

---

**Renaissance and Reformation**  
**Renaissance et Réforme**



**Ventra, Stefania. L'Accademia di San Luca nella Roma del secondo Seicento. Artisti, opere, strategie culturali**

Samantha J. C. Hughes-Johnson

---

Volume 44, Number 2, Spring 2021

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1082729ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i2.37558>

[See table of contents](#)

---

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

---

Cite this review

Hughes-Johnson, S. (2021). Review of [Ventra, Stefania. L'Accademia di San Luca nella Roma del secondo Seicento. Artisti, opere, strategie culturali]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 44(2), 279–281. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i2.37558>

---

© Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies / Société canadienne d'études de la Renaissance; Pacific Northwest Renaissance Society; Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium; Victoria University Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies, 2021

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

---

**é**rudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

(1790), Robert Strange after Van Dyck (1782), and Titian and his workshop (1559) (210–13, 234–35). Steinberg shows great depth and range in discussing visual art in eloquent words.

JONATHAN LOCKE HART

Shandong University

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i2.37557>

**Ventra, Stefania.**

***L'Accademia di San Luca nella Roma del secondo Seicento. Artisti, opere, strategie culturali.***

Quaderni sull'Età e la Cultura del Barocco 2. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2020. Pp. xliv, 370 + 161 ill. ISBN 978-8-8222-6682-8 (paperback) €55.

From its unapologetic introduction, Stefania Ventra's investigation into the artists, work, and cultural strategies of the Accademia di San Luca seeks to overturn the misconception that the academy represented a fortress of classicism in terms of artistic philosophy and praxis, a space where Roman academic traditions of the seventeenth century stood in direct opposition to the baroque, with the former being the predominant didactic, dictated by the institution.

An ancient and important organization, primarily concerned with the education of young artists but with a confraternal branch and various devolved powers that extended into the city's civic sphere, the academic culture of the Accademia di San Luca, from Ventra's perspective, "cannot be interpreted according to stylistic or ideological connotations" (xliii; all translations here are mine). Notwithstanding the institution's great impact on the figurative arts, the notion of a succession of great men ordaining a homogenized classical manifesto to compliant members is deftly toppled as Ventra delves beyond the individuals who directed San Luca and explores the critical roles of students, secretaries, and estimators, all of whom contributed to the proprietary reputation of the academy.

Through the skilful and scrupulous intertextual analysis of visual and literary documents, Ventra works both chronologically and thematically, examining the membership lists and registers of the academy as well as the artistic output of its members between 1662 and 1702.

Beyond the usual introductory chapters, the study is organized into two main parts and includes three appendices detailing the *elenchi* and *registri* produced by the academy between the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

The first portion of the study begins with a comparison of the “artistic strategies and cultural practices” (1) of the academy during the 1660s and 1670s and then investigates various movements within and without the institution, including the influence of Parisian academic culture upon its Roman equivalent. Ventra uses renderings of portraits donated to the academy by Carlo Maratti (1625–1730) to illustrate the diversity of creative character inherent in the artworks and, in turn, within the academy. Concentrating also on the year 1664, a period that saw the appointment of Maratti as *principe* of the academy, Ventra contextualizes the debate between Maratti and Giovanni Pietro Bellori (1613–96) and reveals the exercise as an advertisement of the institution’s activities. Furthermore, this section clarifies the hierarchical position of the various artistic forms within the institutional psyche and explores the internal, regulated competitions between members. Further still, the investigation elucidates the institutional privileges that benefitted fellows. The final subsection of this portion of the volume explores the legacy of Pietro da Cortona (1596–1669), and the associated machinations concerning the academy’s “co-ownership” (117) of the church of Santi Luca e Martina, following the artist’s death.

The second part of the volume is dedicated to the role of the academy as a proponent of contemporary Roman art. Accordingly, the first two subsections introduce fresh, innovative detail on how the institution fared under the influence of its newly-appointed permanent secretary, Giuseppe Ghezzi (1634–1721). Ghezzi not only carved out his own position within the academy, using their statues to strengthen his hand, but also dealt with increasing artistic competition from France as the *Seicento* drew to a close. Ventra continues her scrutiny of Ghezzi’s activities to include his undertakings outside of the institution, and skilfully connects the secretary’s associations and actions to the legacy of Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598–1680). Ghezzi’s engagements within the academy suggest that he was not in favour of the unquestioning adoption of Maratti’s philosophical and stylistic canon. Furthermore, the secretary’s connections outside of the institution (especially with Queen Cristina of

Sweden, who was renowned for her eclectic taste in art and her support of Bernini), indicates that Ghezzi was an advocate of stylistic diversity.

Ventra concludes the monograph by bringing together the various strands of discussion in order to view them in light of a tripartite treatise written by Lodovico Antonio David (1648–after 1709). David’s discourse criticized the Accademia di San Luca’s educational programs and the wider artistic traditions of classicism and blamed the decline in “academic hegemony” (196) on the rejection of Raphael Santi’s style in favour of the modern style of foreign artists. This criticism, when examined in light of what was actually occurring at the academy at the time, works to illuminate the “academic action” (197) that was taken in order to assert the value of contemporary Roman Seicento artworks and academic culture during the ongoing antagonism between ancient and modern, Roman and foreign.

Ventra’s final paragraph reiterates and affirms the premise of the introduction. Rather than exemplify an unquestioning reliance on classicism and uphold the polarized notion of the antique versus the contemporary, the stability of classicism versus the drama of baroque, Ventra rejects the concept of a consolidated, institutional stylistic canon and replaces it with a multifarious perception of artistic expression. Accordingly, she concludes that the Accademia di San Luca took in those things that would make it strong. Without fear of contrast, the institution retained the teachings of classical antiquity that existed alongside modernity. Furthermore, it was strengthened by the diverse skills and artistic proclivities of its members and became reinvigorated by the roles assumed by hitherto anonymous players.

Given the volume’s necessary reliance on a variety of rich evidential sources and the original and skilful manner in which they are utilized, Stefania Ventra’s *L’Accademia di San Luca nella Roma del Secondo Seicento: Artisti, opera, strategie culturali* will be an essential resource in the study of early modern academies and an indispensable reference for those pursuing the age-old, continuing debate surrounding how these and other similar institutions dealt with coalescing past and present.

SAMANTHA J. C. HUGHES-JOHNSON

Independent Scholar, Stoke-on-Trent, UK

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i2.37558>