Frances Gage

»It is not so easy to recognize the period and age of paintings«. Visual and Textual Evidence in Giulio Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura* and in Early Modern Connoisseurship

In 1957, Luigi Salerno argued that Giulio Mancini anticipated the historical »transformation from virtuoso to connoisseur«, which occurred in the eighteenth century.[1] In his commentary to Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, Salerno extolled Mancini for his »acute sensibility« to paintings, which attested to Mancini's extensive first-hand observation of pictures; Salerno responded in particular here to the Sienese physician's precepts for distinguishing an original from a copy.[2] Thirty years later Carlo Ginzburg similarly identified Mancini with the development of empirical practices of connoisseurship, adumbrating the conjectural epistemological approach of this clinician-connoisseur, whom Ginzburg argued anticipated Giovanni Morelli.[3] The contributions of Salerno and Ginzburg, both of whom failed to recognize that Mancini's recommendations on distinguishing copies and originals were not wholly new, have formed the bedrock on which many studies of Mancini's *Considerazioni* rest.[4] The Sienese physician has been praised for his observational skills and blamed for unoriginal theories.[5] Yet scholars of the *Considerazioni* have often ignored the crucial relationship between historical information, precept, and empirical practices in Mancini's treatise and in broader cultural activities. This is owing to the still lingering modern prejudice against textual sources on art, particularly in relation to practices of connoisseurship, which has been construed as a science of the eye.[6] For example, Donatella Sparti protests against any potential practical utility for the *Considerazioni* in the realm of connoisseurship, which she conflates with attribution, and argues that it is scarcely believable that anyone wishing to learn how to authenticate a picture would have taken up this treatise.[7] Moreover, anyone in the seventeenth century seeking to make attributions would have turned to an artist, not a physician, she states.[8] What remains unclear is how Sparti could envision the act of authentication being easily or at all separated from the other related processes of reception

and judgment that Mancini outlined in his *Considerazioni*. To understand the *Considerazioni* requires that the modes of observation Mancini recommended to and presumed among his readers be examined against the knowledge he was codifying and in relation to contemporary practices of connoisseurship.[9]

Recognition

Mancini addressed the role of observation in the judgment of painting in his chapter *Ricognizione delle pitture*, the penultimate chapter in both the *Discorso di pittura* (ca. 1617–19) and in the first part of the later *Considerazioni* (ca. 1619–1625).[10] The fact that Mancini devoted an entire chapter to recognition and closely aligned it to his celebrated chapter *Regole per comprare, collocare e conservare le pitture* affirms that he believed techniques of recognition to be fundamental to the process of judging works for purchase and display in a collection. The crucial importance of this act is confirmed as well in the Introduction to the *Considerazioni* (though not discussed in the Introduction to the *Discorso*), where the author united it with judgment in the process of evaluating color, perspective, and the *affetti*.[11]

The etymology of *ricognizione* casts into greater relief Mancini's conception of observation in connoisseurship. On the one hand, this term, which derived from the Latin *ricognoscere*, denoted attentive observation.[12] On the other, seventeenth-century definitions of the verb *ricognoscere* indicate it was a form of observation associated with both completeness and precision. The Italian-English dictionary edited by Giovanni Torriano translated the verb as »to recognize, […] to survey, or take perfect notice of.«[13] With the latter two definitions, Torriano conveyed that he equated recognition with the complete discernment of an object and all of its parts.[14]

Mancini's most extensive treatment of the act of recognition appeared in his unpublished treatise, *Alcune considerazioni del'honore*, when he articulated what constituted a good general and soldier as well as physician.[15] Fundamentally Aristotelian here, Mancini defined *ricognizione* as that good deliberation in men of *ingegno* and general *erudizione*.[16] Recognition is the capacity to elect the good immediately; it is rapid judgment and successful decision-making and the ability to judge well in all circumstances at all times.[17] Mancini also laid down how recognition issued from the intellectual habits of prudence and wisdom.[18] The man of *ingegno* for whom Mancini was writing could therefore

teach himself how to recognize paintings, at least in part. But good native ability to judge was inadequate – a man who wished to become knowledgeable necessarily had to look at art and to expose himself to the judgments of others. Whereas in his *Discorso*, Mancini explained that in order to recognize and judge the various period styles of painting, here »nothing can be said other than [...] to practice, see and ask [questions],« in his *Considerazioni* he argued that skill in judging could be acquired through the practice of looking and considering »the similitude [...], equality or inequality« of one work to another as well as through hearing »the judgment of other *intendenti*.«[19] Mancini's ideas concerning the role of observation and experience find a close analogy in the work of the English theorist Franciscus Junius, who urged art lovers to engage in a »a studious and daily exercise,« so that the amateur »shall [...] be able to know the one [style] from the other.«[20] In this way, Junius' readers »accustomed their eyes to such a sure *Facilitie* in judging.«[21]

Copies and Originals

Mancini's well-known remarks concerning the distinction between copies and originals alluded to observational practices that he described elsewhere in his chapter on recognition.

> »[One must ask if] there is to be seen that frankness of the master, and in particular in those parts that are necessarily made with resolution, nor that can be conducted well through imitation, as, in particular, are the hair, beard and eyes. So that when the ringlets of hair have to be imitated they are made with painful toil [*stento*], which then appears in the copy, and if the copyist does not want to imitate them, then they do not have the perfection of the master.«[22]

As valuable and interesting as these insights are, however, they scarcely constitute a how-to recognize guide. Mancini never opined on the morphology of a labored brushstroke any more than on a fluid and confident one. He evidently supposed his readers could already distinguish frank and resolute handling from one that betrayed »painful toil«. (He did articulate in the *Discorso* the fact that originals would demonstrate a greater union of colors, though he did not disclose how to recognize the greater blending of hues. This passage

was dropped in the *Considerazioni*.)[23] One still new to connoisseurship could not therefore have automatically applied any of these critical terms to specific material differences in the facture of individual painters, nor have carried out judgments solely with the *Considerazioni* functioning as an instruction manual. Rather, Mancini's text, as will become clear, would have proved more useful to one with experience, perhaps even considerable experience, in observing paintings.

Mancini's presumption in his chapter on recognition that his readers already possessed experience in the autopsy of paintings is particularly evident in his first precept concerning the distinction of copies from originals. One must ascertain if in »the painting [...] there be that perfection with which the artificer, under whose name [the picture] is being proposed and sold, [actually] worked.«[24] In other words, one attempting to discern an original from a copy needed to know an artist's *oeuvre* and presumably those of other related artists as well. Mancini presumed »una certa pratica«, and a substantial visual memory to evaluate whether a given object conformed to the style or one of the styles practiced by an individual artist.[25]

Mancini likewise expected that his readers would already have or eventually acquire the skills necessary to distinguish the hand of a master from those of his pupils or that of a copyist.[26] In his broader discussion of recognition, he recounted an anecdote that reveals the ritualized behaviors associated with authenticating paintings in seventeenth-century Italy. He narrated how Annibale Carracci, soon after arriving in Rome, executed a copy of *Christ Mocked* by Sebastiano del Piombo. Painting it on a new canvas, Annibale set it within an old frame before hanging it on the wall for Cardinal Odoardo Farnese's inspection (Tafel 3). Farnese, observing it and attributing it to Sebastiano, lamented that the manner of those old Renaissance masters had been lost.[27] Annibale joked: »Monsignor illustrissimo, by the grace of God, I'm alive, nor do I wish to die.«[28] Farnese then removed the painting from the wall, and glimpsing the new canvas, offered up the excuse that he had been deceived by the old frame. Annibale snapped back: »Painting is made to be looked at from the front and not from behind«, adding »that his [own] ordinary manner appeared to him [to be] *better* than that one [of Sebastiano] and in the present and in the future he would work in his customary and natural manner« [emphasis added].[29]

Mancini communicated several lessons in this passage. Firstly, to date and authenticate a painting by merely observing the rear rather than by analyzing the artist's pictorial manner was not a mark of a true *intendente* of painting. Even if Joachim von Sandrart confessed to having examined the back of a canvas before identifying the picture as a recent copy of a Giorgione, this was no substitute for pictorial evidence.[30] Indeed, Sandrart examined the reverse only after a prolonged inspection of the painted image.[31] Secondly, Annibale was suggesting that Farnese should have recognized that the painting was not by Sebastiano, but by an artist who was superior to Sebastiano, even though Annibale was imitating Sebastiano. Reinforcing the idea that one learned by listening to others' judgments and comments (including those of artists), Mancini repeated the quip of Cosimo de' Medici that a copy contained two arts, that of the original author and that of the copyist.[32] This constituted Mancini's third and related point: a connoisseur must distinguish both styles conjoined in a single copy, recognizing the hands of both the imitated artist and the imitator. Incidentally, Mancini and Cosimo de' Medici were not alone in their belief that copies presented a proving ground for the connoisseur. In the eighteenth century, connoisseurs of drawings such as Pierre-Jean Mariette produced copies of old masters as a means of playfully testing the observational skills of their fellow *cognoscenti*.[33]

Mancini's conception of the recognition of painting entailed the observation and distinction of sometimes very subtle stylistic differences. As he argued in several distinct contexts of the *Discorso* and the *Considerazioni*, an artist »has his own individual special property [and] even if he has made every singular effort to imitate the things of the master [...] this distinct special property is recognized.«[34] Mancini had already developed this idea in his earlier treatise when declaring that if more than one artist worked in a particular manner, as, for example, when students worked in the style of their master, »it was necessary to detect the difference between the hand of the master and the pupil, which could be done by acquiring knowledge of the defects of the painting one has before one.«[35] His example was the school of Raphael, which he also took up in his recommendations for the display of art (reinforcing the connection between recognition and display), in which he set forth a system that highlighted individual personalities within Raphael's school as well as their connections to the master.[36] Altogether the connoisseur needed

to acquire both breadth and depth of knowledge, that of masters and of secondary artists: a complete understanding of the history of art.

Precepts and Organized Knowledge

When Mancini came to address the recognition of chronological distinctions in his *Discorso*, he declared that this process should also be grounded upon »observation and having seen and observed the manners, *century by century*« [emphasis added].[37] Yet Mancini demonstrated that these modes of observation simultaneously functioned as mechanisms of gathering and organizing knowledge as well. He outlined how the practice of recognition entailed learning how to apply specific taxonomies to paintings according to a logical sequence, beginning with the distinction between originals and forgeries or copies, then turning to period style, followed by the recognition of regional style, and concluding with a consideration of individual artists' manners and a judgment of the relative perfection of a painting.[38]

The obvious question arising in response to Mancini's proposed procedure is how well the recognition of distinct stylistic attributes for each century could be achieved through observation alone, particularly in light of the fact that Mancini was treating periods of history prior to those fully discussed by Vasari. Mancini, in fact, anticipated this question, implying that the identification of period styles entailed textual study that facilitated the organization of historical knowledge through taxonomical classification. In the opening sentence of the chapter on recognition in the *Discorso*, Mancini articulated his expectation that the act of recognizing painting followed the acquisition of the historical knowledge he had compiled in the first chapters of his short treatise: »Having proposed all the things that can be considered about painting, about the nations, centuries, manners, masters, and their names, it remains to come now to the other chapter which is the recognition of these paintings.«[39] The contents of the preceding chapters formed the historical knowledge which connoisseurs could bring to bear upon the observation and recognition of specific works. Though less specific in his *Considerazioni*, Mancini likewise noted in the first sentence of the same chapter that »[i]t follows now that the recognition of painting, that is, whether the painting that happens to be presented to us has those requirements that we have proposed in any kind of painting, be considered.«[40] The inference was that recognition was both

observation and a process of historical classification that Mancini had already developed in his earlier chapters.

A more developed articulation of the fundamental role of his text in facilitating these acts of observation, recognition, and judgment of period and regional styles appears in the second paragraph of this same chapter in his *Considerazioni*.

> »As to the period and age [of painting] it is not so easy to recognize it, it being necessary to have a certain practice in knowing the variety of painting as far as its [different] periods [go], as these antiquarians and librarians have of characters, by which they recognize the period of the painting [before them]. And concerning this period and age [it] is recognized by the *disegno*, composition and *colorito* proper to whatever age [it may be], as already noted above, as for example, [the manner of] working with painful toil [*operare stentato*] with knowledge [of art] and perspective, but with dryness, [which] is proper to the adolescence of painting from 1400 to about 1470, and that which is said about the adolescence of painting must be understood for other eras, as is noted above. And this mode [of recognition] will be learned that much more to the extent that the paintings and painters will be considered according to the series of periods that we propose [in this treatise], beyond the observance of the clothing which was used from century to century and according to which then the paintings have been made, [and] by the letters that are sometimes seen in paintings.«[41]

Mancini argued that the ability to recognize historical periods presumed considerable experience in observing the degree to which the *disegno*, *colorito* and composition in paintings corresponded to his proposed period classifications, adding that learning to observe paintings in accordance with his already established taxonomies would facilitate the recognition of period styles of each century as well as the manners of individual artists.

In his chapter *Ruolo delle pitture* in Roma, Mancini revealed various approaches to dating and attributing paintings. Although his presentation and methods do not always appear very systematic, it is possible to discern some of the dominant methods he employed and how he then organized the results according to the very taxonomies – nation, century, manner, master,

1. The Death of Dido, Vatican Vergil, ca. 400, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 3225. © HIP/Art Resource, NY.

and name of artist – he had urged his readers to apply to the observation of paintings.[42] Mancini organized this chapter roughly chronologically, using established historical information to date the paintings he had observed. When considering the paintings in the Pyramid of Caius Cestius, for instance, he linked the monument to the Bridge of Cestius, which he noted had been mentioned in Tacitus' *Annals*, concluding that the paintings belonged to the same era as this text.[43] Once Mancini had established the period of history, he sought the names of potential artists who had lived at that time, proposing in this case that the paintings had been executed by a member of the Fabij family.[44] This method of attribution matched monuments to potential artists according to intersecting dates.

In another instance, Mancini divulged a different strategy, one that he had hinted at in the quotation above. Writing about the paintings in San Francesco a Ripa, Mancini connected these to the Anguillara family on the grounds that this family's coat of arms appeared throughout the church. Then, identifying a portrait of a figure holding a church, which he presumed to be the Anguillara patron, he dated the paintings to before 1300 on the basis of the style of the costumes worn by the patron and other figures.[45]

Mancini recognized that these methods, useful as a starting point, were not very precise and developed a more complex methodological variant in order to date the art of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance, integrating textual sources, inscriptions, and stylistic evidence. He often secured this progression by reference to the dates of the reigns of individual popes to which he linked specific artistic commissions.[46] Inscriptions, on which he frequently depended, informed him in one of two ways: either by providing an actual date or by revealing a period of time through the style of the lettering, a stylistic clue Mancini had noted in the passage above. For instance, Mancini relied upon a correspondence between common opinion and the style of the script to date the Vatican Virgil, when he wrote that this manuscript was generally believed to have been both written and painted by Tacitus (fig. 1).[47] Mancini believed the style of lettering confirmed the received date.[48] He verified consistency of dating in the historical sources, checking to see if dates of patrons, artists and works corresponded and inspecting inscriptions, coats of arms, portraits, or other identifying information that might resolve inconsistencies. He would seek the names of potential artists known to have worked either for an individual patron or in a given period in Rome, and he sometimes compared a manner with other known works by the same artist. Here again, a significant factor was the probability of intersecting dates.

Examining a particular example further demonstrates Mancini's dependence upon textual sources and the degree to which he was invested in disproving Vasari's claims of Florentine primacy in the rebirth of painting. Writing about the relative absence of artistic production during the period of the papal schism, Mancini adhered to Vasari's attribution to Pietro Cavallini of paintings and mosaics in Santa Maria in Trastevere. He suggested a new chronology, however, dating Cavallini's works (incorrectly), to ca. 1400 instead of to the previous century. To do so, Mancini linked Cavallini's mosaics to the patronage of Cardinal Pietro Stefaneschi, who died in 1417.[49] Stefaneschi's

dates could be established through visual and textual evidence, his portrait and the inscription on his tomb; these Mancini took to provide indisputable evidence.[50] Strikingly, Mancini suggested that Vasari himself had applied similar methods of linking artists to patrons in order to make attributions, though he accused the Aretine writer of having conflated two members of the Stefaneschi family and having incorrectly concluded that Cavallini's patron was the earlier one.

From the perspective of modern art historical knowledge, Mancini's approach initially appears unimpressive. Yet a consideration of both Mancini's own conceptual framework and the constraints under which he was operating demonstrates the sophistication of his methods. Mancini fused a biological conception of stylistic perfection and decline, a framework uniting chronology and quality, to a linear historical chronology. In evaluating the relative perfection of a painting according to a biological conception of birth, adolescence, maturity, and old age, a connoisseur might propose a likely sequence of works within a given period, but in order to establish actual dates, this progression had to be united to a linear chronological sequence. Regarding Cavallini, whom Vasari categorized among pupils of Giotto, Mancini's dating not only loosened any potential tie between them, but also implied that Cavallini surpassed Giotto. Nevertheless, Mancini argued that period styles were not absolutely homogeneous in quality; artists such as Annibale might surpass their contemporaries and rival those of a superior period style.[51] In dating Cavallini's works to ca. 1400, Mancini established the Roman artist's independence and supremacy in a period that saw few active painters and little artistic production. This further bolstered Mancini's claims, for in a period seeing a dearth of commissions, what other artist could have emerged than one of considerable merit, like Cavallini?

Stefano Pierguidi demonstrates that Mancini made attributions as well on the basis of comparative stylistic analysis, as Mancini affirmed in recognizing paintings by the artist il Viterbese – an artist ignored by Vasari.[52] Mancini declared that he learned of this artist from the curate of the church of San Simeone and Giuda, where he saw one of his works, after which he made other attributions on the basis of comparison.[53] In another instance, Mancini performed stylistic comparisons, linking paintings in various Roman churches and attributing them to the same hand, though he confessed he could not identify the artist by name, because no signature could be read on

the pictures in this group.[54] Stylistic analysis was always implicit in Mancini's *Ruolo delle pitture*, although it was underemphasized relative to the authoritative historical information Mancini sought in signatures, dates, and inscriptions. Mancini did not envision his *Considerazioni* principally as an inventory of attributions he had carried out, nor as a simple how-to guide. Rather, his project was one of establishing and organizing historical knowledge so as to facilitate the production of further knowledge. As Mancini declared in inventorying artists in his *Discorso* (the chapter would become *Ruolo dei pittori*), »in the following catalog the name and surname will be noted and the city or place of all of them that there have been up until now from the rebirth of painting, […] leaving the earlier centuries, because about some painters either the name is not known or, having the name of the painters, there are no works.«[55] Mancini sought to match paintings to painters' names and to produce a foundation for a universal history of painting in Rome.

In light of how Mancini organized his treatise – and he evidently rethought the structure when expanding the *Discorso* into the *Considerazioni* – he set himself the task of organizing and presenting historical material in a variety of ways, evidently in order to facilitate continual expansion and incorporation of new knowledge (and he indeed added to his treatise until the end of his life). His treatise presented historical material and stylistic classifications that could be variously accessed and applied to the observation and recognition of as yet uncatalogued paintings. Both his chapter *Ruolo delle pitture* in Roma and his *Viaggio per Roma per vedere le pitture* set forth largely the same material, but they were organized in distinct modes to permit readers to access the material according either to chronology or in the form of a guidebook to the art in various regions of Rome, which would facilitate direct observation. This dual presentation of the same material encouraged readers to observe paintings directly and to classify them historically, facilitating comparisons between objects already inventoried and those that were not yet recorded.

Mancini recognized that the major challenge for the *conoscitore*, considering the breadth of knowledge he needed to be able to activate, was an organizational one. This was so not only insofar as an *intendente* typically was engaged in organizing his own collection of material objects, but more importantly in the development and organization of his visual and historical memory. In fact, for Mancini, organizing a collection functioned as a mechanism to develop both visual memory and the skills of recognition. This is

attested through advice Giulio Mancini sent to his brother, Deifebo. If »you [Deifebo] would put together the[ir] drawings and make a book of them, putting those of the Carracci together [...] and those of Raphael, and so on, hand by hand, I don't doubt that you will [come to] know« the styles of individual painters.[56]

Judging Upon Request

In an era in which Rome witnessed numerous construction and demolition projects that yielded up both pagan and Christian antiquities, regular opportunities arose in which archaeological discoveries required identification and classification. Mancini's chapter *Ruolo delle pitture* in Roma repeatedly referred to recently recovered objects and suggested that Mancini had inspected some of these works.[57] A man with his historical knowledge and keen eye would have offered valuable services to his patrons and collectors in his capacity to identify and date objects newly come to light.

A similar performance of artistic judgment, either of contemporary or Renaissance paintings or of antiquities, came to be an increasingly sought-after spectacle in seventeenth-century elite culture. As Mancini stated in the opening sentence of his *Discorso*, he set out to prepare an art lover to evaluate a painting upon request. In this treatise he declared that:

> »My intention is to consider and propose some considerations with which a man who has a taste for a similar study [of painting] can easily give a true account of a painting presented to him for examination, and consequently then, in serving a prince with similar pleasures [in painting], can serve him in this business.«[58]

An almost identical sentence begins the *Considerazioni*.[59] With the rapid development in collecting, particularly in Rome, knowledge of painting would bring credit to any *intendente* who could make similar rapid-fire pronouncements.[60]

Calls for impromptu judgments might come about because of curiosity to hear another's opinion while following the progression of a commission or upon the reception and authentication of newly purchased or delivered pictures. On these occasions, the collector or buyer often requested this service from friends or associates who were known *intendenti*. When Mancini

received a painting of *Moses* by Guercino in 1624 as a gift from his nephew, two of his associates in the papal court were on hand to receive it and immediately authenticate it.[61] An even more telling example of the way in which collectors and courtiers were expected to make spontaneous judgments of painting is attested to by letters from the Barberini agent, Gregorio Panzani, at the court of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, concerning the reception of Italian paintings sent by Cardinal Francesco Barberini. Initially the pictures were shown to the Queen and her ladies-in-waiting, who approved of them.[62] Shortly thereafter they were presented to the king and those he invited to accompany him. Upon notice of the pictures' arrival, the king and each of his guests, including Inigo Jones and the Earls of Arundel, Howard and Pembroke, immediately ran to inspect them. In the circles of elite collectors such as these, the first look at a painting and any pronouncement about its authorship and perfection were evidently matters of urgency. This suggests that connoisseurs sought out the opportunity to make the first judgments of a painting because these were seen as authoritative.

Although the documentation about this performative reception of paintings at the Stuart court underscores the immediacy with which pictures were judged – Inigo Jones being described as approving of them the »very moment […] [he] saw the pictures« – and intentionally highlights the visual acuity of those engaged in artistic judgment, contemporary processes of authentication and evaluation did not rely upon visual analysis or observation alone, nor were judgments always spontaneous.[63] A precious detail from the same correspondence reveals the authoritative status of textual evidence in the authentication of painting, even if the contents of this textual evidence may have been unknown to Jones. In one of Panzani's letters, the Barberini agent reported how Jones had boasted that he had authenticated almost all of the pictures correctly. However, Jones' identification of the artists had occurred after Charles I had removed labels that Panzani had previously attached to the pictures with the names of each of the painters, the king's objective being to force Jones either to guess or (as Jones thought) to demonstrate his extensive knowledge of Italian painting. This strongly suggests that Jones was able to boast about his visual expertise precisely because this skill was still relatively rare; relying upon textual evidence or written inscriptions, even if added in the form of labels bearing the authors' names, still was more common and held more sway.[64]

Considering that Barberini sent Panzani information about various Italian artists before he had even sent the gift of pictures to the English court strongly suggests that Barberini was the source of the attributions on the labels Charles later removed. Panzani and Barberini had corresponded at some length concerning both contemporary and Renaissance artists in the process of identifying the tastes and inclinations of Charles I. On June 6 1635, Francesco Barberini briefly outlined the styles and reputations of Pietro da Cortona, Domenichino, Lanfranco, Poussin, Francesco Albani, Guido Reni, and the Carracci. The Cardinal's knowledge of these artists was surely acquired in part through his own collecting, but his brief comments about the nature, style, and estimation of contemporary artists also loosely corresponded to information Mancini had already codified in his *Considerazioni* more than a decade earlier. This included succinct characterizations of the styles of individual masters and their reputations. The Cardinal nephew certainly knew Mancini's treatise on painting, for in 1628 he presented a copy to the Grand Duke of Tuscany.[65] Significantly, Barberini's remark to Panzani that the Carracci were esteemed as much as »ancient« painters (by which he meant Renaissance masters), almost echoed a judgment Mancini had articulated years earlier, when he noted that Annibale Carracci, who belongs to »our century, [which is] subsequent [to that of the most perfect period], [is] more perfect than anyone of the perfect century for painting,« which he considered to be that of Michelangelo and Raphael.[66] In this case stylistic judgment also implicated periodization, demonstrating that modes of evaluation and classification were interrelated.

Disegno and the Judgment of Painting

Another occasion in which collectors might solicit visual examinations of their pictures from *intendenti* occurred during disputes between patrons and artists, typically concerning remuneration. One such conflict, which occurred within Mancini's extended family, prompted numerous requests to family, friends and associates to inspect a painting and judge its merits. As in the reception of paintings in the Stuart court, this incident attests to the degree to which the judgment of painting in the seventeenth century had become a collaborative endeavor, uniting men across social, economic and professional boundaries, and requiring the sharing together of their experiences and learning. It also

attests to the complicated role of drawing in the artistic judgment of painting.

The dispute involved payment for a lost painting by Giovanni Lanfranco representing the *Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew*, which had been commissioned by Giulio Mancini for his family chapel in Siena and that remained unfinished and partially or completely unpaid upon Mancini's death on August 22, 1630 (fig. 2). Michele Maccherini associates a preparatory drawing in Oxford with this commission.[67] A long correspondence between Deifebo and the artist as well as friends of the Mancini brothers ensued. Lanfranco implied in his earliest surviving letter to Deifebo of November 16, 1630, that the two had already corresponded, and that Deifebo had declared that the price, which we later learn must have been at least 500 scudi, was exorbitant.[68] In spite of Deifebo's apparent refusal to pay this, Lanfranco pressed him for instructions about what he should do with the painting, so that »the fee [*premio*] not be delayed.«[69] In response, Deifebo, who had not seen the altarpiece and who could not travel to Rome, demanded a sketch. This provoked Lanfranco, who on November 30 adopted a more aggressive tone, refraining from all conventional demonstrations of courtesy. »The last letter of *Vostra Signoria* has given me an incredible sense of disgust [*disgusto*] [...] for the little satisfaction that you take in the work, lowering the price and demanding the sketch [*skizzo*].«[70] Lanfranco flatly refused, stating that he did not have apprentices who could execute

2. Giovanni Lanfranco, Compositional Drawing of the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, ca. 1629/30, Oxford, Christ Church Picture Gallery, Inv. JBS/595. © by Permission of the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford.

the drawing, and in any case, it was not customary to produce one after a painting was finished.[71] This was highly ironic. Only a few years earlier, Lanfranco had commissioned and circulated a print after a drawing he himself had perhaps made in order to persuade beholders that Domenichino had stolen Agostino Carracci's invention for the *Last Communion of St. Jerome* (Pinacoteca, Bologna) for his painting of the same subject, now in the Pinacoteca Vaticana.[72] It is even more ironic considering that Lanfranco, in a subsequent letter of February 8, 1631, argued that, »it is impossible, even by one [a beholder] most diligent, to give a judgment of a colored work« on the basis of a drawing.[73] Instead, Lanfranco offered Deifebo a substitution for direct observation in the form of a verbal description of his altarpiece, a solution permitting him to mount multiple arguments for maintaining his required price.

> »The painting [...] beyond the landscape, represents a history of fourteen or fifteen figures, almost all as large as life size, and more [of them], that is, the saint tied to a tree, with three scoundrels [*manigoldi*] who flay him, a woman who's knelt down in the act of veneration, two armed soldiers [...] and many others [...] and in the air an angel who presents the crown and palm to the saint. I have described it so, so that you, having considered the invention, expression, coloring and number of figures and their unity [*concerto*], all things that require long toil of mind and hand and great time to put together, will judge of the suitability of the price.«[74]

Significantly, the structure of Lanfranco's description and his language bear certain analogies to Mancini's requirements for recognizing the perfection of a history painting. Lanfranco began by referring to the location where the action takes place before turning to the actions of the main figures. Similarly, Mancini began his analysis of history painting with the setting, and then focused principally on the actions and expressions of the figures.[75] According to Lanfranco, the painting's artistic value resided principally in its invention, in the expressions and unity of the action, the last two elements being those Mancini identified as most significant to this genre.[76] This was no coincidence. Lanfranco was well-informed about Mancini's theories of painting, having confessed that the Canon of St. Peter's contributed deeply to the appearance

of the *Martyrdom*: »I endured so much labor to please *Monsignore*, doing and undoing the *disegno* and the painting more times with my great toil [*fatica*] and disgust in order to give him pleasure.«[77] Mancini must have articulated his theories, critical terminology, and methods of observing and judging art to the painter for, as the art collector Agostino Chigi, Rector of the Sienese Hospital of Santa Maria della Scala declared, the figures had been superior while the Monsignor was alive.[78] Additionally, Lanfranco's verbal description in turn would have prompted Deifebo to reconstruct in his mind's eye a visual image bearing analogies to his brother's precepts concerning history painting. Here the modality of inner visualization could have been informed by textual knowledge and criticism. Lanfranco encouraged Deifebo to pay an exorbitant sum by demonstrating his own facility in judging art and by characterizing his composition in terms he may have thought a *cognoscente* (particularly the brother of Giulio Mancini) equated with quality.[79]

As the conflict between Deifebo and Lanfranco grew heated, both factions increasingly availed themselves of artists, friends and *intendenti* to give their opinions on the work. On the side of Deifebo, those invited to judge or provide relevant information about the painting included collectors, scholars and clerics, members of the medical profession, and artists, a list that demonstrates how the judgment of and payment for a single painting might engage a patron's extensive social network.[80] The invitations to inspect the painting were not necessarily spontaneous; Mancini's nephew, Cesare Perini informed Deifebo about various individuals he intended to ask to observe and judge it, but if occasions arose he may have caught the ear of a sympathetic friend and asked him to observe the picture and spontaneously give his opinion. By June 1631, Perini suggested in a letter to Deifebo that Chigi thought auctioning the picture off was a good idea. Further, Chigi recommended that to bolster the reputation of the picture, an inscription reading »Opera del Lanfranchi,« be attached to it, a suggestion that confirms that the attachment of a label could provide authoritative evidence of a painting's quality as well as providing an attribution.[81] The value of labels is scarcely surprising considering that Mancini and his contemporaries regarded inscriptions as providing authoritative historical evidence. This fact may have fostered the estimation of similar forms of documentation, even if they accompanied, but did not replace visual evidence.

Mancini articulated a conception of observation and recognition – precise and comprehensive looking – that facilitated taxonomical classification of painting in accordance with categories of national and period styles and individual manners. Far from being a science of the eye alone, early connoisseurship, as Mancini outlined it, entailed a lengthy process of gathering, sorting, and cross-checking both visual and textual information in order to establish and refine the history of art. This lengthy process involved an initial examination of the paintings in Roman monuments and churches, the tracking of relevant documentation concerning the monuments, patrons, and periods in which objects were produced and an analysis of stylistic characteristics, gathered and analyzed over time against related objects and styles, in order to establish a correspondence between historical documentation and visual evidence. Perfected over time, these skills eventually permitted connoisseurs to perform spontaneous acts of judgment upon request. Early connoisseurship involved a conjunction of various modes of evaluation and varied forms of evidence. For Mancini, methods of dating might entail judgments of artistic quality that could also lead to attributions. At other times, attributions might emerge from a correspondence of historical and visual information and on still others, attributions might remain tentative, involving no more than a convergence of dates or a selection of a potential artist from the *Ruolo dei pittori*. The examples above demonstrate that the conjunction of visual and textual evidence was a normative expectation of evaluation. This is borne out as well in contemporary instances of forgery and this tendency carries on into the eighteenth-century and in the recommendations of Jonathan Richardson.[82] Although Mancini was a keen observer of art, his treatises demonstrate that over time, his project evolved from the genre of advice literature to a comprehensive (though unfinished) reference manual historically documenting and classifying the paintings in Rome. At heart, Mancini, like many of his contemporaries, still regarded texts as rather more authoritative, even as he recommended and perfected new modes of observation.

Notes

1 Salerno 1957, p. xxiii.
2 Ibid.
3 Ginzburg 1989, p. 108f.
4 Muller 1989, p. 142.
5 Salerno 1957, p. xxiii; Maccherini 2005, p. 392.
6 Cropper/Dempsey 1987, p. 497, on the prejudice against the historiographical sources.
7 Sparti 2008, p. 59.
8 Ibid.
9 For Mancini and connoisseurship, see Gibson-Wood 1988, p. 33–40; Sparti 2008, p. 58–66; Gage 2010, p. 128–129; Frigo 2012; Gage 2015, especially p. 259f; Pierguidi 2016.
10 ASEPD, CXIX 170, Rome, 15 January 1625, Mattia Naldi to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 577r. This is the last mention I have found of Mancini working on his treatise on painting.
11 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 7.
12 For Mancini and *ricognizione*, see Gage 2016, p. 142–144.
13 Torriano 1659.
14 The *Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (1971) defines the verb »to survey« as »the act of viewing, examining or inspecting in detail.« To take notice is an act of observation.
15 Mancini, *Alcune considerationi del'honore fatte da Giulio Mancini per suo trattenimento*, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. Lat. 4314, fol. 112r–113v. The act of *ricognizione* elevated men of *ingegno* above the level of the *peritus*, whose knowledge pertained only to a single profession. For consideration of *peritia* and *paideia*, see Frigo 2012. For more on recognition, see Gage 2016, p. 143.
16 Mancini, *Alcune considerationi*, fol. 112r.
17 Ibid., fol. 113r. The Carracci also possessed recognition and judgment. See Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 109.
18 Mancini, *Alcune considerationi*, fol. 112r. For prudence in artistic judgment, see Cropper/Dempsey 1996, p. 93. On the Aristotelian position of prudence in universal reason, see Barzman 2000, p. 147. For intellectual habit, see Gage 2014a, p. 396f. For authors' decisions to leave judgments to their readers, see Blair 2010, p. 188.
19 »Bisogna praticare, vedere e dimandare,« and »basta solo un buon giuditio ammaestrato con aver visto più pitture e da per sé e col giuditio di più intendenti, e con la similitudine, equalità o inequalità giudicare dell'altre.« Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 330, and p. 7. For conversation in contemporary collections, see Cropper/Dempsey 1996, p. 93.
20 Cropper 1984, p. 166; Junius/Aldrich/Fehl 1991, p. 305.
21 Ibid., p. 309.
22 »Se vi si veda quella franchezza del mastro, et in particolare in quelle parti che di necessità si fanno di resolutione nè si posson ben condurre con l'immitatione, come sono in particolare i capelli, la barba, gl'occhi. Che l'anellar de' capelli, quando si han da imitare, si fanno con stento, che nella copia poi apparisce, et, se il copiatore non li vuol imitare, allhora non hanno la perfettione di mastro,« Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 134. For »Stento,« see Torriano 1659: »Stento. Care and pining care, toilsome languishment,

sufferance and miserie of body and mind«; also, resolution, which he translated as »resolution« as well as »virtue,« and »valour.«

23 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 327.

24 »Se nella pittura proposta vi sia quella perfettione con la quale operava l'artefice sotto nome del quale vien proposta e venduta.« Ibid., p. 134.

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid. See also Robertson 2008, p. 128. For this anecdote, see Lenain 2011, p. 203–208 and Loh 2006, p. 258, both of whom slightly miss Mancini's points.

27 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 135.

28 »Monsignore illustrissimo, per gratia di Dio vivo nè ho voglia di morire.« Ibid.

29 »La sua maniera ordinaria gli pareva meglio che quella, e pertanto per operare meglio et al presente et nell'avenire haverebbe operato nel suo modo consueto e naturale.« Ibid., p. 135.

30 Kurz 1948, p. 35. For examples of examinations of the reverse of paintings, see Warwick 2000, p. 79f.

31 Kurz 1948, p. 35.

32 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 135.

33 Smentek 2014, p. 103. For similar games in the seventeenth century, see Tummers 2008, p. 31.

34 »Habbia la proprietà propria individuale ancorchè habbia fatto ogni singolar studio d'immitar le cose del mastro.« Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 107.

35 »Bisogna riconoscer […] se del mastro o del scolare, il che si fa dell'haver cognitione dei difetti della pittura che si ha avanti.« Ibid., p. 327.

36 Ibid., p. 145.

37 »L'haver visto et osservato la maniera di secolo per secolo.« Ibid., p. 327.

38 Ibid., p. 327. See also Junius/Aldrich/Fehl 1991, p. 307.

39 »Hor, havendo proposte tutte le cose che si possono considerare della pittura, delle nattioni, il secolo, maniere, mastri et loro nomi, resta che hor si venga all'altro capo ch'era la ricognitione di esse pitture.« Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 327.

40 »Seguita hora che si consideri la recognition della pittura, cioè se la pittura che ci vien proposta habbia quei requisiti che habbiam proposto in qualsivoglia sorte di pittura,« Ibid., p. 133.

41 »Quanto al tempo et età non è così facile a riconoscerla, bisognando d'havere una certa prattica nella cognitione della varietà della pittura quanto a' suoi tempi, come han questi antiquarij e bibliotecarij dei caratteri, dai quali riconoscono il tempo della pittura. Et circa a questo tempo et età si riconosce dal disegno, compositione e colorito proprio di qualsivoglio età già notata di sopra, come per essempio l'operare stentato col sapere e prospettiva, ma con secchezza, è proprio dell'adolescentia della pittura dal 1400 in 70 incirca, e quel che se dice dell'adolescenza si deve intendere dell'altr'età, come è stato notato di sopra. E questo modo tanto più s'apprenderà quanto che se anderanno considerando le pitture et i pittori secondo la serie dei tempi da noi proposte, oltre all'osservanza di panni di secolo in secolo che se sono usati e secondo poi sono state fatte le pitture, dalle lettere che alle volte si vedono nelle pitture.« Ibid., p. 134.

42 It is not clear if Mancini anticipated that his readers would follow his example and develop their own dates and attributions or if they were to defer to his conclusions. Ibid.

43 Ibid., p. 41.
44 Ibid.
45 Ibid., p. 70. On the relationship of costume and fashion to notions of historical time, see Nagel 2004, p. 34, 46 and Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 106f.
46 See also Pierguidi 2016.
47 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 45f.
48 Ibid.
49 For Mancini's attributions, see Pierguidi 2016, p. 65f. For the significance of Cavallini in seventeenth-century art historiography of Rome, see Oy-Marra 2015, p. 247–256.
50 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 72.
51 Ibid., p. 106.
52 Pierguidi 2016, p. 67.
53 Ibid.; Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 73 and apparatus, and another example on p. 69.
54 Ibid., p. 72, apparatus. See Bizoni/Banti 1942, p. 42f., for an analogous instance of attribution followed by confirmation in an artist's signature.
55 »Sarà notato nome, cognome e le città o luogo di tutti quelli che fin qui, dalla rinascente pittura, secolo per secolo sono stati di fama, lasciando i secoli superiori, perchè d'alcuni pittori o non se ne sa il nome o, havendosi il nome de' pittori, non s'hanno l'opere.« Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 321.
56 Maccherini 1997, p. 81, no. 1, the letter from Giulio to Deifebo Mancini of 23 settembre, 1606, fol. 336r.
57 As for example, Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 52f., 68f. For Mancini's interest in the demolition of Old St. Peter's, see Gage 2015.
58 »L'intention mia [...] è [...] di considerare e proporre alcuni avertimenti con i quali un huomo di gusto di simile studio possa con facilità dar ragguaglio d'una pittura propostagli, et per consequenza poi, servendo qualche prencipe di simili diletto, possa servirlo in quest'affare.« Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 291.
59 Ibid., p. 5.
60 Ibid., p. 291.
61 Gage 2014b, p. 654, 656.
62 Wittkower 1948, p. 50f.
63 Ibid., p. 51.
64 See the passage in Bizoni/Banti 1942, note 54 above.
65 ASEPD, CXIX, 170, Rome, 4 March, 1628, Giulio Mancini to Deifebo Mancini fol. 947r, and 18 Marzo 1628, fol. 952r.
66 Lister 2000, p. 160f.; Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 106.
67 Maccherini 2004, p. 48. See also Schleier 2002, p. 375f.
68 ASEPD, CXIX 170, Rome, 16 November 1630, Giovanni Lanfranco to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 16r; ASEPD, CXIX 167, Rome, 4, 1631 (no month), Augusto Chigi to D[octo]r Naldi, fol. 126r.
69 ASEPD, CXIX 170, Rome, 16 November 1630, Giovanni Lanfranco to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 16r.
70 ASEPD, CXIX 170, Rome, 30 November 1630, Giovanni Lanfranco to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 18r. *Disgusto*, was equated with nausea and repugnance, annoyance.
71 Ibid.
72 Cropper 2005, p. 7, for Baldinucci's claim Lanfranco produced the drawing.

73 ASEPD, CXIX 170, Rome, 27 December 1630, Giovanni Lanfranco to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 20r.
74 See note 70 and Maccherini 2004, p. 51. For history painting, see Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 117–119. See also Gage 2016, p. 121–151.
75 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 117–119.
76 Ibid.; ASEPD, Rome, 30 November 1630, Giovanni Lanfranco to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 18v.
77 ASEPD, Rome, 8 February 1631, Giovanni Lanfranco to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 22v: »ho durato tanta fatica per compiacere a M.re facendo e disfacendo più volte il disegnio e la pitura per darle gusto con maggior fatica e disgusto.«
78 ASPED, Rome, 4, 1631 (no month), Augusto Chigi to D[octo]r Naldi, fol. 126v, confirms Mancini's involvement in the appearance of the picture.
79 Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57, vol. 1, p. 121.
80 This episode is the subject of a future article.
81 ASEPD, Rome, 7 June 1631, Cesare Perini to Deifebo Mancini, fol. 135r: »se ve contentate ch[e] si vendra l'quadro alincanto per darli fine più presto si come al s[igno]r Chigi è piaciuto l'mio pensiero et soggionto metterci l'iscrittione opera del lanfranchi p[er] vend[er] lo con più riputat[io]ne.«
82 For the various forms of evidence utilized to detect forgery, see Rowland 2004. For the importance of historical and art historical knowledge to the connoisseur, see Richardson 1719/1972, p. 65–69. See also Gibson-Wood 2000, especially pp. 179–208.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

Giulio Mancini, Alcune considerationi del'honore fatte da Giulio Mancini per suo trattenimento, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. Lat. 4314.

Mancini family correspondence, Archivio della Società di Esecutori di Pie Disposizioni, CXIX 167, 170.

Printed Sources

Barzman 2000: Karen-edis Barzman, The Florentine Academy and the Early Modern State: The Discipline of Disegno, Cambridge 2000.

Bizoni/Banti 1942: Bernardo Bizoni, Europa Milleseicentosei: Diario di Viaggio, ed. Anna Banti, Milan/Rome 1942.

Blair 2010: Ann M. Blair, Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age, New Haven 2010.

Cropper 1984: Elizabeth Cropper, The Ideal of Painting: Pietro Testa's Düsseldorf Notebook, Princeton 1984.

Cropper 2005: Elizabeth Cropper, The Domenichino Affair. Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome. New Haven 2005.

Cropper/Dempsey 1987: Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, The State of Research in Italian Painting of the Seventeenth Century, in: The Art Bulletin 69, 1987, p. 494–509.

Cropper/Dempsey 1996: Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting, Princeton 1996.

Frigo 2012: Alberto Frigo, Can One Speak of Painting if One Cannot Hold a Brush? Giulio Mancini, Medicine and the Birth of the Connoisseur, in: Journal of the History of Ideas 73, 2012, p. 417–436.

Gage 2010: Frances Gage, ›Some Stirring or Changing of Place‹: Vision, Judgment and Mobility in Pictures of Galleries, in: Intellectual History Review 20, 2010, p. 123–145.

Gage 2014a: Frances Gage, Invention, Wit and Melancholy in the Art of Annibale Carracci, in: Intellectual History Review 24, 2014, p. 389–413.

Gage 2014b: Frances Gage, New Documents on Giulio Mancini and Guercino. in: Burlington Magazine 156, 2014, p. 653–656.

Gage 2015: Frances Gage, Visual Evidence and Periodization in Giulio Mancini's Observations on Early Christian and Medieval Art in Rome, in: Remembering the Middle Ages in Early Modern Italy, eds. Lorenzo Pericolo and Jessica N. Richardson, Turnhout 2015, p. 257–269.

Gage 2016: Frances Gage, Painting as Medicine in Early Modern Rome: Giulio Mancini and the Efficacy of Art, University Park (Pennsylvania) 2016.

Gibson-Wood 1988: Carol Gibson-Wood, Studies in the Theory of Connoisseurship from Vasari to Morelli, New York/London 1988.

Gibson-Wood 2000: Carol Gibson-Wood, Jonathan Richardson: Art Theorist of the English Enlightenment, New Haven 2000.

Ginzburg 1989: Carlo Ginzburg, Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method, Baltimore 1989.

Junius/Aldrich/Fehl 1991: Franciscus Junius, The Painting of the Ancients/De pictura veterum, according to the English translation (1638), eds. Keith Aldrich, Philipp Fehl and Raina Fehl, Berkeley 1991.

Kurz 1948: Otto Kurz, Fakes: A Handbook for Collectors and Students, London 1948.

Lenain 2011: Thierry Lenain, Art Forgery: The History of a Modern Obsession, London 2011.

Lister 2000: Susan Madocks Lister, ›Trumperies Brought from Rome‹: Barberini Gifts to the Stuart Court, in: The Diplomacy of Art: Artistic Creation and Politics in Seicento Italy, ed. Elizabeth Cropper, Milan 2000, p. 151–175.

Loh 2006: Maria Loh, Originals, Reproductions and a ›Particular Taste‹ for Pastiche in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Painting, in: Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe, 1450–1750, eds. Neil de Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet, Brepols 2006, p. 237–262.

Maccherini 1997: Michele Maccherini, Caravaggio nel carteggio familiare di Giulio Mancini, in: Prospettiva 87/88, 1997, p. 71–92.

Maccherini 2004: Michele Maccherini, Ritratto di Giulio Mancini, in: Bernini: Dai Borghesi ai Barberini: La cultura a Roma intorno agli anni venti, eds. Olivier Bonfait and Anna Coliva, Rome 2004, p. 47–57.

Maccherini 2005: Michele Maccherini, Giulio Mancini. Committenza e commercio di opere d'arte fra Siena e Roma, in: Siena e Roma, Raffaello, Caravaggio e i protagonisti di un legame antico, exh. cat. Siena, eds. Bruno Santi and Claudio Strinati, Siena 2005, p. 393–401.

Mancini/Marucchi 1956/57: Giulio Mancini, Considerazioni sulla pittura, ed. Adriana Marucchi, 2 vols., Rome 1956/57.

Muller 1989: Jeffrey Muller, Measures of Authenticity: The Detection of Copies in the Early Literature on Connoisseurship, in: Studies in the History of Art 20, 1989, p. 141–149.

Nagel 2004: Alexander Nagel, Fashion and the Now-Time of Renaissance Art, in: Res: Polemical Objects 46, 2004, p. 33–52.

Oy-Marra 2015: Elisabeth Oy-Marra, Changing Historical Perspectives: Giovan Pietro Bellori and the Middle Ages in Rome, in: Remembering the Middle Ages in Early Modern Italy, eds. Lorenzo Pericolo and Jessica N. Richardson, Turnhout, 2015, p. 247–256.

Pierguidi 2016: Stefano Pierguidi, Giulio Mancini e la nascita della connoisseurship, in: Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 79, 2016, p. 63–71.

Richardson 1719/1972: Jonathan Richardson, A Discourse on the Dignity, Certainty, Pleasure and Advantage of the Science of a Connoisseur (1719), Menston (Yorkshire) 1972.

Robertson 2008: Clare Robertson, The Invention of Annibale Carracci, Florence 2008.

Rowland 2004: Ingrid D. Rowland, The Scarith of Scornello: A Tale of Renaissance Forgery, Chicago 2004.

Salerno 1957: Luigi Salerno, Commento alle opere del Mancini, in: Giulio Mancini, Considerazioni sulla pittura, ed. Adriana Marucchi, vol. 2, Rome 1957.

Schleier 2002: Erich Schleier, Studio compositivo per un ›Martirio di San Bartolomeo‹, in: Giovanni Lanfranco: Un pittore barocco tra Parma, Roma e Napoli, exh. cat. Parma, ed. Erich Schleier, Milan 2002, p. 375–376.

Smentek 2014: Kristel Smentek, Mariette and the Science of the Connoisseur in Eighteenth-Century Europe, London 2014.

Sparti 2008: Donatella Livia Sparti, Novità su Giulio Mancini: Medicina, arte e presunta ›Connoisseurship‹, in: Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz 52, 2008, p. 53–72.

Torriano 1659: Giovanni Torriano, Vocabolario Italiano & Inglese: A Dictionary Italian & English Formerly Compiled by John Florio [...] Now Most diligently Revised [...] Whereunto Is Added A Dictionary English & Italian [...] By Gio: Torriano, London 1659.

Tummers 2008: Anna Tummers, ›By His Hand‹: The Paradox of Seventeenth-Century Connoisseurship, in: The Art Market and Connoisseurship: A Closer Look at Paintings by Rembrandt, Rubens and their Contemporaries, eds. Anna Tummers and Koenraad Jonckheere, Amsterdam 2008, p. 31–69.

Warwick 2000: Genevieve Warwick, The Arts of Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta and the Market for Drawings in Early Modern Europe, Cambridge 2000.

Wittkower 1948: Rudolf Wittkower, Inigo Jones – ›Puritanissimo Fiero‹, in: The Burlington Magazine 90, 1948, p. 50–51.