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Whimsy: An Allegory of Urban Patronage

PROLOGUE

It could be argued, I think, that patronage of necessity plays a greater role in promoting innovation in architecture than in the other arts. Certainly, during the second quarter of the 17th century, one of the greatest patrons and one of the greatest artists of European history, Pope Urban VIII Barberini and Gianlorenzo Bernini, working together inaugurated a new era of Roman urbanism. While I readily admit that the idea of linking a notorious Counter-Reformation Catholic pope with a notorious modern Jewish princess is whimsical, to say the least, I do think it offers some food for thought. I have no illusions about convincing anyone that what follows is anything but an allegory. Nevertheless, the plot thickens at least a little when I recall that years ago, during her frequent stops in Rome to visit Richard Krautheimer, Phyllis Lambert stayed at the Hotel Bernini.


Rome

Now the Bernini, although not the grandest hotel in Rome, is deluxe, and it lay a few short blocks from the Krautheimers' apartment at the Bibliotheca Hertziana. But I like to think that another reason Phyllis stayed there was that she liked the view of the Piazza Barberini in front and the adjacent palace, whose character and name were largely determined by the aforementioned patron and artist. The rather weird plot thickens a little more when you think about the legacy of the design of the Palazzo Barberini. Soon after his election
the pope acquired a palace built some decades earlier for the Strozzi family, situated in what was then a near suburb of Rome, on the slope of the Quirinal Hill with a view overlooking the ancient city and the Tiber River toward the Vatican. Barberini added a middle block fronted by three stories of open arcades, perpendicular to the Strozzi Palace, devoted to grand ceremonial spaces, and an additional wing of living quarters equal in size and parallel to the original building. The result was revolutionary. The U-shape itself was nothing new: the Villa Farnesina built a century earlier just across the Tiber, where projecting wings also flank an arcaded centerpiece, was surely an important model. But the Palazzo Barberini broke with tradition by reversing the usual orientation so that the open, informal, suburban facade faced the city, in place of the traditionally closed, formal, imposing, often forbidding urban palace facade that was a legacy of the medieval palace as fortress. Implicit in this simple but profound reorientation and transparency was a new attitude toward the urban fabric, which, instead of confronting, embraced the life of the city.
From her window in the Hotel Bernini Phyllis could catch a glimpse of the Palazzo Barberini at her left. But the piazza that first welcomed her on her way to see the Krautheimers was no less revolutionary than the palace itself. Piazza Barberini, far larger than its predecessors, is not in front of the palace but at the side, not reclusively isolated in the city but at the confluence of important thoroughfares, an integral part of the city’s life. In the center of the piazza stood Bernini’s famous Fountain of the Triton, the second major public fountain in Rome exclusively modeled on organic forms, with no architectural or geometric elements except the retaining basin at the bottom. Such wholly “natural” fountains had a long tradition in suburban and artificially rustic settings such as grottoes, but never in the heart of the city or at such a monumental scale. Similarly, aquatic themes had long been conventional for fountain designs, but never with such simplicity, dramatic concentration, and eruptive power. The great water beasts suck up the liquid through gaping mouths, concentrate it in a narrowing spiral, and thrust it upward through an Olympic “hybrid” who blasts it sky-high through his sounding conch, calling his thirsty followers to assemble. Compare the small, intimate piazza before the Palazzo Mattei, filled with the delightful Fountain of the Turtles by Giacomo della Porta and Taddeo Landini (1581–84), in which ephebic sprites create a balletic, delicately balanced transition between amorphous half-shells below and thin ribbons of water streaming from the basin above. (The turtles were added in a 1658 restoration by Alexander VII, perhaps by Bernini.) Perhaps the most distinctive feature of Bernini’s design is its openness in every direction. The pressurized jet of water thrust heavenward cascades down into bivalves spread wide like the wings of a bird on which the triton seems to ride, or rather
2. The bridge was attributed to Bernini by two contemporary writers and has never been questioned, except by Patricia Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces: Use and the Art of the Plan (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990), 269–71. In fact, the concept of the bridge closely recalls the disastrous stage scenery that formed the central conceit of Bernini’s “bella idea” for a self-caricaturing comedy (1644) about a famous stage designer and impresario whose wonderful illusionistic contraption collapsed (from theatrical sky to earth), and therefore created the perfect illusion. See Irving Lavin, Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 152–57, and Donald Beecher and Massimo Ciavollela, “A Comedy by Bernini,” in Gianlorenzo Bernini: New Aspects of His Art and Thought: A Commemorative Volume, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1985), 62–115, see also 100–102. Contemporary with the execution of the ruined bridge was Bernini’s Ponte Sant’Angelo, whose openwork railings (also revolutionary in a monumental city bridge) were inspired by a temporary wooden truss bridge in Paris. See Irving Lavin, “Bernini at Saint Peter’s: Singularis in singulis, in omnibus unicus,” in St. Peter’s in the Vatican, ed. William Tronzo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 179–99, where, however, the Parisian bridge was wrongly identified; the bridge in question, also called Pont-Rouge, is correctly identified and discussed in a greatly revised and enlarged version of the work, in the course of publication by Pindar Press, London.


float forth, on some fantastic crustaceous flying carpet. In fact, nothing had ever been seen in any context quite like this triumphant sound-blast announcing the arrival of a new era overflowing with benign, munificent refreshment.

What Phyllis could not see from her window was another feature added 40 years later to the south side of the palace by a nephew of the pope, but probably also conceived by Bernini and wholly in the jocular spirit of his work under Urban – that is, the famous ruined bridge connecting the piano nobile to the adjoining garden higher on the slope of the hill. The arches of the bridge appeared to be not simply ruinous but collapsing, until a wooden drawbridge was lowered; with its open iron railing the whole affair must have seemed precarious indeed (its stability was assured by hidden metal chains).2

On her way to the Krautheimers’, Phyllis saw, as a kind of marginal footnote at the northeast corner of the piazza, another equally astonishing fountain innovation that opens the piazza in another way, that is, to the visitor, merging two heretofore distinct categories – relief and freestanding.

Again the bivalve opens, this time vertically, to yield its glistening treasure close to the ground for all of its visitors, parched in the Roman sun, to share, including animals, and, notably, the three emblematic bees from the Barberini coat
of arms. (Originally installed at the corner of a building at the northwest corner entrance to the piazza, the fountain was dismantled in the 19th century and later reconstructed, freestanding, at the far northeast corner.) The upper shell serves double duty as an inscription attached to the wall, defining the point of this engaging witticism and the rationale for its extraordinary design: "Urban VIII, having built a fountain for the public ornament of the city, ordered this one for the utility and especially the convenience of the individual.")

Finally, having left the Krautheimers' place and descended the hill to the Piazza di Spagna, she encountered what must surely have seemed the most astonishing of all urban creations, or should one say creatures, the first major wholly organic fountain in Rome — known fondly since it was installed early in Urban’s reign as the Barcaccia, from its resemblance to a type of humble workboat, double-prowed so as to go up- and downstream without turning around when hauling freight on the Tiber. From antiquity on, there had been naval fountains in Rome, but never in postclassical times in so conspicuous a site, and always in the form of an imposing warship, whether an archaeological relic or a detailed replica of a modern galleon. In Bernini’s version the water pouring over the sides suggests that the poor awkward craft is about to sink beneath the waves; at the same time, the morbid shape of the gunwales suggests the lips and gaping mouth of some great sea monster swallowing the thing in one voracious gulp. But in fact, the situation might just as well be the opposite: the monster could be vomiting it up, in effect saving it from a watery death. Gun emplacements fore
and aft harmlessly trickle forth ribbons of clear, cool, gentle water. This ironic portrayal of an unlikely object in an unlikely situation in an unlikely place – one of the major city squares – was a delight to one and all, and surely contributed to its immediate baptism with an endearing name in the common Romanaccia dialect of the city.

The irony is plain to see if one considers that the flagship symbol of the Catholic Church as an institution was precisely the noble ship, as the ship of state, Christ's earthly domain guided by the pope at the helm. The theme was so central to the ideology of the church at the outset of Urban’s reign that one proposal offered for furnishing the newly completed basilica of St. Peter's actually enclosed the high altar and the choir for the cardinals in a ship under a sail blown by the crucifixion. The Barcaccia’s astonishing, quasi-persiflage of this exalted concept was rooted – no less surprisingly – in a minuscule, rather crude object in which, as if providentially, all the fundamental themes of the maritime metaphor seemed to have been distilled. This object was a small cut gem mounted in what was thought to have been an episcopal ring, evidently from the early Christian period. Newly discovered but then soon lost, the gem was unique in design and subject matter. Inscribed Jesus and Peter with abbreviations in Greek letters, the carving portrays a ship carried shoreward on the back of a gigantic sea monster; a figure at the rear mans the rudder, while another figure, perhaps a fisherman casting a net, appears in the prow. Raised on a mast in the center is a smaller ship, perhaps the ship’s flag, surmounted by a bird, which seems to communicate with another bird mounted on the main vessel’s poop. The birds surely allude to the raven and the dove that Noah sent forth from the ark on Mount Ararat to see if the waters had dried up (Genesis 8:12). The open mouth of the great beast inevitably suggests that of the whale casting Jonah up
The ring was the subject of a very scholarly monograph published by Girolamo Aleandro, a member of the papal court, and dedicated to the pope's nephew Cardinal Francesco Barberini, with a learned commentary relating the gem to all the piscatorial, naval, and marine themes attesting to the miraculous institution of the church and the salvation it offered. The book appeared in 1626, the same year Urban dedicated the new church of St. Peter's and the year before the Barcaccia was begun. The Barcaccia morphed the vessel, the sea monster, and the water into a coherent, organic image of Urban's offering on behalf of the church to the people of Rome—a rippling and continuous flow of grace as aquatic succor for body and soul.

Bernini's biographers make two points about the fountain that are especially relevant here. They note that the whole idea sprang from the fact that the water pressure in the Piazza di Spagna was inadequate for a regular fountain, thus the solution illustrates one of the cardinal points of Bernini's idea that the test of a good architect is to treat obstacles in such a way that had they not existed, one would have invented them. The second point is that Bernini made the fountain at the pope's behest, and there can be no doubt in this case because we know that Urban insisted on this location, despite the lack of water. The Barcaccia floats smack in the middle between the preternatural superpower rivals, with the Spanish embassy on one side of the piazza, and the French enclave, with Villa Medici up the hill, on the other. The papacy was often caught uncomfortably in the middle, especially in seeking to reconcile and unite the antagonists in the struggle against Protestant heretics. In this light and in this place, the Barcaccia is an emblem not only of the pope's diplomacy but also of his diplomatic method.

When the work was completed, Urban himself celebrated with a distich that explained its meaning: "The papal warship does not pour forth flames, but sweet water to extinguish the fire of war."5

Montreal
My guess is that, challenged to do so, an astute and imaginative architectural historian could trace a line, however wiggly and often faint, from the "House" that Urban VIII built in Rome to the "House" that Phyllis Lambert built in Montreal.6 As the Strozzi Palace was incorporated into the Palazzo
Barberini, so the Shaughnessy House (a beautiful old mansion that was about to be demolished) was incorporated into the Canadian Centre for Architecture. The north, or city facade of Peter Rose’s building faintly echoes, though in a more formal and imposing way, the symmetrical projecting wings that faced the city in Rome. But at the south side, with the auditorium on the left and the scholars’ wing on the right, the echo becomes a veritable embrace within an embrace. And as in Rome, the embrace of the protruding wings extends to the city itself, down the slope of the Mont-Royal to the Autoroute Ville-Marie and the Canal de Lachine, toward the St. Lawrence River in the distance. (To my mind, the spectacle of those rushing highways is what makes the CCA truly modern and relevant.) Here, at the rear, instead of the traditional landscape garden, Melvin Charney’s work for the CCA creates a quite unprecedented relationship to its environment. In what follows, I have depended largely on Charney’s own meditative and deeply philosophical essay on his work in the 1992 volume on the building and gardens of the CCA.

The underlying principle at the CCA was not to contrast with the urban environment, but rather to co-opt it, first of all by grounding the layout in a synthesis of the regular pattern of streets, including party or boundary walls, that previously occupied the site (based on the CCA’s immense project
to retrieve, organize, and publish virtually the entire documentary history of Montreal from its beginnings). Carefully collocated within this historically and archaeologically determined framework is a series of objects (I use this term deliberately to obscure the difference between sculptural and architectural forms) that in themselves echo, rather than contrast with, the urban context that preceded and surrounds them. These objects, in turn, function urbanistically in two ways, retrospectively and prospectively, both metaphorically and literally. Retrospectively, in that at the center of the garden two parallel concrete “arcades” echo the front and the rear of the Shaughnessy House itself, whose main features have been disassembled, as it were, into transparent screens (like the arcaded galleries at the Palazzo Barberini) through which the proper, cultivated garden transpires. Prospectively, toward the south, on a platform that edges the escarpment that runs down the hill to the city beyond, are ranged two regular rows of objects also in the form of architectural fragments, which comprise two kinds of structures, often commingled: monuments as abstract, architectural types, such as temples and columns; and quasi-real structures — a construction crane lifting architectural icons, an obelisk become industrial chimney billowing forth a constructivist cloud of smoke — that can actually be seen in the city.

In garden-historical terms you might say that they are follies about follies. And so the CCA garden is a sort of memory theater, the term used by the great psychological theorists of the Renaissance to describe an imaginary structure of the mind consisting of distinct locations that they called luoghi deputati, “assigned places,” places in an imaginary (or image) structure, which they called a theater, assigned to
locate and preserve those fragments of experience and
thought that the mind deems worthy of future recollection.
This theme, which might here be called not just a theater of
memory but a theater of architectural memorabilia, is
uniquely suited to an institution devoted to the preservation
and study of architectural history, that is, the human legacy
of what is nowadays commonly called the built environment.

To my mind, a lamentable counterexample to the
enlightened embrace of the setting from the CCA garden is
provided by the monumental sculpture park at Storm King,
a beautiful site on the Hudson River just below West Point.
Some years ago I was asked to write an essay about the place,
where the former owner had built a house on the crest of a
hill overlooking the westward valley toward Storm King
Mountain on the horizon. The house became the Storm King
Art Center, and a great collection of modern sculptures was
distributed around the high rolling hills at strategic points,
usually chosen by and sometimes created by the artists
themselves. What could be more ideal? The only trouble,
according to the presiding landscape architect and a leading
member of the Board of Trustees, was that the site bordered directly on the New York State Thruway, which runs through the valley and spoils the view of the mountain and “natural” setting in which the sculptures were meant to be seen. To me, however, the spectacle of the thruway, vibrant with rushing 22-wheelers and automobiles, was indeed part of the landscape, a work of modern art accompanying the park, no less magnificent and expressive and no less a product of our culture and way of life than the elegant and ingenious expansion bolts that made large-scale concrete construction cheaper and more reliable. These bolts were manufactured by the Star Expansion Company, which created the wealth of its owners, who created the foundation that created the Storm King Art Center itself and acquired the sculptures it treasures inside the park. Despite my passionate plea to love and embrace the magnificent thruway in its magnificent setting, they decided to hide it behind a row of huge trees along the ridge in front of the house. But not before I had extracted a promise to allow me to begin and end my essay with views up toward and down from Storm King Art Center with the New York Thruway coming and going full speed ahead.
Postscript

The link between our Catholic pope and our Jewish princess is certainly a stretch, but I do think a savvy researcher could actually trace, maybe through Richard Krautheimer, who certainly knew both characters well, the line that connects them. The passionately affirmative outward reach, and the wry wit they share are not only matters of individual personality, they also embody a sort of genetic cultural heritage. The word I would choose to describe this public-minded sentiment is, simply, urbanity, in the loftiest and most far-reaching sense of the word. And here again the pope played the lead role.

Contemporary sources give two main reasons why Maffeo Barberini chose to call himself Urban: first, because of his special affection for Rome, the Urbs par excellence. And second, because he wished his name to be a perpetual reminder (to himself) that he must curb his own natural inclination toward sternness. Barberini was from Tuscany, where urbanity is native, but he clearly adopted the capital in affection when he moved there as cardinal, and he incorporated his love for the city, along with his debonair manner and personal charm, into the conduct and very image of his papal office. The extraordinary fact is that these affective psychological qualities were translated into practical measures of state policy – even in a formal state portrait, where Urban is shown bidding an obeisant visitor to rise and engage in conversation, as a contemporary observer noted.8 There developed a reciprocal affection between the pope and his young protégé, visualized in a frescoed scene that constitutes a kind of double-portrait signature in the grotto beneath the

8. This is the way the letterato Lelio Guidiccioni described the shoulder and arm movement of a bust of Urban, which he watched Bernini carve. See Lavin, “Urbanitas urbana: The Pope, the Artist, and the Genius of the Place,” 22.
crossing piers of St. Peter's while Bernini was designing and supervising the execution of the Baldachin and the area around the high altar. Bernini is depicted as presenting and explaining to the pope his design for the aediculae in the upper niches of the crossing piers that would contain the relics of Christ's passion. Bernini is explaining and Urban is commenting, and in fact, the niches as executed are quite different from those seen in the fresco.

If the thesis I have been pursuing has any merit, it will come as no surprise to learn that Phyllis's essay in the CCA volume Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens is almost entirely devoted to the strictures imposed on her (for she is an architect) and the other creators of the CCA by the problems of the site and the efforts to preserve and display as much as possible of the Shaughnessy House. Photographs of her with the architect Peter Rose and with Melvin Charney speak volumes about the relationship between patron and client, and the thin line of social and cultural development I have been trying to trace.