated panel, contemporary abstract art aspires to create imaginary spatial and temporal relations that have all the richness of the changing imagery of film and television, experiences as rich as those produced by walking through the Del Bono Chapel.<sup>44</sup>

Color is the key to these experiences. Baroque art tried, and finally failed, to combine chiaroscuro and local color, value and hue. The artists failed because they needed to use value gradations to describe the forms of their figures, thus limiting the possibilities for other ways that value could structure their paintings. Since abstract paintings do not need to depict forms, artists can solve these problems and use value and hue in new, integrated ways. In viewing television and film, we are used to switching between black-and-white and color, and have thereby become more sophisticated in our knowledge of the complex ways color can be manipulated artificially. These media use that switching to suggest different levels of reality. Pseudo-documentary footage can be shown in black and white, which seems more "real" than color. In Baroque art, a sacred light floods the painting, unifying the value structure and mood. The human figures act out their drama within this light, their humanity intensified by their juxtaposition with this otherworldly light. Their actions can be in opposition or submission to the light. Now film and television create a different unified light, which seems superhu-

man.<sup>45</sup> This light is not as directional as the religious light in Baroque painting; it uniformly increases the color intensity across the screen. This lack of directionality can be an advantage. Now light does not imply shadows, and can be graded in modulation. This light can be played off against the human elements in contemporary painting, which are not figures but gestures and marks varying in size from the smallest handmade marking gesture, made with pencil or brush, to large pourings or other manipulations of paint. These marks can suggest a body moving in the unified light, as in Baroque painting. But now the spectator identifying with the marks is manipulated and transformed as he views the painting. Moving through the color and imagery, he attempts to synthesize the work, to create a whole from those fragments.

In 1934 Erwin Panofsky offered an untraditional account of the Baroque, which we find congenial.<sup>46</sup> Like Woelfflin, Panofsky describes two opposing forces, antiquity and naturalism, or perspective and gothicism, by which he means forms clinging to the surface. But Panofsky's categories are historical, not abstract. In High Renaissance painting there is a balance of these two opposed forces, which is disturbed in Mannerism's emphasis on extreme actions. The Baroque attempts to regain the balance of the Renaissance. The Baroque is the Renaissance regained, but haunted. There is emotion and the awareness of that emotion; consciousness stands aloof and knows. Contemporary artists and critics stand in relation to Abstract Expressionism as their Baroque counterparts stood to the Renaissance. We are self-conscious about what we are doing, and this self-consciousness haunts our work. Like the Baroque painters, we can choose not to deny contradictions, but use them to create energy.

Just as the spectator of contemporary paintings cannot be located at one position, so he or she is not restricted to one place in time, condemned to struggle with precursors in order to advance. We may learn from the distant and recent past. Because of changes in the nature of the self, the spectator who stands before the work is now a different figure than in the era of the Baroque. History never repeats itself. Meanings of formal devices depend upon their art-historical context. These meanings, which art historians seek to recover, have perhaps changed completely for the contemporary artist. We can try to experience old-master works as they were experienced in the past, but we also experience them in our own new way. This simultaneous double vision, complex and self-conscious, creates a dialogue, the basis for an art-world community, an invaluable resource for artists today and in the future.<sup>47</sup> □

1. Cecil Gould, *The Paintings of Correggio* (Ithaca: 1976), 22.

2. The indispensable account is Denis Mahon, *Studies in Seicento Art and Theory* (London: 1947). Different, conflicting views are Elizabeth Cropper, "Tuscan History and Emilian Style," in *Emilian Painting of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Bologna: 1987); Charles Dempsey, *Annibale Carracci and the Beginnings of Baroque Style* (Glueckstadt: 1977); and Carl Goldstein, *Visual Fact over Verbal Fiction* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1988).

3. Norman Bryson, *Tradition & Desire. From David to Delacroix* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1984), Ch. 2. Rudolf Wittkower's contrast between "the most common empirical procedure of art historians . . . tracing of influences and borrowings" and what in art they "paradoxically . . . stigmatize . . . as eclectic." ("Imitation, Eclecticism, and Genius," *Aspects of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. E. Wasserman (Baltimore: 1965), 154) fails to do justice to the psychological aspects of this situation to which Bryson, following Harold Bloom, has drawn attention.

4. Sydney J. Freedberg, *Circa 1600. A Revolution of Style in Italian Painting* (Cambridge, Mass. & London: 1983), 59.

5. Walter Friedlaender, *Nicolas Poussin. Die Entwicklung seiner Kunst* (Munich: 1914), 3.

6. John Rupert Martin, *The Farnese Gallery* (Princeton: 1965), 129-30.

7. Freedberg, *Circa 1600*: 113.

8. Richard E. Spear, *Domenichino* (New Haven & London: 1982), I, 34-6. Elizabeth Cropper gave a talk on this incident at the Institute of Fine Arts, N.Y.U., May 1988.

9. See Denis Mahon, "Eclecticism and the Carracci: Further reflections on the validity of a label." *J. of the Warburg and Courtauld Inst.* 16 (1953): 303-41.

10. Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Discourses on Art* (London: 1966), 97, 90. Carrier used to think this was his discovery, but it appears in Leo Steinberg, "The Glorious Company" (J. Lipman and R. Mitchell, *Art about Art*. [New York: 1978], 25, 15) whose text, in turn, now seems to employ the vocabulary of Harold Bloom: "You can tell the outsider from his anxiety to relate art at once to the phenomenal world . . ." (our italics).

11. Cropper, "Tuscan History and Emilian Style," 61.

12. Donald Posner, *Annibale Carracci: A Study in the Reform of Italian Painting around 1590* (London: 1971), 15.

13. Walter Friedlaender, *Mannerism & Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting* (New York: 1965), 6.

14. Posner, *Annibale Carracci*: 39.

15. S. J. Freedberg, *Parmigianino. His Works in Painting* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1950), 8, 13-14.

16. Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *The Lives of Annibale & Agostino Carracci*, trans. C. Enggass (University Park & London: 1969), 5-6.

17. "Modern Art," reprinted in his *Modern Art, 19th and 20th Centuries* (New York: 1978), 218.

18. Rosalind E. Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, Mass. & London: 1985), 194.

19. See Carrier's "Le opere d'arte false nell'era della riproduzione meccanica," *Museo dei Musei* (Florence: 1988), 29-34.

20. John Shearman, *Mannerism. Style and Civilization* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: 1967), 65.

21. John Ashbery, *Self Portrait in a Convex Mirror* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: 1976), 74. See Douglas Crase, "The Prophetic Ashbery," *Beyond Amazement, New Essays on John Ashbery*, ed. D. Lehman (Ithaca & London: 1980).

22. S. J. Freedberg, *Painting in Italy 1500 to 1600* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: 1971), 189. See also Hubert Damisch, *Théorie du nuage/pour une histoire de la peinture* (Paris: 1972), 11-31.

23. Rudolf Wittkower, *Art and Architecture in Italy 1600 to 1750* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: 1973), 161. Eugenio Riccomini, "The Frescoes of Correggio and Parmigianino: From Beauty to Elegance," *The Age of Correggio and the Carracci*. (Washington: 1986), 16-18 links this work to the Baroque as "one of the first responses of Roman and Catholic sentiment to . . . Luther. . ."

24. Leo Steinberg, *Other Criteria. Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: 1972), 81.

25. Anthony Blunt, "Illusionistic Decoration in Central Italian Painting of the Renaissance," *J. of the Royal Society of Art* (April 1959): 309-26; Marie Christine Gluton, *Trompe-l'oeil et décor plafonnant dans les églises romaines de l'âge baroque* (Rome: 1965).

26. See Carrier's "The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: Caravaggio and his interpreters," *Word & Image* 3, 1 (1987): 41-73.

27. Freedberg, *Circa 1600*: 8.

28. Ernst H. Gombrich, "The Renaissance Theory of Art and the Rise of Landscape" in his *Norm and Form. Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (London: 1966). See also Federico Zeri, *Le mythe visuel de l'Italie*, trans. C. Paoloni (Paris: 1986).

29. Ernst Kris with E. H. Gombrich, "The Principles of Caricature," in Ernst Kris, *Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art* (London: 1953), 189.

30. Dwight C. Miller in *The Age of Correggio and the Carracci*. (Washington: 1986), 528.

31. Howard Hibbard, *Caravaggio* (New York: 1983), 108; and Ann T. Lurie and Ann Percy, *Bernardo Cavallino of Naples. 1616-1656* (Cleveland and Fort Worth: 1984).

32. Keith Christiansen, "Caravaggio and 'L'empio davanti del naturale,'" *Art Bulletin* LXVIII,3 (1986): 423.

33. Frank Stella, *Working Space* (Cambridge, Mass. & London: 1986), 4.

34. Adam Gopnick, "Stella in Relief," *The New Yorker*, January 4, 1988: 71.

35. Stella, *Working Space*: 23-24, 155.

36. For a detailed discussion, see Carrier, *Principles of Art History Writing* (University Park and London: forthcoming, 1991), Ch. 11.

37. Clement Greenberg, "After Abstract Expressionism," *Art International* 6 (1962): 28.

38. Freedberg, *Painting in Italy*: 182.

39. See Gould, *Correggio*: 78, 80 and Alberto Bevilacqua, *L'opera completa del Correggio* (Milan: 1970), 112-13.

40. Geraldine D. Wind, "The Benedictine Program of S. Giovanni Evangelista in Parma," *Art Bulletin* 65 (1976): 521-7. Thanks to Virginia Budney for this reference.

41. Freedberg, *Painting in Italy*: 278.

42. Leo Steinberg, "Observations in the Cerasi Chapel," *Art Bulletin* 49 (1959): 183, 187. This conception of painting is developed in Steinberg's "Leonardo's Last Supper," *Art Quarterly* 36,4 (1973): esp. 368-70.

43. Steinberg, *Other Criteria*: 82.

44. This is not an original idea; on the relation of old-master art to film, see Steinberg, *Other Criteria*: 318-21.

45. Thanks are due to Jonathan Lasker for suggesting that modern lighting can function in this fashion, and to Mel Bochner for discussion about light in contemporary painting.

46. In an unpublished, unrecorded lecture at Vassar College; our account draws on the summary by Irving Lavin, College Art Association Conference, "Baroque Studies Thirty Years After Wittkower," February 1986. Related ideas appear at the end of his *Studies in Iconology. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (New York: 1972).

47. We have learned from the recent New York exhibitions of Caravaggio and of Emilian painting; the 1987 Yale exhibition of Neapolitan painting and the 1984 Cleveland exhibition of Bernardo Cavallino. This essay has grown out of conversations, often shared while viewing paintings. Help was provided in Parma by Lillian Ball, Arthur Danto, and Marianne Novy.

*David Carrier is the author of Artwriting (University of Massachusetts Press) and two forthcoming books, Principles of Art History Writing and Poussin's Painting. David Reed is a painter living in New York whose work is exhibited at Max Protetch Gallery.*