



FIGURE 2. Houses, rue Sainte-Famille. Hatton, p. 55.

avoids raising our anxieties. The church, he tells us, “was not always hidden by a bank of banal retail stores. Until the twenties, it stood alone in all its glory — the largest and finest Protestant church in the city” (p. 19).

The degree of nostalgic appeal is generally inversely proportional to the amount of seriously researched historical material, and it is the latter that we assume to be of greatest interest to the readers of this review. *Lost Montreal* comes close to achieving a happy balance between the two, although, as we have seen, the author was somewhat embarrassed by the latter. As for the other books, however, we must either teach our sentimentalists a bit about history, or show our historians how they may learn to feel.

H.K.

ELLIS WATERHOUSE. *Roman Baroque Painting: A List of the Principal Painters and their Works in and around Rome*. London, Phaidon, 1976. 121 + viii pp., 81 illus., \$48.00.

The distinguished art historian Sir Ellis Waterhouse belongs to that group of brilliant scholars and connoisseurs who have written innumerable classic articles and books on a variety of subjects and artists. Among Waterhouse’s notable contributions are his monographs on Sir Joshua Reynolds and Thomas Gainsborough, and his survey studies *Painting in Britain, 1530 to 1790* (Harmondsworth, 1953) and *Italian Baroque Painting* (London, 1962). Thus,

this reviewer looked forward to the recently published book here under review.

This work is a revised edition of his original text *Baroque Painting in Rome: The Seventeenth Century*, which appeared in 1937, at which time it was described as being indispensable. Waterhouse offers some reasons for reissuing his work: “The book has now become extremely scarce and it has been reported to me that it has been stolen from a surprising number of University libraries” (p. vii). He adds, “It has not been easy to decide what to do with the preliminary text. One can hardly recapture the spirit in which it was written more than thirty-five years ago and do it all over again. But . . . treating it as a sacred text and merely adding some modest notes of correction does not seem to me acceptable. I have therefore corrected positive mistakes and modified certain points of view. . . . The result is a compromise” (p. vii). The present text is, however, more than a reprinting of the first, for the lists of artists and their works have been greatly expanded and there are an additional twenty-one plates.

The book consists of a brief essay (some thirty-nine pages) which can be loosely divided into sections delineating the history of the later sixteenth century, a cursory look at Annibale Carracci, Caravaggio, and the decoration of palaces during the first quarter of the seventeenth century, and a discussion of the reigns of Urban VIII, Innocent X, Alexander VII, and their successors until 1700. This essay is then followed by a general bibliography of Roman Baroque sources, a note on subsequent annotated lists of nearly seventy artists (wherein recent changes in attribution are mentioned), a citation of some recent literature, a selection of eighty-one black-and-white illustrations, and a topographical index.

Phaidon, the publisher, asserts that the volume on Baroque painting is “an indispensable source book for all those interested in its essential manifestation — the pictures painted by artists in Rome between 1580 and 1710.” However, would it not be fairer to acknowledge the actual limitations which the author has observed? The book is not a definitive study of Roman Baroque painting. It is a list of the principal painters who worked after the accession of Urban VIII in 1623 and were born before 1660. Of all the artists mentioned in the lists, only Bacchio Ciampi was alive in 1580, and he was then only two years of age. In his chapter on the later sixteenth century, Waterhouse therefore offers no discussion of Federico Barocci, who was a native of Urbino yet was a major precursor of the Roman Baroque.

Waterhouse writes of Annibale Carracci, “It will thus be seen that what Annibale did for the succeeding century of Roman painters was to sum up compendiously the results of the Renaissance and to establish the canon of a classical style” (pp. 8-9). This is quite true, but the discussion might well have been carried further for, in fact, Carracci’s ceiling in the Farnese Gallery was the starting point for the two major Roman Baroque stylistic currents — classicism and illusionism. Hence, the painter points forward not only to Domenichino, Sacchi, and Maratta, but also to Lanfranco, Cortona, and Bernini. Several sources of inspiration for Carracci’s ceiling can be found across the Tiber River in the Villa Farnesina; works painted there by Peruzzi and Raphael anticipated Carracci’s later use of the *quadratura* and *quadro riportato* devices. Of course the *quadratura* tradition was extremely well known to Annibale through his knowledge of the work of Mategna, Giulio Romano,

Correggio, and Pellegrino Tibaldi, Carracci developed landscape painting which importantly led to the masterly works of Claude, Poussin, and Domenichino; likewise, his return to the study of the live model and his interest in caricature were important.

The terse discussion of Caravaggio by Waterhouse has neither an analysis of the importance of the artist nor a treatment of Caravaggism as such. These problems have been admirably pursued by Richard Spear in his superlative work, *Caravaggio and his Followers* (Cleveland, 1971), not cited in the bibliography of *Roman Baroque Painters*. As it has been noted, Waterhouse did not intend to present an in-depth study of Caravaggio, nor, for that matter, of other Roman Baroque painters.

Waterhouse's generalization that the Roman Baroque style "owes its origin in general to a new conception of the function of art introduced by the Jesuit Order, and in particular to the interpretation and fulfillment of that conception by Urban VIII and his family" (p. 15) would seem to call for explication and examples. His assertion that El Greco produced the first Baroque pictures in Europe (p. 16) omits discussion of supporting evidence. Is Waterhouse suggesting that they are Baroque simply because they were done between 1600 and 1614? If so, then this would seem to contradict his earlier view that the Baroque style owes its origin particularly to Urban VIII, whose importance as a patron does not begin until nine years after the death of El Greco. Perhaps El Greco is considered Baroque because of the extreme emotionalism of his art. We simply do not know from Waterhouse's text.

The bibliographical notes are basic and useful, but do not provide new sources. Discussion of archival material is extremely scant, and references are omitted to the many publications of the Archivio di Stato di Roma — among which is the *Pietro da Cortona Mostra: Documentaria* with its innumerable citations to artists, inventories, wills, and testaments. Nor does he cite the *Diaries of Carlo Catari*, which contain invaluable information on seventeenth-century artists and patrons. Waterhouse's lists provide an indispensable reference tool which makes the book a welcomed addition to a scholar's library. The eighty-one black-and-white photographs present an extremely important body of visual material which otherwise might be quite difficult to find. However, one regrets that the reproductions, which could be of higher quality, are squeezed into thirty-two pages, and that there are no colour plates.

This newly revised text is not on that very high level to which Waterhouse has accustomed the readers of his many publications. All in all, the limitations observed by the reviewer underscore art historians' need — notwithstanding the classic *Die Malerei des Barock in Rom* (Berlin, 1924), written by Hermann Voss over half a century ago — for a definitive text on Roman Baroque painting.

DAVID BERSHAD
University of Calgary
Calgary

RONALD PAULSON. *The Art of Hogarth*, London, Phaidon, 1975. 204 pp., 172 illus., \$33.00.

This is the latest of a long series of publications which have established the author as the leading authority on Hogarth. Ronald Paulson is a Professor of English, now at Yale, who first made his name by monographs and articles on English satirists and comic novelists from Swift to Smollett, an admirable introduction to Hogarth studies. His writings show a deep and lasting interest in the visual arts.

Professor Paulson has eclipsed all his recent predecessors in making massive additions to Hogarth fact. The aim of the late Frederick Antal is explicit in his title, *Hogarth and his Place in European Art* (London, 1962). Antal, a highly professional art historian, brought to his task an unusually extensive knowledge of European engravings, including reproductive prints; his account of Hogarth's use of pictorial sources is likely to stand the test of time as far as one can see into the future, although Paulson and others are constantly producing new examples from the inexhaustible mine.

Antal, as a liberal Marxist, also pioneered ground by rigorously relating Hogarth's development at every stage to his economic and social background, but such was his caution and habit of qualifying his generalizations that the reader has sometimes to wrestle with a number of separated passages before ascertaining the meaning, and then not always to complete satisfaction.

Paulson is admirably clear. His greatest contribution to Hogarth studies is his critical catalogue *Hogarth's Graphic Works* (2 vols., New Haven and London, 1965; rev. ed., 1970), the indispensable reference for all future studies. His two-volume *Hogarth: His Life, Art and Times* (2 vols., New Haven and London, 1971) is not merely an interpreta-



FIGURE 1. Hogarth, *The Shrimp Girl*. Paulson, Pl. 124.