Preface

This project began with my study of Barocci's cartoons and pastel and oil heads, which passed to the suspicion that many other drawings were full size as well. I first noticed even stranger things while getting ready to go to Italy with a Fulbright Fellowship. Barocci's models, oil sketches and the like, seemed to have numerical relationships with their mother works that were only dimly intuited at that point. Meanwhile, a web depository of images I created in html, and in which I entered drawings and paintings at one centimeter to the pixel, revealed other unusual things. This examination led to extensive size manipulating via web uploading, Photoshop, and even once photocopying!

It was at a crucial point in the project that I began to exchange ideas in earnest with John Marciari, who was writing the catalogue of the drawings of the Yale University Art Gallery. We began sending Photoshop manipulations back and forth, and I revealed my unorthodox intuitions. John produced two beautiful Photoshop documents of the *Madonna del Gatto* and the *Madonna del Popolo* – the model I have continued to follow – which fueled our collaborative work that is partially republished here.

The result is a unique product, but one demanded by Barocci himself. The book is both caught in all the minutiae of drawings that one would expect from a monograph on drawing, but the book also feeds into a very broad view of not only Barocci's practice but that of his peers. The only precedent for such a project that I can think of – with no presumptions to matching its success – is Michael Baxandall and Svetlana Alpers' *Giovanni Tiepolo and the Visual Intelligence.*[1]

What is required for Barocci is a revised notion of connoisseurship. In spite of more and more works appearing on the art market and making their way into specialists' catalogues, judgment about what constitutes a work by Barocci have not improved. Barocci is a special case that demonstrates that one must go beyond visual intuition to all sorts of other factors to attribute successfully a work to him. These are "analytical" as opposed to "phenomenological" standards, but they refine one's phenomenal sensitivity, and so the analytic, and on and on.[2]

As a consequence, I do not enumerate drawings for each painting. Oftentimes, I do not make hard judgments about Barocci's authorship about a drawing. I have not burdened the footnotes with full documentation of drawings, directing the reader to Emiliani's catalogs, or Mann's exhibition catalog. This is a synthetic study and should be treated as such. Finally, the attentive reader may see a sentence first written for my dissertation. There is no claim for absolute novelty – this has been a very long project in coming.

Working in Cortona, Italy, I had waves of students help on the famous "Photoshop project." Back in Philadelphia, Josh Velong, Margot Halpern and most recently Caroline Miller helped. Parts of Chapter 2 were published jointly with John Marciari in *Master Drawings.* A shorter version of Chapter 8 was previously published in the *Notizie da Palazzo Albani.* Alex Marr enlightened me about Urbino mathematicians. Claire Farago was kind enough to share her ongoing work on Leonardo's Codex Urbinas. Were it not

---

[1] Alpers and Baxandall (1994).
[2] Mandelbaum (1980), 19-34: reprinted in Mandelbaum (1984).

for a mountain of commitments, John Marciari might have been a co-author. I could have used his broad knowledge and good judgment to smooth out my flashes of sometimes preposterous and slightly reductive ideas. In any case, he very helpfully read earlier drafts and provided helpful comments.

Ian Verstegen
Philadelphia