Upon the death of his father Camillo in July 1666, Giovanni Battista Pamphilj’s legal status changed dramatically: the eighteen-year-old prince became the primogenito of his wealthy and powerful family. With his inheritance came responsibilities, including the oversight of his father’s unfinished artistic projects at Sant’Agnese in Agone, Sant’Agostino, Sant’Andrea al Quirinale, the Collegio Innocenziano, and the Palazzo al Collegio Romano. The latter was the new wing, begun in 1659, which had been added to the Palazzo Aldobrandini al Corso (fig. 1), owned by his mother, Princess Olimpia Aldobrandini (1622–1681). After Olimpia, the sole heir to the great Aldobrandini fortune, married Camillo Pamphilj in 1647, the couple moved into her palace rather than his, the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona. The architect Antonio Del Grande designed Camillo’s new wing as a trapezoidal block to the northwest of the Aldobrandini property, between the Piazza al Collegio Romano and the large courtyard (figs. 2, 3). Today, this unified palace is known as the Palazzo Doria Pamphilj al Corso. Under Camillo, construction was completed and the interior decoration was begun, but the task of outfitting the new rooms fell to Giovanni Battista.¹

In this article—drawing on the information provided by two inventories of the palace’s contents, dating from ca. 1680 and 1709, respectively—I shall analyze and attempt to reconstruct the furnishings in Prince Pamphilj’s noble, winter, and mezzanine apartments. As we shall see, the furniture, fabrics, paintings, and other objects in these apartments were integrated into a decorative scheme that accorded with the prince’s exalted status and typified the baroque penchant for creating an overall impression, where each individual object contributed to a greater or lesser degree to a compositional whole. Although all of these material goods contributed to this greater network of display, easel paintings appear to have played an especially significant role in the noble and mezzanine apartments and, in many rooms, covered the walls in a type of display characterized as “a incrostazione,” or encrustation.² Choices about where to hang individual paintings had to be made

¹ On the construction of the new wing, see Carandente 1975, 104–130. Cappelletti 1996a, 17; 1996b, 12; and 2008b, 40 cited the documents recording Giovanni Battista’s payments to artisans for completing work on the new wing; she determined that Camillo intended to install the collection there but did not accomplish it before his death and that Giovanni Battista was responsible for installing the collection.

² For the material culture of early modern Rome, see especially Ago 2006. On the character of Italian baroque interior decoration and the display of collections, see De Benedictis 1998, 101–108 (quotation, 103). The Getty Research Institute, under the direction of Dr. Gail Feigenbaum, is currently sponsoring a major collaborative project on “The Display of Art in Roman Palaces, 1550–1750,” which promises to shed much new light on these issues; the publication is scheduled for 2013. My research has benefited from the conference of the same title held at the Getty Research Institute in December 2010.
during the process of decorating the rooms, and these choices help us to understand better the principles of display that were operative in late baroque collections. In the case of Prince Pamphilj, who had inherited his father’s copious collection, there were hundreds of paintings from which to choose. The installation of the collection occurs at a formative moment in the establishment of display principles in which formal, thematic, and “mixed-school” arrangements were emerging as the preferred approaches to organizing a collection. As we shall see, these principles were applied selectively to parts of the installation of Prince Pamphilj’s paintings. Furthermore, the function and

3 The term “mixed-school” is used by McClellan 1994, followed by Paul 2008.
Fig. 2. Plan of the Palazzo Doria Pamphilj al Corso, with room numbers inserted, eighteenth century, ADP Cart. 5, int. 3 (Archivio Doria Pamphilj, Rome).

Fig. 3. Giuseppe Vasi, Palazzo Panfilio, from Le magnificenze di Roma, 1st ed. (Rome 1747) (McMullen Museum of Art, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA).
Fig. 4. Caravaggio (Michelangelo Merisi), Rest on the Flight into Egypt, ca. 1595, oil on canvas, 135.7 × 166.5 cm, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome (fc 241) (photo Arti Doria Pamphilj srl).

Fig. 5. Annibale Carracci, Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, 1604, oil on canvas, 122 × 230 cm, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome (fc 236) (photo Arti Doria Pamphilj srl).
scale of spaces—large public reception rooms versus smaller spaces dedicated to art—certainly played a role in selecting the subjects, styles, sizes, and even the medium of the paintings chosen for individual rooms. Most significantly, having a copious and varied collection offered the prince an unusual degree of flexibility in furnishing his apartments since the pictures could be easily put to new uses and integrated with the other furnishings to create a rich setting appropriate to his status.

1. The Galleria Doria Pamphilj

The earliest installation of the Pamphilj collection in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano (ca. 1666–1709) provides a rare opportunity to study the principles of display in Roman princely collections in the era before the development of more systematic installation criteria in the later eighteenth century (as exemplified by the displays at the Capitoline Museum in Rome and the French royal collection in Paris). Even today, after centuries of modifications, visitors to the Galleria Doria Pamphilj may feel as if they have passed through a portal to an earlier age, where time stands still and the small group of famous masterworks that drew them there in the first place have seemingly always hung in the same place: Raphael’s *Double Portrait*, Titian’s *Salome*, Caravaggio’s *Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (fig. 4), Annibale Carracci’s *Landscape with the Flight into Egypt* (fig. 5), Guercino’s *Erminia Discovers the Wounded Tancred*, Claude Lorrain’s *Landscape with Dancing Figures* and *View of Delphi with Procession* (fig. 6), and Velázquez’s *Portrait of Innocent X* (fig. 7). But the complex history of the collection belies this atmosphere of immutability.

As the scholarship of Eduard Safarik, Giorgio Torselli, Giovanni Carandente, Francesca Cappelletti, and Andrea G. De Marchi has shown, the collection of the Galleria Doria Pamphilj is the result of the patronage and collecting activities of several individuals extending over centuries. It begins with Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini (1571–1621), who purchased the palace on Via del Corso in 1601 and amassed a significant collection of paintings and ancient sculpture, including the Raphael and Titian noted above, much of which was housed in his villas at Frascati and Montemagnanapoli. In 1638, this property devolved to Pietro’s great-niece, Olimpia (1622–1681), principessa di Rossano, who married Camillo Pamphilj in 1647. Camillo created his own copious collection of paintings and ancient sculpture and inherited paintings from his uncle, Innocent X, and his mother, Donna Olimpia Maidalchini. Although his paintings represented all of the genres and artists from various schools, his collection was particularly rich in landscapes and northern European painters. It is this collection that Giovanni Battista inherited and had installed in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano. As
his mother’s second son (Olimpia Aldobrandini had a first son from her previous marriage to Prince Paolo Borghese [1622–1646]), Giovanni Battista was also the principal Aldobrandini heir, but it seems that he did not integrate that collection, bound by a strict fideicommissum, into his own living space. It also does not appear that the prince added, in any significant way, to these other, inherited collections. During the same period, Giovanni Battista’s brother Benedetto (1653–1730), who became a cardinal in 1681, amassed his own collection of approximately 1,400 paintings, which he displayed in his rooms in the Palazzo Aldobrandini al Corso and his country residence in Albano.

After their mother’s death in 1681, the two brothers were the principal occupants of the family palace. There is some confusion regarding their living arrangements in the scholarship on the palace, and the design and function of their respective apartments have not been systematically analyzed. Giovanni Carandente mistakenly concluded that Giovanni Battista and his wife, Violante Facchinetti, occupied the Palazzo Aldobrandini al Corso, while Benedetto resided in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano. The brothers’ inventories record the opposite arrangement. Giovanni Battista’s apartment in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano will be discussed in detail here, as will his mezzanine rooms, which were apparently used by Violante at the time of his death. The rooms that Violante

9 Cappelletti 1996c, 82; Cappelletti 2008a, 26.
10 Cappelletti 1996a, 17.
11 Few of his paintings have been identified in the collection today. Leone 2011, with earlier bibliography, 128 nn. 1 and 2.
13 For Giovanni Battista’s inventories, see pp. 190–191 below; for Benedetto’s inventory (ADP 4.17), Ammannato 1999.
employed for the formal reception of guests have yet to be identified. Cardinal Benedetto occupied the older Palazzo Aldobrandini, which is depicted in the plan of 1661–1662 as a rectangular block of rooms flanking the Via del Corso, with a double-enfilade extending west between the “Giardino secreto” and the “Giardino de Melangoli” (see fig. 1). Benedetto’s use of these rooms will be the subject of a subsequent article. Since the brothers’ living arrangements are documented in Giovanni Battista’s two inventories, as well as Benedetto’s inventory of 1725, we can be fairly certain that they remained consistent throughout their adult lives. Another space in the palace that requires further attention in relation to the display of art is the no-longer-extant gallery, of massive proportions (11.20 × 38 m), that was built under Camillo and Olimpia. On the eighteenth-century plan, it is depicted in a subdivided state between the large “cortile” and the “Vicolo detta della Gatta” (see fig. 2). Christina Strunck, in her groundbreaking work on Roman galleries, has argued that this room’s innovative scale and form rendered it inhospitable for the traditional function of displaying art, but no one has yet determined how it was decorated and whether any paintings or sculpture were installed there. Since the gallery is not mentioned in Giovanni Battista’s inventories, the solution to this problem lies beyond the scope of this study.

In the course of succeeding generations, the collection grew and diminished in tandem with the vicissitudes of the family. A decisive moment occurred in 1760, when the extinction of the Pamphilj male bloodline resulted in the transfer of the primogeniture to the Doria of Genoa, who

---

14 Strunck 2007a, 154–156; 2007b, 82, 94–96; and 2010, 225 has identified the galleries of the Palazzo Aldobrandini al Corso and the Palazzo Colonna, both designed by Antonio Del Grande, as early examples of a new type in which the gallery assumed a representational role surpassing its traditional function as a place for leisure and art and equating it with the function of the salone. On the Pamphilj gallery, see also Frommel 1973, 2:88–102, esp. 98. On the development of the gallery in Italy, see Prinz 1988; De Benedictis 1998, esp. 79–86; Mazzetti di Pietralata 2010.
were related through the 1671 marriage of Giovanni Battista’s daughter Anna to Giovanni Andrea III Doria Landi. In 1763 the legal joining of the Doria and Pamphilj names and heraldry under Andrea IV (1747–1820) completed the merger of the families. This development led to substantial changes in the palace and the collection: Andrea IV Doria Pamphilj ordered the architect Francesco Nicoletti to redecorate the Palazzo al Collegio Romano and rehang the collection in the reception rooms, as well as in the quadrilateral gallery (which was created in 1731–1734 by enclosing the early-sixteenth-century courtyard in the Palazzo Aldobrandini). Francesca Cappelletti has identified Nicoletti’s installation, which is well documented in a series of detailed drawings depicting the location of paintings, as marking the moment when the collection was systematically arranged according to subject, style, and school, and especially formal principles of size, shape, symmetry, and balance. The first wing of the quadrilateral gallery, with its concentration of landscape paintings by artists of various schools, describes the late-eighteenth-century installation as “si raccolgono i dipinti di paesaggio, finendo con l’allestire quasi un museo delle tendenze pittoriche.”


16 Cappelletti 1996a, 22–24; 2008c, 81–82, in which she...
offers an especially good example. As Cappelletti explains: “The famous Aldobrandini lunettes, reunited as mirror images according to their dimensions, are hung below the two large pendants by Claude Lorrain and flanked by the small Flemish paintings with their brilliant green and blue tones, which furnish the necessary counterpart to the examples of Bolognese and Roman landscapes, in a context that besides symmetry seems to privilege the concept of variety, as a means to avoid boredom” (fig. 8). To be sure, this kind of arrangement by subject, school, and formal properties was applied more methodically in the late eighteenth century. But my central argument here is that these same organizing principles can be detected in the first installation of the collection, if in an inchoate manner rather than in full development.

2. Giovanni Battista Pamphilj as Prince and Patron

Less is known about the biography and patronage activities of Giovanni Battista Pamphilj than those of his brother, Cardinal Benedetto, whose education, career, and patronage of music, literature, and the visual arts have been well studied. Nevertheless, what we do know places Giovanni Battista firmly within the world of Roman culture and patronage occupied by his brother, as well as the parents who raised them, although the precise degree of his engagement and his contributions remain undefined. Alexandra Nigito’s recent work on Giovanni Battista’s musical patronage demonstrates that, like his brother, he retained a “maestro di cappella” and a group of musicians as members of his household and sponsored concerts at the churches under his protection, Sant’Agnese in Agone and San Nicola da Tolentino. His actions to complete his father’s building projects have been discussed in studies on the individual structures, but no systematic attempt has been made to define his contribution to the visual arts in late baroque Rome. His projects at Valmontone, the feudal holding purchased by Camillo in 1651, indicate that Giovanni Battista took steps to establish himself as an independent patron. In 1683, he reignited his father’s plan to renovate the town and commissioned his house architect, Mattia de Rossi, to demolish and completely rebuild the Collegiata as an elliptical church with curved façade and prominent cupola. Subsequent to its construction, the prince commissioned altarpieces for its seven radial altars from a group of painters who were connected to his family’s patronage network. But even before beginning work on the Collegiata, Giovanni Battista had finished the work of furnishing the palace in Valmontone. The number of paintings there increased from 220 in 1666 to 375 in 1683. This activity paralleled the outfitting of the Palazzo al Collegio Romano in Rome, suggesting that the young prince sought to create settings appropriate to his new social standing, both in the city and in the countryside. But in both cases, there is as yet no evidence that he played an active role in selecting the paintings and making choices about the installation—a guardaroba might have been in charge—and it is difficult to infer intentionality or taste since he did not collect but rather inherited his paintings. Despite

17 Cappelletti 2008c, 82: “Le famose lunette Aldobrandini, riunite specularmente a due a due a seconda delle dimensioni, sono sovrastate dai due grandi pendants di Claude Lorrain e affiancate dai quadretti fiamminghi che con gli squillanti toni verdi e azzurri, forniscono il necessario contraltare agli esempi del paesaggio bolognese e romano, in un contesto che oltre alla simmetria sembra privilegiare, per fuggire la noia, anche il concetto di varietà.”

18 Montalto 1955; Leone 2011.


20 For instance, Preimesberger and Weil 1975.


22 Serafinelli 2012.

23 Fabjan and Di Gregorio 2004, 60.
these obstacles, Giovanni Battista’s actions can be interpreted as consonant with a man of his social status in early modern Rome.

The installation of paintings and other luxury furnishings like fabrics, tapestries, and precious objects served as the external expression of the occupant’s magnificence. Vincenzo Scamozzi, in his popular treatise, L’idea dell’architettura universale, published in 1615, reminds his readers that a fine collection of antiquities and paintings reflects the “great and noble soul” of its owner. Indeed, even a sharp critic of the excesses of contemporary religious art like Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, in his De Sacris et Profanis Imaginibus (1582), acknowledges that “secular art could legitimately enhance the fame and honor of the artist or his patron.” In so doing, these authors acknowledge the general belief that the collecting of art is an expression of the owner’s gentilezza, or aesthetic discernment and civility. These ideas persisted into the eighteenth century: Fundamental to Nicodemus Tessin the Younger’s Traictè dela decoration interieure, for example, is the symbiotic relationship between the interior decoration of noble apartments and the magnificence of the occupant. Though drafted in 1717, Tessin’s treatise was largely based on his travel notes made on journeys in the late seventeenth century. To be more precise, Tessin was in Rome from 1673 to 1677, around the time that Giovanni Battista Pamphilj was decorating the Palazzo al Collegio Romano, and returned once again from 1687 to 1688. That art played a major role in endowing interior spaces with magnificence is clear from Tessin’s attention to wall and vault paintings in part one, and his enumeration of sculpture and easel paintings adorning palaces in part two. But the treatise also indicates that other types of decorations—both immobile ones like marble revetments, doorframes, and fireplaces, and movable objects like tapestries, fabrics, and furniture—contribute to the impression of magnificence. About a half-century ago, Francis Haskell defined the art collection as one of the major components of noble patronage in seventeenth-century Rome. The subsequent literature has reinforced the centrality of this activity among the elite, as well as those further down the social scale. The installation of Prince Pamphilj’s collection should, therefore, be understood within this sociocultural context. By following this model, the display of artistic and material culture in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano situated Prince Giovanni Battista firmly within the ranks of the Roman nobility.

3. The Inventories

As noted above, two important documents record the installation of the collection during Giovanni Battista’s lifetime. The first is the undated inventory ADP 86.29, which has been connected to the inventory suggests that it was at least partially decorated.

24 Cited by Cappelletti 1996a, 14: “grande e nobile animo.”

25 Schildgen 2011, 10.


27 Tessin 2002: on magnificence as the purpose for the interior decoration of noble residences, 30–32; on Tessin’s travel, 13–25, esp. 14 and 22. In part two of the treatise, Tessin does not include Prince Pamphilj’s urban palace but does list many works of sculpture and easel paintings in the Villa del Bel respiro, suggesting that the villa remained an important site of display (pp. 181–182). Since we do not know the precise dates when the Palazzo al Collegio Romano was furnished, it is impossible to know what state it was in during Tessin’s four-year stay in Rome, but the dating evidence of the first decades. Sources and comparative studies pertinent to this article are cited in the text. For a broad study of collezionismo after Haskell, see De Benedictis 1998. Waddy 1990, 58 connected collecting to public reputation. On collecting by non-noble Romans, see Cavazzini 2008. Feigenbaum and Ebert-Schifferer 2011 have recently argued that the collecting of sacred objects was a powerfully transformative social phenomenon.

28 Haskell 1963 makes this point on the first page of his book and elaborates on it in “Part I. Rome.”

29 The phenomenon of art collecting—collezionismo in Italian—has become an especially robust topic in the past two decades. Sources and comparative studies pertinent to this article are cited in the text. For a broad study of collezionismo after Haskell, see De Benedictis 1998. Waddy 1990, 58 connected collecting to public reputation. On collecting by non-noble Romans, see Cavazzini 2008. Feigenbaum and Ebert-Schifferer 2011 have recently argued that the collecting of sacred objects was a powerfully transformative social phenomenon.
lawsuit of 1684 over the Aldobrandini patrimony that followed the death of Olimpia Aldobrandini in 1681. However, the annotation on fol. 189r, “14 gennaio 1675,” which was recently noted by Dott. Mercantini, provides an earlier terminus ante quem for it. Mercantini has described the inventory as a working document to which additions were made over time. This assessment is substantiated by the listing of a portrait of Innocent XI, who became pope on 21 September 1676, and by the notation of the consignment of a group of paintings in 1680. In 1972, Jorg Garms partially transcribed this inventory in his invaluable compendium of documents from the ADP. Since its precise date is undetermined, I will refer to this first document as the ca. 1680 inventory. The second document is also an inventory but differs from the previous one in two ways: it is the official inventory filed by the notary Paolo Fatij, and its date is securely tied to Giovanni Battista’s death in 1709. Although scholars have cited this inventory on occasion, it has not been studied thoroughly or compared to the earlier one. There are two copies of the 1709 inventory: ADP 86.33–34 and ASR Notai A.C. vol. 2661, and the former has been transcribed and published by the Getty Research Institute. Although I have studied both original documents, and transcribed parts of each, I will refer to the Getty’s transcription here since it is so readily and easily accessible. The survival of two inventories separated by approximately thirty years provides a dynamic view of the prince’s installation of his collection in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano. Comparing the documents reveals that major changes took place over time, resulting in a tighter organization of the collection based on theme and school.

4. The Installation of the Collection under Camillo Pamphilj

Before studying the changes that occurred under the stewardship of Prince Giovanni Battista, we shall consider the installation and movements of paintings during Camillo’s lifetime, which will demonstrate that significant modifications also took place between the lifetimes of father and son. Under Prince Camillo, the Palazzo al Collegio Romano contained relatively few paintings since work on the interior had yet to be completed at the time of his death. The greatest concentration of paintings was found at that time in “the room where the . . . most excellent Prince Don Camillo died,” including a portrait of Innocent X, which has been tentatively identified as Velázquez’s famous painting (see fig. 7). In this period, the main part of Camillo’s collection was kept at the Villa del

---

30 Cappelletti 2008c, 81, 96 n. 83; Ammannato 1999, 235. The inventory is carefully written and includes many attributions.
31 Dott.ssa Mercantini, Director of the Archivio Doria Pamphilj, conveyed this information to me in writing.
32 Garms 1972, 316–328. Garms transcribed the above noted consignment of paintings as occurring in 1690, but the date is in fact 1680 in the original document (ADP 86.29, 413v).
33 De Marchi 2008b, passim; and Ammannato 1999, 235. Cappelletti 1996c, 82, 88 n. 32.
35 Although these inventories document the appearance of the interior spaces, they have limitations. The identification of paintings as unique objects, which can be traced from one inventory to the next, depends upon the specificity of the information—attribute, subject, measurements, and material—and even then there is room for error, as De Marchi 2004 has shown for the Aldobrandini collection. It is difficult to ensure that paintings of much repeated subjects or generic subjects (like landscapes) are one and the same. The Pamphilj inventories highlight the difficulties since there are many generic subjects and cases of more than one version of a subject by the same artist, such as the paintings of Noah’s Ark attributed to Bassano; Garms 1972, 334, 344. Following De Marchi, I will pursue a cautious path in identifying paintings from one inventory to the next and with actual paintings.
36 Cappelletti 2008b, 40.
37 Garms 1972, 330: “camera dove mori la gloriosa memoria dell’eccellentissimo Signore Principe Don Camillo.” Further in the inventory, there are scattered references to paintings and a list of paintings on six folios, recto and verso, but their
Fig. 9. Girolamo Rainaldi and Francesco Borromini, Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona, Rome, 1645–1650 (photo Mimmo Capone).

Fig. 10. Francesco Borromini, Gallery, Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona, Rome (photo author).
Bel Respiro, just outside the city walls on the Janiculum hill. Many of Camillo’s prized landscapes were installed in the villa’s *casino*, including Claude Lorrain’s *Temple of Delphi* and *Landscape with Dancing Figures* and three other paintings by the same artist, as well as works by the Bassano, Paul Bril, Gaspar Dughet, Herman Van Swanevelt, and others (see fig. 6).^38^ Part of the collection was also displayed at the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona (fig. 9), which Innocent X and Camillo’s mother, Donna Olimpia Maidalchini, had constructed to house the Pamphilj dynasty but to which Camillo refused to move. Yet even though Camillo did not live there, the palace was used as a site of display with paintings concentrated in the gallery and the apartment between the gallery and the Church of Sant’Agne on in Agone.^39^ The gallery, with its vault frescoes representing scenes of Aeneas by Pietro da Cortona, retained its traditional function as an exhibition space (fig. 10).^40^ In 1664, Bellori noted paintings by Guido Reni, Guercino, Caravaggio, “and other celebrated painters” in the gallery.^41^ According to Camillo’s inventory, most of these paintings depicted religious subjects.^42^ Based on the few identifiable works, paintings collected by Camillo were mixed with those he inherited: for instance, “a painting on canvas five-and-a-half *palmi* high with Erminia and the wounded Tancredi [with] gilded frame” has been tentatively identified as Guercino’s painting that originally belonged to Donna Olimpia, whereas Caravaggio’s *Flight into Egypt* (see fig. 4), Jan Bruegel the Elder’s *Allegories of Earth, Air, Water and Fire* (fig. 11) and *Terrestrial Paradise*, and Pieter Bruegel’s *Bay of Naples with Ships* were acquired by Camillo.^43^

The display of paintings in the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona was, however, short-lived. In 1669 Giovanni Battista put an end to his great-uncle’s plan of establishing the Piazza Navona as the seat of the Pamphilj dynasty. His father had refused to move there, and the young prince decided to rent it out. In December it was readied for the arrival of Cardinal Cibo. All of the paintings had been removed, which effectively diminished the palace’s function as a representation of the family’s noble status.^44^ In fact, about a century later the abbot of Saint-Non wrote of the Palazzo Pamphilj:

---

^38^ On the villa as the primary repository of Camillo’s collection, Cappelletti 2008b, 40. Camillo’s inventory of 1666 was published by Garms 1972; for the Claude Lorrain paintings, 335, 345, 349, and 352. For their significance in the villa, see Beneš 2005, 37–38. In the reinstallation of the collection from 1766 to 1769, Claude Lorrain’s *Temple of Delphi* and *Landscape with Dancing Figures* were moved into the quadrilateral gallery and placed in a systematic display of landscape painting; see pp. 188–189 above.

^39^ On the history of the palace, see Leone 2008. Camillo’s inventory does not record paintings in the reception rooms before the gallery; Garms 1972, 412–414.

^40^ Strunck 2010, esp. 223–226, 233 has defined a gallery first and foremost in terms of its form as a longitudinal space but also writes that its main function was as an exhibition space for entertaining guests.

^41^ Bellori 1976, 42. The earliest recorded evidence for the display of paintings in the gallery is Francesco Scanelli’s 1657 guidebook, which notes paintings by Guido Reni, Andrea Sacchi, and others; Scanelli 1666, 208, 354. In 1662, the gallery was described as “covered with . . . exquisite pictures, ornamented with majestic carved frames, gilded, under which with the needed distance one sees many statues, placed on carved and gilded pedestals.” The document is in the papers of notary Jacobus Simoncellus, in the ASR, and transcribed by Del Piazzo 1968, 101, no. 146.

^42^ For the inventory, see Garms 1972, 414–417. Along with the preponderance of sacred paintings is a portrait of Machiavelli that hangs near a Madonna and Child, Penitent Magdalene, and Crucifixion of St. Peter.

^43^ Cappelletti 1996a, 44 identified the Guercino; for the inventory citation, see Garms 1972, 417. For the paintings by Caravaggio and the Bruegel, see Garms 1972, 417–418. Cappelletti 1996a, 38 identified the Caravaggio, which Bellori 2005, 108 described in detail, noting that it “can be seen in Prince Pamphilj’s palace.” For the provenance of Jan Brueghel the Elder’s paintings, see the catalogue entries in Boccardo and Di Fabio 1996, 76–80. The *Terrestrial Paradise* cited is on panel, but Camillo also owned a version on copper (see Boccardo and Di Fabio 1996, 70). For Pieter Bruegel’s painting, see Safarik 1996, 38–39.

^44^ The inventory of the palace (ADP 88.40.3), taken on 20 December 1669, records no paintings in the gallery, but there are “Cinque statue alte p.mi otto in c.a dentro cinque
“it has nothing noteworthy except the ceiling of the very grand and superb gallery frescoed by Cortona.”

On the plus side, however, the despoilment of the palace in Piazza Navona provided a rich selection of paintings for the embellishment of the Palazzo al Collegio Romano, which became the new repository of the family collection.

5. The piano nobile Apartment of the Palazzo al Collegio Romano

Prince Giovanni Battista Pamphilj performed some of the most vital social rituals of the nobility, such as the all-important ceremony of the visit, in his piano nobile apartment, comprising two enfilades: the reception rooms facing the Piazza al Collegio Romano and the private rooms along the large courtyard (see fig. 2). The appearance of the enfilades accorded with their respective function, providing the appropriate visual settings for the activities that took place within them. The furnishings of the reception rooms where social rituals were enacted were luxurious (but not abundant), were appropriately marked with the prince’s emblems, and were well coordinated, with crimson being the color of choice.

Easel paintings played a primary role in the treatment of wall surfaces, displacing the more common options of fabrics, leather, tapestries, and frescoes. Changes between the prince’s two inventories indicate that, over time, the preference in these ample rooms was for paintings on canvas, of medium to

---

Saint-Non and Fragonard 1986, 151: “non ha nulla di notevole se non il soffitto di una grandissima e superba galleria affrescata dal Cortona.” Abbot Saint-Non, born Jean Baptiste Claude Richard (1727–1791) wrote a travel diary, Diario o note su un viaggio fatto in Italia.

Waddy 1999, 26–28 characterized the treatment of reception rooms.
large dimensions, with thematic unity among the subjects. Although many pictures were attributed to well-known painters with distinct styles, unattributed works of familiar or repetitious subjects, such as the Madonna and Child and landscapes, were freely integrated into the display. In the prince’s private rooms, the furnishings were generally sparser, the display of pictures was less cohesive, and the objects reflected the specific functions of the rooms, such as sleeping, studying, and playing music.

As the first reception room of the noble apartment, the salone set the stage with its sumptuous and coordinated decor (see fig. 2, no. 1).47 Crimson was the dominant color here, being applied to the six damask overdoors, the fabric hangings above the four windows, and the set of twelve velvet chairs. Other furniture included a large marble table with a red border that was marked with the prince’s emblems of lilies and stars in giallo antico; a small table with black ebony inlay; and a wood chest with spalliera, about a meter high, also marked by the Pamphilj Aldobrandini arms.48 Integrated into this display were the easel paintings that lined the walls. The flexibility of these movable objects meant that a group from the prince’s collection could be selected based on size, shape, and subject and arranged into a friezelike arrangement at the top of the walls, while others were chosen for the surfaces below. The inventories record that a change took place over time—both the number of paintings and the variety of subjects decreased—resulting in greater thematic unity among the pictures in the room.

Scholars have long recognized that a series of large landscapes was installed as a frieze in the salone in the late seventeenth century, but no one has discussed the important detail of the fictive statues painted in chiaroscuro interspersed with the unframed canvases, which effectively created a unified decorative system.49 Beginning on the western (or entrance) wall and moving counterclockwise, the eleven landscapes were probably hung thus: the seven of horizontal format and similar size (ca. 270 × 460 cm) by Gaspar Dughet and Guillaume Courtois of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel (fig. 12), Saint Mary of Egypt, Saint Augustine and the Holy Trinity, Saint John the Baptist, The Good Samaritan, and Saint Eustace; the unattributed horizontal hunting scene with a woman on a horse; two vertical paintings of the Temptation of Christ and the Flight into Egypt, both by Dughet; and the final vertical landscape (without figures) by Dughet’s pupil, Crescenzio Onofri. The last three paintings, measuring half the width of the others, were interposed between the windows on the wall facing the Collegio Romano.50 The lack of frames and the fictive statues in chiaroscuro integrated the canvases into their spatial environment in imitation of the landscape fresco friezes that had been popular in Roman palaces since the late sixteenth century. These included, to name but a few, the Vatican Palace cycles in the Torre dei Venti by Matthijs Bril (1582) and the Sala del Concistoro by Paul Bril (1600–1602); the frieze in the salone of the Palazzo Caetani (formerly Palazzo Mattei alle Botteghe) by Paul Bril; the friezes by Agostino Tassi and others in the piano nobile rooms of Palazzo Lancellotti (ca. 1625); and the landscapes, seascapes, and narratives set in landscapes in nearly all the rooms of the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona (1634–1650).51

48 Getty, I-537, fol. 112–114.
49 Getty, I-537, fol. 118. In the ca. 1680 inventory (Garms 1972, 317), “Figure grande” is written between the first and second paintings in the series, but scholars have not investigated the notation’s meaning.
50 In her monograph on Dughet, Boisclair 1986, 50–52 and cat. nos. 117–123; 84 and cat. nos. R.153–155 dated the seven horizontal paintings with sacred figures to 1652/1653 and attributed the two vertical canvases with religious narratives to Onofri. De Marchi 2008b, 102–103, 112–113 has recently shifted the date of the former group to 1653/1654 and reattributed the latter group to Jan Baptist Weenix and Pasquale Chiesa; in addition, he has identified the latter group as hanging in the Villa del Bel Respiro in Camillo’s 1666 inventory.
The installation of easel paintings in the salone, however, represents a different type of patronage activity; rather than commissioning a particular subject from a specific artist for a selected site, the existing inventory was evaluated and reused in a creative and functional way. The format of the paintings—horizontal versus vertical—seems to have been a primary selection criterion depending upon which wall the paintings were hung. And it is not surprising that landscape emerged as the theme, given the large number of such paintings already in the collection. The variety within this genre—nine landscapes with religious figures, a hunting scene, and a landscape without figures—supports the idea that the frieze represents an adaptation of these eleven paintings to the new environment rather than a reflection of their originally intended use.

In the room today, there is still a friezelike organization of landscape paintings, but the arrangement of the individual paintings has changed. They are framed, and the chiaroscuro figures have disappeared (fig. 13). As noted above, the medium of oil on canvas differentiated this frieze from the frescoes typically found in Roman palaces. Indeed, in other cases where oil-on-canvas easel paintings were

---

52 On Camillo’s penchant for landscape and especially Dughet, see De Marchi 2008b, 103, 105. On the earliest documented landscape paintings in Roman collections, dating to the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and the increasing diffusion of landscapes around 1620, see Cavazzini 2008, 108, with further bibliography.

53 Scholars had assumed that Camillo intended to display these landscapes in the salone, but De Marchi has recently argued that they initially hung in different residences belonging to Camillo (five at his palace in Nettuno) and that they were moved to the salone under Giovanni Battista’s auspices; Cappelletti 2008b, 44–46, with De Marchi’s annotation; De Marchi 2008b, 99–115.

54 Cavazzini 2001, 215 writes that the trend for landscape frescoes developed into the market for easel paintings of landscapes in part because it was easier to paint on canvas than to fresco.
hung in saloni, they were not normally arranged in this way (that is to say, in friezes). For example, Paul Bril’s *Feudi Mattei* series, the large landscapes (1.55 × 2.2 m) depicting the family’s fiefs, was hung as overdoors in the salone of the Palazzo Mattei (ca. 1601).\(^55\) The 1644 inventory of Cardinal Antonio Barberini records four large triangular paintings of saints, two by Andrea Sacchi, one by Lanfranco, and one by Gianlorenzo Bernini, in the Barberini salone. Although the inventory does not indicate their placement, their shape certainly precludes a friezelike arrangement.\(^56\) In the salone of the Palazzo Chigi at Santi Apostoli (later the Palazzo Chigi-Odescalchi), the four large rectangular paintings (14 × 17 palmi) of moralizing themes by Bernardino Mei probably covered the entire wall surfaces, according to Waddy’s calculations.\(^57\)

The treatment of the Pamphilj salone also differed from the Mattei, Barberini, and Chigi saloni in that numerous independent pictures were hung below the frieze. At the time of the ca. 1680 inventory, fifty-five paintings of diverse themes—mostly landscapes and devotional subjects but also sacred narratives, portraits, allegories, and genre scenes—were recorded.\(^58\) Among the history paintings were Giorgio Vasari’s *Deposition of Christ*, which Camillo had purchased from the fathers

---

56 For an old photograph showing how they might have been hung originally, see Waddy 1990, 218. Waddy discussed the display of the paintings in the Barberini salone at the Getty conference, “The Display of Art in Roman Palaces, 1550–1750” and has kindly shared her reference with me: Lavin 1975, 158: IV.inv.44 (now BAV, Arch. Barb., Ind. II, no. 2439).
57 The paintings were installed in 1664. Waddy 1990, 304, based on the documentation in Golzio 1939, 6, 14, 70 (no. 1105). Waddy also discusses this decorative scheme in the aforementioned forthcoming publication by the Getty Research Institute.
58 For the inventory, see Garms 1972, 317–318. A similar mixture of sacred and secular images is found in the *sale* of non-noble Roman houses; Cavazzini 2008, 99.
of Sant’Agostino in Rome, and the large *Tribute Money*, which Camillo commissioned from Mattia Preti.59 Another large-scale painting by Preti of “diverse figures singing” is likely the *Concert* in the present collection. Given the proximity of the two Preti paintings in the inventory, it seems the large-scale figural works were paired as formal counterparts rather than thematic ones. Velázquez’s *Portrait of Innocent X* (see fig. 7) must have stood out as the only portrait in the installation, especially considering its large size and visually arresting character.60 Its move to the *salone* (possibly from the room where Camillo had died) endowed it with the function of providing a visual reminder of the current prince’s illustrious pedigree.

At some point between the first inventory and 1709, the installation in the *salone* was transformed from a variety of subjects and abundance of paintings into a thematically unified group of landscape paintings.61 All of the paintings in the ca. 1680 inventory, except for those in the frieze, were removed, and only seven other paintings were hung on the walls. The difference in number might have been compensated, at least partially, by their large size: *four tele imperatori* (6 × 4 palmi), two by “Monsù Gio: Cosciò Fiamingo,” respectively representing a seascape and a wooded landscape with a figure kneeling before an image of the Madonna, and two unattributed seascapes; a horizontal landscape by Dughet (12 × 16 palmi); and the *Nativity with the Adoration of the Shepherds* by a “good Lombard hand” (7½ palmi wide); and Ciro Ferri’s *Noah and the Ark* (18 × 11 palmi). Neither the unattributed *Nativity* nor Ferri’s *Noah and the Ark* has been identified, so it is impossible to know what they looked like, but their subjects imply a landscape and seascape respectively. Prior to my analysis of Giovanni Battista’s inventories, the thematic unity expressed in this room had been associated with Prince Andrea IV Doria Pamphilj’s reinstallation of the collection in the late eighteenth century.62 It is now clear that the 1709 installation offered an important precedent for installing landscapes in this room both as a frieze and on the walls below. However, the two installations differed in that the 1709 arrangement featured eighteen paintings total, whereas the late-eighteenth-century arrangement increased the number to forty-nine.63

Since at least the early seventeenth century, thematic organization had been applied selectively as a guiding principle in the display of Italian collections.64 Portraiture was the most common theme: in 1627 Cardinal Del Monte’s *sala* contained 277 portraits of *viri illustri*; and in 1644 an anteroom of the Palazzo Barberini held thirty-six portraits.65 There was a room in the ground floor apartment of this same palace dedicated to landscapes, but unlike Pamphilj’s *salone* it was not a part of the noble apartment.66 Pamphilj’s brother, Cardinal Benedetto, filled many of his rooms in the Palazzo Aldobrandini al Corso with the minor genres, but not one room is exclusively dedicated to a single subject type.67 The anteroom of the three-part gallery on the *piano nobile* of Palazzo Colonna was installed with easel paintings of landscapes, many by Gaspar Dughet and Claude Lorrain, between

59 On the Vasari, see Cappelletti 2008b, 50; it was purchased in 1661 for 150 scudi. On the Preti, see Cappelletti 1996b, 10.
60 Cappelletti 1996a, 50 has argued that the painting seems to have held pride of place here, for it was not displayed with other family portraits, as was typical, and the painter is noted in the inventory, which is unusual for portraits in seventeenth-century inventories.
62 Cappelletti 2008c, 80–81.
63 The number of paintings in the late-eighteenth-century installation is indicated in the diagram of the room attributed to Nicoletti; ADP, Francesco Nicoletti (attr. a), Allestimento della Galleria.
64 Waddy 1990, 58; Rudolph 1995, 108; Squarzina 1997b, 109; Cappelletti 2008c, 82; Cavazzini 2008, 86–95; Paul 2008, 8–18.
65 On Del Monte, see Jones 2004, 82. On the Barberini, see Waddy 1990, 58.
66 Waddy 1990, 58.
67 For his 1725 inventory, see Ammannato 1999, 239–245.
1697 and 1700.68 Both this room and Prince Pamphilj’s salone are notable for privileging oil-on-canvas landscape paintings in a major reception room of a noble palace.

The display of paintings in the antecamera (see fig. 2, no. 2), with matching overdoors and few furnishings (a set of eight chairs, a small table, and a pedestal for displaying a bust), also underwent a dramatic transformation during the prince’s lifetime.69 In the ca. 1680 inventory the pictures represented a mix of subjects and genres, and among the attributed ones are several seventeenth-century masters from diverse schools: Caravaggio’s Saint John the Baptist Seated with a Ram, Annibale Carracci’s Satyr with a Youth and Latona, Lanfranco’s Galatea, Tornioli’s St. Peter, Giovanni Francesco Romanelli’s Erminia with the Shepherd, Mattia Preti’s Hagar, and two Claude Lorrain landscapes.70 By 1709 all of these pictures had been removed, and only one painting was hung: Pier Francesco Mola’s large (11 1/2 × 8 1/2 palmi) vertical canvas of the Virgin and Child adored by angels set in a landscape.71 We might expect that the walls were recovered with fabric or leather at this time, given that paintings no longer covered their surfaces, but the inventory does not indicate a new treatment.

The privileged function of the audience room (see fig. 2, no. 3), the space where the prince received his guests, was reflected in the greater density and heightened splendor of its material goods, which fulfilled Camillo Pamphilj’s vision of a noble apartment in the “Italian style,” as a sumptuous space designed to impart a feeling of respect and reverence to its visitors.72 The variety of objects and materials included crimson damask overdoors with coordinated fabric hangings above the windows; twelve French chairs in crimson Moroccan leather with gilded lilies; a table of diaspro di Sicilia supported by four harpies with cartouches, leaves, and festoons; four small tables of breccia di Francia (5 1/2 × 3 palmi) on a walnut wood and gilded base with lion’s feet; a large mirror with a complex crystal frame surrounded by another frame of gilded wood and a crimson taffeta covering; and a vase in the form of an oval shell made of “Oriental alabastro,” with two handles in the form of cartouches.73 Coordinated with this decor was the baldachin of crimson damask with gold trim measuring 22 palmi high by 12 palmi wide, with a piece of leather hanging (corame) about 39 1/2 palmi long by 20 palmi wide. Given its size, the leather hanging might have covered the entire wall where the baldachin was located. Princely palaces typically featured a baldachin in the salone, and sometimes a second one in the audience room, but here the latter was the only space so equipped.74 Underneath the baldachin hung, as was traditionally the case, the portrait of the reigning pope, Clement XI (1700–1721), which replaced the one of Innocent XI recorded in the earlier inventory.75

The material splendor of the audience room was further enriched and distinguished from the previous two reception rooms, through the medium of marble sculpture. The family pontiff, Innocent X, was represented in this room by a marble bust carved by Alessandro Algardi, and four other marble busts by a modern hand depicted unnamed emperors. This grouping drew upon the

---

68 Strunck 2007a and 2007b has rewritten the history of the Colonna gallery. See also Borghese 2009, 15–23. For a cogent discussion on the diffusion of landscapes in Roman collections: Cappelletti and Cavazzini 2011.

69 Garms 1972, 318–319; Getty, I-537, fols. 118–120.

70 Except for Tornioli’s St. Peter and Carracci’s Latona, works on these subjects by these painters remain in the GDP today; Cappelletti 1996b, 96, 100, 105, 111, 112. The generic titles of the Claude Lorrain landscapes make it impossible to relate them to existing paintings.

71 The painting is no longer in the GDP.

72 Cappelletti 2008b, 36 cited Camillo’s quotation: “imprimere intanto nel straniero che gli va parlare con gran rispetto e riverenza della sua persona, mentre contempla la suntuosità della sua casa.” The passage refers to Camillo’s palace in Terranova but is also relevant to the Palazzo al Collegio Romano. The document, ADP 91.80, is in Garms 1972, 145 no. 631.

73 Getty, I-537, fols. 120–123.

74 On the location of baldachins, see Waddy 1990, 12–13.

tradition for displaying a series of twelve emperor busts in noble palaces, albeit in a much truncated iteration.\textsuperscript{76} Both the gallery of the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona and the principal entrance of the Villa del Bel Respiro featured the standard number of twelve emperor busts.\textsuperscript{77}

The number of paintings in the audience room remained nearly constant (twenty-eight versus thirty-three) from the first to the second inventory, but in the later document, religious subjects increased (from sixteen to thirty-one) while nonreligious themes decreased (from twelve to two), resulting in greater thematic unity.\textsuperscript{78} As in the other reception rooms, the majority of paintings were medium- to large-scale oil paintings on canvas; in 1709 twenty of the thirty-three paintings were larger than \textit{tela da testa} (2 $\times$ 3 palmi).\textsuperscript{79} In the earlier inventory all of the Guercino paintings—\textit{Erminia Discovers the Wounded Tancred} (probably moved from the Piazza Navona palace), \textit{Saint John the Baptist}, \textit{Prodigal Son}, \textit{Saint Agnes}, \textit{Endymion} (fig. 14, moved here from the Villa del Bel Respiro), and \textit{Samson}—were hung in this room.\textsuperscript{80} The first four are listed consecutively, which suggests they were hung next to one another, and the final two seem to be nearby. By 1709 the \textit{Erminia} had been removed, but the others remained, leaving the \textit{Endymion} as the only mythological painting (previously Lanfranco’s \textit{Galatea} and Sacchi’s \textit{Dedaelus and Icarus} were also present) and one of only two nonreligious subjects in the room. This Guercino picture alongside the other Guercinos in the collection would have encouraged viewers to compare, study, and appreciate a fine selection from the painter’s oeuvre.\textsuperscript{81}

Based on her interpretation of Giulio Mancini’s early-seventeenth-century treatise on art, Frances Gage has recently argued that scholars should look beyond the dominant values of wealth, prestige, and style in studying the arrangement of collections and consider how the rhetorical function of paintings “informed viewing practices within Roman collections in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.”\textsuperscript{82} Seen in this way, the religious subjects in Pamphilj’s audience room provided persuasive models of piety and devotion and offered tangible signs of the prince’s own practice of these virtues.\textsuperscript{83} While the images of the Madonna and Child and saints presented easily comprehensible exemplars of Christian behavior, the appearance of Saints Agnes and John the Baptist promoted the specific cults with which the prince and his family identified. The former served as a visual reminder of the Pamphilj’s good works in venerating Saint Agnes through the monumental new church in Piazza Navona, dedicated under Giovanni Battista’s auspices, and the latter represented the prince’s own personal spiritual advocate, who was also the patron saint of Innocent X. The sacred narratives in the room also offered moralizing messages, such as the steadfast faith in God displayed in the story

\textsuperscript{76} Getty, I-537, fols. 123–124. The bust is reproduced in Montagu 1985, 2:fig. 172.

\textsuperscript{77} The busts in the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona are cited in Camillo’s 1666 inventory; Garms 1972, 414. Tessin 2002, 181 noted the series at the villa during his journey to Rome from 1673 to 1677. A comparative example is the series in the Palazzo Borghese; Hibbard 1962; Paul 2008, 71.

\textsuperscript{78} Garms 1972, 319–320. Getty, I-537, fols. 120–131. Among the removed paintings was the portrait of \textit{Luther and Calvin} attributed to Giorgione, now thought to be the humanists Andrea Navagero and Agostino Beazzano by Raphael, which came from the Aldobrandini collection. It was recorded by Bellori in the Villa Aldobrandini at Montemagnanapoli in 1664; Cappelletti 1996b, 34. Its inclusion represents a rare instance of an Aldobrandini painting incorporated into the display of the Pamphilj collection.

\textsuperscript{79} There were three smaller than \textit{tela da testa}, ten \textit{tela da testa}, nine between \textit{tela da testa} and \textit{tela d’imperatore}, and eleven greater than \textit{tela d’imperatore}.

\textsuperscript{80} All but the \textit{Samson} remain in the GDP; Cappelletti 1996b, 101, 105; Cappelletti 2008b, 32–53; Stone 1991, 70, 242, 286, 296. On the \textit{Endymion}, see Cieri Via 1996, 162–164; De Marchi 2011.

\textsuperscript{81} McClellan 1994, 4 discusses the grouping of works by a single artist for this purpose, using the princely collection at Dusseldorf as an example.

\textsuperscript{82} Gage 2011 (quotation, 78).

\textsuperscript{83} On pictorial decoration in a domestic setting as an extension of the patron, see Dunlop 2009, 35–41.
of Abraham and Isaac, in the painting attributed to Anthony Van Dyck. The prince held audience within this pictorial framework of good Christian behavior.

In the 1709 inventory all but two of the attributed paintings in the audience room (fifteen of thirty-three are attributed) are the works of seventeenth-century masters, which recalls Giulio Mancini’s novel advice to collectors, in his *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (1620), to organize works by century but not to display works only of the same school. The installation recorded in 1709 provided a mechanism for comparing seventeenth-century paintings of different schools and styles: Caravaggio and Niccolò Tornioli (who assimilated aspects of the former’s style), Barocci, Guercino, Pietro da Cortona and his student Giovanni Francesco Romanelli, Rubens, and Van Dyck. If Mancini’s ideas were indeed a factor in the conception of this display, they were not rigidly applied since relatively early “Old Master” paintings, Giovanni Bellini’s *Circumcision* and Garofalo’s *Visitation of St. Elizabeth*, were interspersed among the seventeenth-century works. In this sense, the selection of paintings in the audience room accords with Carole Paul’s characterization of display practices in

---

84 Mancini 1956, ch. 10 “Regole per comprare collocare e conservare le piture,” esp. 144–145. De Benedictis 1998, 104–105 identified Mancini’s chronological and stylistic organization as novel but notes that it was not typically adhered to.

85 Neither the Rubens nor the Van Dyck is in the GDP today. In the ca. 1680 inventory Tornioli’s *St. Peter* was in the “Anticamera grande”; Garms 1972, 519.
seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Italian collections as essentially “unsystematic”; that is, works by different artists, schools, and time periods were mixed rather than following the chronological arrangement advocated by Mancini but achieved only in the second half of the eighteenth century. Paul has argued that this mixed type of display gave owners the means to endow their collection with “a unified purpose” while facilitating the comparative viewing practices expounded in the later seventeenth-century treatises of André Félibien and Roger de Piles. The aim, in this case, was to hone and test connoisseurship skills like discerning the artist, time period, and school.

After passing through a small, sparsely furnished room (see fig. 2, no. 4), one arrived at the longitudinal space described as “in the form of a gallery,” which functioned as the site of display for the zampanaro (representational bed) and paintings. On the eighteenth-century plan, a wall is shown subdividing the gallery into two spaces (see fig. 2, no. 5). This type of representational space, after the audience room and before the prince’s private rooms, had become customary in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Called a letto da riposo in the inventory, the bed was made of two benches (11 × 10½ palmi each) covered with crimson fabrics. The other furnishings were coordinated: eight chairs “in the French style” with crimson Moroccan leather and two mirrors with crimson velvet frames. The latter must have added a splendid quality to the room. Besides two paintings of the Madonna, there were six landscapes: Claude Lorrain’s View of Delphi with Procession and Landscape with Dancing Figures, which came from the villa, and four slightly smaller, unattributed paintings (see fig. 6). This symbolic space was sumptuous, well coordinated, and unified thematically; the display of two large landscapes by Claude Lorrain situated the prince among the privileged group of Roman collectors who owned works by this celebrated landscape painter.

Abundant and luxurious furnishings distinguished the privileged space of the chapel, which was a large, distinct space that projected at a right angle from the trapezoidal wing and communicated with Santa Maria in Via Lata through a corretto, or small choir, from which the prince could hear Mass in the church (see fig. 2, no. 6). The chapel’s walls were covered with many pieces of red brocatelle, and there were several stools, a few chairs, and two prie-dieu to accommodate the prince and his guests, but the greatest density of objects was on the two altars. The high altar supported a lunette-shaped altarpiece of a Pietà, identified as a copy of Annibale Carracci, a large ivory cross with a gilded figure of the Crucified Christ wearing a silver crown of thorns, six candelabras, an altar frontal covered in silver leaf, altar linens, and a missal with the Pamphilj coat of arms. Behind it was a large walnut credenza containing numerous chalices and other accouterments of the Mass. On the lateral altar was Jusepe de Ribera’s painting of St. Jerome.

86 Paul 2008, 8–18. McClellan has discussed the development of chronology as a guiding principle in the hanging of collections; see n. 4 above.
87 Getty, I-537, fols. 132–133 (“Nella Stanza piccolo che segue vicino alla Cappella che hà le due fenestre verso il Cortile”); fols. 134–138 (“Stanza che segue alla Sudetta fattà à forma di Galleria”). The usefulness of the ca. 1680 inventory diminishes at this point because it is mostly organized into general groupings rather than individual rooms.
88 Waddy 1990, 13, 19.
89 The measurements of View of Delphi with Procession and Landscape with Dancing Figures differ between the 1666 inventory (9 × 6½ palmi) and the 1709 inventory (about 8 × 6 palmi); Garms 1972, 335 and Getty, I-537, fol. 137.
90 On Roman collectors of Claude Lorrain paintings, see Beaven 2005, with further bibliography.
91 Getty, I-537, fols. 160–180. For Carlo Fontana’s work in the chapel in 1681, see Montalto 1955, 271. It has since undergone two renovations, by Francesco Nicoletti in the eighteenth century and Andrea Busiri Vici in the nineteenth century; Carandente 1975, 148–150.
92 Getty, I-537, fol. 179. The description of the painting—St. Jerome seated with a book on his knee and other books and a skull below his left elbow—does not exactly match the Ribera St. Jerome that is presently in the GDP. The latter shows the saint with a scroll on his lap rather than a book on his knee.
space, Giovanni Battista displayed images of appropriately devotional subjects, which also carried the names of well-known painters.

The more modest treatment of the enfilade flanking the large courtyard suggests that the rooms held less symbolic value, and in fact the prince’s private rooms were located here. In the first two rooms (see fig. 2, nos. 7 and 8) were crimson overdoors of ormesino (a light silk) and additional large pieces of this fabric with cords and tassels, perhaps forming curtains around the doors. There were only a few paintings: in the first room two landscapes “in the style of Bril,” and in the second only a Madonna and Child, inscribed “Alberto Durer Germano faciebat,” in an ornate frame of ivory and lapis lazuli, whose rich materials demonstrated reverence for this image.93 Following the sparse third room was the prince’s bedroom (see fig. 2, no. 10), which is distinguished by a greater density of material goods: a grisaille frieze with the Pamphilj emblems, two overdoors of crimson ormesino, a bed with coverings, a prie-dieu, small tables of inlay, and eight stools covered in green velvet.94 All three images are religious: an “antique” copper picture of the Madonna and Child and four small angels playing instruments; the Holy Face of Christ with instruments of the Passion printed on a white silk cloth in a frame of black pear wood; and St. Liborius before the Madonna and Child on red taffeta in a frame of white wood. The materials underscore the variety of supports used for paintings, while the subjects presumably met the devotional needs of the prince. Further fulfilling his spiritual needs was the small chapel in the passageway between his bedroom and the service room to the west (see fig. 2, nos. 11 and 12).95 The objects in the final large room of the enfilade indicate that it functioned as the prince’s study and music room: numerous books of musical scores by composers in the Pamphilj employ, such as Archangelo Corelli, Alessandro Scarlatti, and Alessandro Melani; a large globe by Father Vincenzo Coronelli; a painting of Naples; and functional pieces of wood furniture (see fig. 2, no. 13).96 The location implies that the room functioned as an intimate space for the prince’s delectation and study of music along with other personal pursuits.

6. The Winter Apartment

The prince’s winter apartment, containing a sala, prima anticamera, stanza del Teatro, seconda anticamera, stanza, camera, stanza del Trucco, and stanza, had fewer pictures and was less sumptuously decorated than his principal apartment but nevertheless contained the expected trappings of nobility. The furnishings suggest a less formal use than the reception rooms on the piano nobile, and certain rooms were dedicated to entertainment. The inventory does not indicate where the apartment was located, but the approximate height of one room (16 palmi) implies a lower ceiling, revealing that it was located on a mezzanine or upper floor. The occupant of this apartment is also unclear, since the camera is specifically labeled as the room where Prince Giovanni Battista slept in the winter, but there are other indications that his wife might have used these rooms. The Facchinnetti arms are found in combination with the Pamphilj Aldobrandini arms in the furnishings of the sala and prima anticamera, and at the end of the series was the “contiguous Stanza that goes

93 Getty, I-537, fols. 138–141.

94 Getty, I-537, fols. 142–147.

95 Getty, I-537, fols. 147–150. The varied furnishings in the "service" room suggest such a use.

96 Getty, I-537, fols. 151–160. The furniture included a table, chest, and credenza.
to the Refectory of the Women Attendants of Sig[nor]a P[ri]n[c]essa D[onna] Violante,” which was decorated with tapestries representing women hunters, and the “Stanza of the Refectory of the Women Attendants.”

It is unheard of for the women attendants’ rooms to communicate with the prince’s living quarters, so we can be sure at the very least that the room before the refectory had to belong to Princess Violante.

The first few rooms in the winter apartment were relatively plain in comparison to the reception rooms on the piano nobile, which suggests a less symbolic function, and the furniture reinforces the impression of a less formal use. The sala contained only some large chests, two scabelloni (stools), and a fabric hanging around the door to the anticamera. The latter room was somewhat more sumptuous, with damask overdoors—green being the color of choice in the winter apartment—matching sets of painted wooden scabelloni (large stools) and leather “sedie d’appoggio,” two large ebony inlaid sideboards, a bed that doubled as a table, and two easel paintings. The next room, the stanza del Teatro, held only a few pieces of equipment used to erect scenery for the theatrical performances that took place here.

The rooms that followed were more amply furnished with coordinated decorative schemes. The seconda anticamera was unified in appearance, kept warm by tapestries of garden imagery, and embellished with five pictures, four by Bassano and a Ciro Ferri copy of the Madonna and Child, whose placement in relation to the tapestries is unclear. In the contiguous stanza, rather than tapestries covering the walls, there were eleven easel paintings representing a mix of religious subjects and landscapes. A chiaroscuro frieze of the Pamphilj emblems of an olive branch and lily, painted on canvas, unified the room, while the daybed suggests an informal use. The prince’s bedroom that followed was treated as a romitorio (hermitage), a space for contemplation, and was decorated with a type of wall decoration that was less expensive than tapestries or fabrics. For here a single, large canvas painted in gouache, with a chiaroscuro foliate frieze and views of sky, woodlands, and sea, hosting sacred narratives, was installed on the walls. This decorative scheme follows the tradition of depicting religious figures in vast natural settings, a format that was intended to stimulate contemplation and devotion in both secular and sacred spaces. In the stanza del Trucco, the set of tapestries depicting hunting scenes suggests its seasonal use, following the tradition for tapestries of rural subjects exemplified by five rooms in Queen Christina of Sweden’s palace. Two objects—a large wooden piece of furniture called a trucco ($25\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ palmi) used in playing the homonymous game, and a studioletto containing a small organ—indicate its use for entertaining. Both the wall decoration and the objects would have made this room conducive to leisure activities.

97 For the sala and prima anticamera, Getty, I-537, 181–185. On the room next to the refectory and the refectory, Getty, I-537, fol. 199–208. The next entry is the kitchen located downstairs.


99 Getty, I-537, fol. 185.

100 Getty, I-537, fols. 185–189. The Bassano canvases represent Christ Crowned with Thorns before Caiaphas, Noah’s Ark, Orpheus Playing His Violin, and the Nativity with the Adoration of the Shepherds. In Camillo’s inventory, there are two versions of Noah’s Ark by Bassano, one measuring 6 × 7\frac{1}{2} palmi and the other 5 × 4 palmi; the latter is close to the one in Giovanni Battista’s apartment that measures 4\frac{1}{2} × 4 palmi. The measurements of the Adoration of the Shepherds also differ (6\frac{1}{2} × 4\frac{1}{2} palmi in the 1666 inventory versus 5\frac{1}{2} × 4 in the 1709 inventory). For the 1666 inventory, see Garms 1972, 334, 337, 344.


103 Waddy 1999, 31; Cappelletti 2003. Murals painted on large pieces of canvas were also employed in the contemporary decoration of the second floor apartment of the Palazzo Cancelleria by Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni; Olszewski 1999, 97, 102.

104 Getty, I-537, fols. 194–199. On Queen Christina’s living quarters, see Olszewski 1999, 103.
7. The Mezzanine Apartment

After describing five rooms belonging to the women, the inventory arrives at the sumptuously decorated mezzanine apartment, which appears to be dedicated to the display of art.\(^{105}\) Like other apartments for art in Roman palaces, this six-room suite (four stanze, a camera, and a gabinetto) overlooking the large courtyard and situated above the prince’s private rooms was accessible from the prince’s piano nobile apartment but also distinct from it.\(^{106}\) The staircase contiguous to his anticamera (see fig. 2, no. 2) and his camera (see fig. 2, no. 10) made the mezzanine accessible from both his private suite and his reception rooms, with which its crimson color scheme was coordinated.\(^{107}\) The overdoors are an additional indication that visitors were allowed in. At the time of the prince’s death, the fifth room was identified as Violante Facchinetti’s camera, and although it was common for a wife’s rooms to be above her husband’s, it seems unusual for her apartment to communicate directly with his public reception rooms in this way.\(^{108}\) It is unclear how to interpret the conflicting information of his possessions in the mezzanine rooms but her apparent use of them, at least at the time of the 1709 inventory. The main question that it raises is: did the prince or the princess use these rooms? Although we are unable to answer this question, one thing is clear: these rooms with their ornate and abundant furniture (each stanza had between twelve and twenty chairs or stools) were outfitted for accommodating guests. The prevalence of scabelletti (small stools) and tavolini (small tables) underscores the small scale of the objects and the space. In the mezzanine the display of art accorded with the baroque “a incrostazione” taste and differed from the installation of the piano nobile reception rooms in several ways: the density of pictures, the prevalence of the minor genres, the small size of many works, the diversity of media, and the organizational principle of variety. In combination, these characteristics seem to have been intended to elicit close viewing in a more intimate setting. Groupings of themes—minor genres in the second stanza and sacred subjects and landscapes in the fourth—imposed some organization on the wide mix of painters from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries. The mixture of styles, especially for a single subject such as landscape, seems conducive to the practice of comparative viewing, making this apartment the right environment for practicing connoisseurship skills and delighting in the viewing of art.

The sheer density of pictures—253 total with 249 concentrated in the first four stanze—makes it clear that art played a central role in the appearance of these rooms, and the abundance of small paintings of the minor genres might have encouraged viewers to interact differently with these works than they would with the larger paintings on the piano nobile.\(^{109}\) A greater variety of minor

---

\(^{105}\) Getty, I-537, fols. 225–281. In the ca. 1680 inventory transcribed by Garm 1972, 321–324, the paintings in the mezzanine are grouped together rather than being listed by room, whereas in the 1709 inventory the rooms and their contents are listed individually. There appear to be many overlaps of paintings between the inventories. The greater detail of the later inventory renders it more useful for understanding the disposition and decoration of the mezzanine. Cappelletti 1996a, 17 published Giovanni Battista’s payments for decorative work in the mezzanine.

\(^{106}\) Getty, I-537, fol. 275: “Nella camera della Sig.ra Principessa Madre Donna Violante sudetta.” In the copy of the inventory in the ASR, the notation, “rintenuti da d.a S. ra Principessa Madre” was inserted between “Nelli mezzanini, che corrispondono verso il Cortile grande” and “P.ma Stanza.”

\(^{107}\) On examples in other Roman palaces, see Waddy 1999, 28–29.

\(^{108}\) Cappelletti and Cavazzini 2011, 79–83 have noted the differences in type between the landscapes in the piano nobile apartment and the mezzanine apartment in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano and have argued generally that varietas was a defining characteristic of landscape collections in seventeenth-century Rome.

\(^{109}\) Getty, I-537, fol. 118.
genres were represented; whereas only portraits, landscapes, and the occasional seascape were displayed below, on this level there were also still life, battle scenes, genre scenes, perspectives, and vedute. The largest category after landscape was still life, with forty-nine examples. As a subject that imitated the details of nature, this genre encouraged close observation, as did the descriptive naturalism characteristic of Flemish and Netherlandish paintings like the thirteen works attributed to various members of the Bruegel family. As Vincenzo Giustiniani wrote: “The other way is to make landscapes with greater diligence, observing every minute detail of whatever thing as Civetta, Bruegel, Bril and others, for the most part Flemings, patiently depict the things of nature with much distinction.”

The small dimensions of these pieces—many were described as quadretto and a few as miniatura—and the variety of media producing different effects—wood panel, canvas, copper, slate, mirror, glass, silk, and drawings in pen, chalk or watercolor on paper and parchment—are further characteristics that seem to solicit intimate viewing, an appropriate activity in an exhibition space.

This general air of variety, abundance, and sumptuousness reached an apogee in the second stanza, where both sculpture and paintings filled the room. The walls were covered with eighty-eight pictures, mostly of the minor genres, including a few battle scenes and a cityscape. But the majority comprised over thirty landscapes, some with sacred figures like Annibale Carracci’s Mary Magdalene and Ludovico Carracci’s Saint Eustachio, and about the same number of still life, twenty-eight of which were miniatures on parchment depicting birds. In addition, there were a few religious narratives like the three of St. Anthony’s life by Mantegna. Attributions to these and other well-known painters, such as Scarsellino, members of the Bruegel family, Paul Bril, and Claude Lorrain, suggest that prized works were displayed here. Furthermore, the concentration of landscapes with or without figures by painters from different schools, Bruegel, Bril, the Carracci, and Claude Lorrain, would have allowed visitors to compare different styles for representing nature. Jan Bruegel the Elder’s Allegories of Earth, Air, Water and Fire (see fig. 11) and the three “incendi” attributed to “Brugolo il vecchio” are likely the same panels hung in the Piazza Navona palace in the 1666 inventory. The pictorial display was enhanced by twelve marble sculptures, some antique and some modern: a few unidentified busts, a Venus, “an ancient figure in white marble of a nude man, that holds in his right hand a club and in his left hand a horn,” a small nude Bacchus, three Cupids, and an “Amorino.” This combination of paintings and statuary recalls spaces for the display of art in other Roman palaces, such as the galleries of Vincenzo Giustiniani (ca. 1621–1638) and Cardinal Camillo Massimo (built 1673–1677). The installation of amorous mythological sculpture in the mezzanine apartment might have inspired Giovanni Battista’s son, Camillo Filippo, to create the “stanza delle Veneri,” with paintings of Venus by Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto, and others in this same space when he occupied the apartment a few years later.

---

110 Giustiniani 1981, 42: “L’altro modo é di far paesi con maggior diligenza, osservando ogni minuzia di qualsivoglia cosa come hanno dipinto il Civetta, Brugolo, Brillo, ed altri, per lo più Fiamminghi, pazienti in far le cose dal natural con molta distinzione.” On the taste for Jan Bruegel the Elder in Roman collections, see Bedoni 1983, ch. 2. On the taste for small-scale paintings by northern European painters in early-seventeenth-century Rome, see Cappelletti 2001.

111 Getty, I-537, fols. 231–245.

112 On their location in 1666, see p. 193 above. Getty, I-537, fols. 236–238. The detailed description of the Allegories of Earth, Air, Water and Fire exactly matches the existing paintings in the GDP. There is also a S. Cristoforo attributed to Bruegel the Elder.


114 On Giustiniani’s gallery, see Strunck 2001, 105. On Massimo’s gallery, see Beaven 2010, 259–293.

115 On the “stanza delle Veneri,” see Cappelletti 1996c. She did not connect the installation of the painted Venuses to the earlier sculptural installation.
Variety and sumptuousness also characterized the appearance of the other three stanze. In the third stanza the fifty-five pictures, mostly of the minor genres, were by a range of artists like Garofalo, Dosso Dossi, Civetta, Cavaliere d’Arpino, Albani, and Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione, along with artists like Braindergh Olandese and Giovanni da Valine whose oeuvres have been lost to us today. Enhancing the variety of the wall surfaces through the effects of light were two mirrors with flowers painted by Mario de’ Fiori, a popular type of decoration in Roman palaces in the second half of the seventeenth century. The materials of the furniture and precious objects added to the room’s ornateness: velvet-covered scabelletti, chairs “alla Spagnola da camera” with crimson damask, three small tables veneered in ebony, four small vases of “vetro turchino” with trim and handles of gilded copper, and a bronze statuette of the martyr Saint Agnes, partially gilded in silver and gold, on a pedestal of diaspro di Sicilia.

With the sixty-six pictures in the fourth stanza, the ratio of minor genres and religious subjects was inverted: thirty-eight were sacred narratives or devotional works. The repeated theme of the Madonna and Child, represented in paintings by Perugino, Correggio, Annibale Carracci, Ludovico Carracci, Albani, and Guercino, would have allowed viewers to compare the treatment of this common devotional subject by different painters, perhaps discerning similarities in style among the Bolognese painters in this group. And one wonders whether visitors might have compared the painting on canvas of Christ on the Cross, a copy of Michelangelo Buonarroti “by the hand of Carracci,” with the framed drawing of Christ on the Cross, “it is said” by Michelangelo Buonarroti, to discern differences between copy and original, painting and drawing, and Michelangelo and Carracci’s interpretation of this subject. The careful distinction between copies and originals and the details given in attributing works in this inventory suggest that authorship mattered to the complier and, by extension, to the owner as well as the members of his anticipated audience. Landscapes, sixteen in all, represent the second most prevalent theme in the room. One can be traced to the Villa del Bel Respiro in Camillo’s 1666 inventory due to its unusual theme and specific description: Claude Lorrain’s “Apollo who plays the viola, and Mercury who steals the cattle,” which remains in the collection today (fig. 15). The description of Albani’s Madonna, Child and St. Joseph in a Landscape serves as a reminder of the movement of paintings. According to the notation in the 1709 inventory, before his death Prince Pamphilj ordered that the painting be given to Clement XI; at the taking of the inventory, only the empty frame remained on the wall!

The final two rooms held fewer pictures but were nevertheless richly furnished with a variety of materials. A frieze of crimson velvet with a matching overdoor unified the camera, which also contained small tables of inlaid ebony and ivory, crimson velvet chairs, three ornate silver objects, and a bed with matching crimson damask. The gabinetto seems to have functioned as a study, offering a comfortable space for relaxation and personal pursuits with a mix of furnishings: a bookcase, cantarano, prie-dieu, and an “ordinary bed.” The presence of a cymbal suggests that music was

---

116 Getty, I-537, fols. 248–249. In 1660 the Colonna commissioned painted mirrors from Mario de’ Fiori working in collaboration with Carlo Maratti; Safarik 1999, 136. Giovanni Battista Pamphilj’s brother, Cardinal Benedetto Pamphilj, also owned two painted mirrors; the flowers on his were painted by the Stanchi brothers; Leone 2011, 118.

117 For all of the objects in the third stanza, Getty, I-537, fols. 246–256.

118 Getty, I-537, fols. 259, 271.


120 Getty, I-537, fols. 266–267. The painting also appears in the ca. 1680 inventory; Garms 1972, 323.

121 Getty, I-537, fols. 275–277.

122 Getty, I-537, fols. 278–281.
played here. The garden tapestry with a frieze depicting Hercules served both to warm and unify the space, and its dimensions, 13¼ palmi high and 66 palmi long in total (the longest piece being 20 palmi), indicate a room of modest size, as one would expect of a mezzanine.

8. Conclusion: The Display of Pictures in Early Modern Italian Collections

By the later seventeenth century, paintings were found nearly everywhere in Roman palaces; in some instances the art collection was concentrated in the gallery or in an apartment dedicated to art, whereas less frequently it was integrated into the decoration of the piano nobile reception rooms. The palaces of papal families tended to have separate apartments for the display of paintings and sculpture. In describing such spaces at the Borghese, Barberini, and Chigi palaces, Patricia Waddy

concluded: “While retaining the form of normal aristocratic apartments, they seem not to have accommodated their full range of activities.” These apartments, especially those with sculpture, were often situated on the ground floor and sometimes served as summer living quarters. In the Palazzo Chigi at Santi Apostoli, for instance, the ground floor apartment contained sculpture, while 406 paintings were hung in the suite of four rooms on the piano nobile, appropriately called the “Appartamento nobile de quadri.” Although one room was called an anticamera and another had a baldachin, “there was no bedroom or other provision for sustained occupancy.” The elite from nonpapal families also followed the practice of separate spaces for displaying their collections. For instance, shortly before his death in 1677, Cardinal Camillo Massimo installed his exquisite collection of paintings and sculpture in his gallery and in the related suite of rooms that were distinct from his noble apartment with reception rooms. In choosing to integrate his paintings collection into the decoration of his piano nobile apartment, Prince Giovanni Battista Pamphilj was following a less common practice. On the other hand, the mezzanine apartment follows the practice of establishing a distinct space for the display of art. In sum, the Palazzo al Collegio Romano privileged the display of Prince Pamphilj’s paintings and grafted his identity onto the collection inherited from his father.

Though less typical, there are precedents for installing a collection throughout a nobleman’s primary living quarters. Luigi Salerno has brought to light the Marquis Vincenzo Giustiniani’s observation of “the new fashion for covering walls with pictures in place of the luxurious and expensive wall hangings of an earlier age.” Silvia Danesi Squarzina has subsequently shown that, in 1638, the pictures hung throughout Giustiniani’s apartment spread through parts of the ground floor, piano nobile, and second floor. The most important paintings were concentrated in the “Stanze de’ quadri antichi,” a group of four rooms on the piano nobile. On the other hand, Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani, the marquis’s brother, displayed only a few paintings in his reception rooms in the piano nobile and instead concentrated his pictures in the gallery and the series of rooms following it. After the cardinal’s death in 1621, the marquis reduced the number of paintings in the gallery from thirty-nine to sixteen and transformed it into a site of display, primarily for his copious sculpture collection. There are also precedents in the houses of lesser collectors where paintings were more often integrated into the living space, as Cavazzini has shown. For instance, in 1625, Alessandro Pallavicini (who was not related to the Marquis Niccolò Maria Pallavicini who is the subject of the next paragraph) displayed many portraits, a battle scene, and a painting of Tityrus in his sala, and nineteen pictures, eleven of which were battle scenes, in another room also called a sala.

Cardinal Camillo Massimo served as a model for the collecting practices of Marquis Niccolò Maria Pallavicini (1650–1714), who amassed one of the most notable and copious painting collections of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, in an effort to perpetuate his Genoese name and reputation in Rome. As a patron, his most notable achievement was the alliance he forged with the renowned painter Carlo Maratti to promote the classical school of Roman history painting.

---

124 Waddy 1990, 58–59 (quotation, 59). During the renovation of the Palazzo Borghese from 1767 to 1775, the division between living space and exhibition space was maintained; Paul 2008, 71–94.

125 Waddy 1990, 59.

126 Beaven 2010, 244–304.

127 Salerno 1960, 22.


129 Cavazzini 2008, 92.

130 On Pallavicini and his collection, see Rudolph 1995, who cited Cardinal Massimo’s collection as a model (p. 11).
But Pallavicini was also known for his collection of Roman landscapes, and it is this taste that he shared with the collection interests of the Pamphilj. Guidebooks praised Pallavicini’s landscapes by Gaspar Dughet, Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi, and others, and Filippo Baldinucci singled out one room in particular for its beautiful paintings by Claude Lorrain.\textsuperscript{131} Besides sharing a predilection for this genre, the two families were related: Giovanni Battista Pamphilj’s sister Flaminia had been married briefly to Niccolò Maria Pallavicini’s younger brother, who died at age twenty-five in 1679.\textsuperscript{132} Both families were also connected to the prestigious literary academy the Academia degli Arcadi. Although Niccolò Maria and Giovanni Battista differ in some fundamental ways as patrons, since the latter inherited his collection and the former amassed his with great passion, both used their paintings as a primary element in the decoration of their reception rooms. In Pallavicini’s palace, paintings were hung throughout his extensive living quarters with rooms in the first noble apartment, the second noble apartment, and the floor above.\textsuperscript{133}

The installation of Prince Giovanni Battista Pamphilj’s collection in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano, from ca. 1680 to 1709, offers an example of adaptation to changing times and physical conditions. Although the floor-to-ceiling method of display without adherence to a strict chronological and geographic sequence seems to highlight sheer numbers and a unified appearance, the analysis presented here has shown that organizational principles based on theme, time period, “mixed-schools,” and formal properties were operative from the beginning and developed in significant ways over time. The intimate and mobile characteristics of cabinet paintings as independent objects (and potential elements in ensemble) offered flexibility in using the collection to decorate and to define space, as illustrated in the contrast between the large-scale landscapes on canvas in the “public” salone of the piano nobile apartment and the small-scale, miniaturist paintings on varied supports in the restricted space of the mezzanine. Furthermore, the changes carried out between the prince’s inventories demonstrate the development of more focused, selective, and historically conscious display principles in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, all the while underscoring the impermanent nature of installations; paintings were easily moved and adapted to new uses. Owning a collection of paintings was common enough in Rome, and indeed provided a mark of status among the elite, but the opportunity to hang and, in many cases, rehang the collection opened the door to nearly endless possibilities.

---

\textsuperscript{131} On Pallavicini’s relationship with Maratti and his collection, see Rudolph 1995, 29ff.

\textsuperscript{132} Rudolph 1995, 12.

\textsuperscript{133} Rudolph 1995, 107–108 and 211–230. The function of the apartments and rooms is not entirely clear; it seems that there were two apartments on the piano nobile but only one audience room and that the marquis slept on the floor above. Nevertheless, the inventory suggests that there was not a distinct exhibition space; rather the collection was strewn throughout the palace.
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