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Sia il direttore dell’Académie de France a Roma, Jean-François de Troy, sia il pittore e collega di Panini, Giuseppe Ghezzi, si dimostrarono critici nei confronti della macchina di Canillac e di Panini, che ne era in parte l’autore, sebbene suo figlio Giuseppe ne risultasse l’architetto responsabile. Un dissenso riferibile tanto al mutevole rapporto di Panini con l’Académie de France quanto a differenti concezioni sulla progettazione di architetture effimere, consistenti essenzialmente nel fatto che Panini concepiva i progetti per le feste come pittorici e non architettonici, mentre i pensionnaires francesi li vedevano come opportunità per sperimentare progetti architettonici miranti al rinnovamento dell’architettura nazionale.
Monsignor de Canillac’s *macchina* for the Festa in Piazza Farnese to Honour the Marriage of the Dauphin of France and the Infanta of Spain in 1745

David R. Marshall

Giovanni Paolo Panini’s *Festa in Piazza Farnese to Honour the Marriage of the Dauphin of France and the Infanta of Spain*, in the Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Virginia (fig. 1), was recently exhibited at the Getty Museum in the exhibition *Eyewitness Views. Making History in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, organised by Peter Kerber in 2017. The painting depicts the *macchina*, or temporary festival structure, in honour of the marriage of the Dauphin of France, Louis (1729-1763), the son of Louis XV, to the Infanta of Spain, Maria Teresa Rafaella (1726-1746) erected in Piazza Farnese in 1745 by Monsignor de Canillac (Claude-François de Montboissier de Canilliac, or Canilliac, de Beaufort, 1693/99-1761).

Panini’s conceit is to show the *macchina* under construction in the presence of Canillac, who appears in the foreground. It shows the *macchina* as executed, whereas a print by the French painter and printmaker Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain (1715-1759), which was published before it was completed in order to advertise it to the public, shows the project (fig. 2).


2. Kerber 2017. This article arises from this exhibition and the associated symposium in June 2017 where I gave a paper that touched on some of these issues. I would like to thank Peter Kerber for inviting me to speak on that occasion and the other participants for fruitful discussions in front of the painting.

3. Giuseppe Panini (designer), *Macchina artificiale rappresentante l’unione di amore ed Imeneo, nel Tempio di Minerva allusiva alle nozze del Real Delfino, e Maria Teresa Infanta di Spagna, fatta erigere in Roma nella piazza Farnese da Monsignor*
Figure 1. Giovanni Paolo Panini, *Festa in Piazza Farnese to Honour the Marriage of the Dauphin of France with the Infanta of Spain*, 1745, oil on canvas, 166 x 238 cm. Norfolk, Virginia, Chrysler Museum, Gift of Walter P. Chrysler Jr., inv. 71.523.
Figure 2. Giuseppe Panini (designer), *Macchina artificiale rappresentante l’unione di amore ed Imeneo, nel Tempio di Minerva allusiva alle nozze del Real Delfino, e Maria Teresa Infanta di Spagna*, 1745, etching by Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense.
In this article I will look at the design of the *macchina*, which has been assigned to both Giovanni Paolo Panini (1691-1765) and his son Giuseppe (1718-1805), its construction, its relationship with the *macchine* for the festival of the Chinea that succeeded it, and its critical reception.

**Canillac’s festa, 19-21 June 1745**

The preparations for the Canillac *macchina* and other festivities associated with the marriage were referred to by the contemporary news publication, the *Diario ordinario* of Cracas, on 17 April 1745 as having just commenced, referring to the days around or before Tuesday 13 April. Work was then taking place both in Piazza Farnese and within the palace.

A letter dated 8 May 1745 from Giovanni Battista Ruele, the imperial agent and archivist, refers to acts of vandalism by the Romans (*Romaneschi*) to the structure, which implies that it was complete or approaching completion. He refers both to satirical inscriptions and to the blackening of the figures overnight that ruined some lions highlighted with gold, so that papal guards had to be stationed there to stop further *disordini*. Moore says this was «apparently committed by individuals moved by their dislike of France». The reference to gilded lions is puzzling, as lions appear neither in the print nor the painting.

Canillac’s *macchina*, as the inscription on the etching discussed below reveals, was intended to be revealed in May. However, on 15 May, because of intermittent rainfall, the pope decided to repair to his villa at Castel Gandolfo. Subsequent fine weather meant that cardinals and the nobility in turn


4. *Diario ordinario*, no. 4326, 17 April 1745, p. 14: «In questi giorni si è dato principio, tanto nella Piazza Farnese, che in quell Palazzo di Sua Maestà in Ré delle Due Sicilie, alli lavori di machine di fuoco arteficiato, ed altri grandiosi preparamenti per le publiche feste da fare in congiuntura del seguito Sposalizio trà il Reale Delfino di Francia, e D. Maria Teresa Reale Infanta di Spagna».

5. MOORE 1998-1999, p. 221, no. 135, citing Napoli, Archivio di Stato, Affari esteri, Roma, 1065 (letter dated 18 May 1745): «Benchè il tempo si mantenesse costantemente, ma interpollatam.te piovoso, volle Sua Santita eseguire la partenza per Castel Gandolfo […] Hanno poi continuato le belle giornate, onde molti altri sono partiti per le reciproche Villeggiature, e atteso questo spopolamento di Roma non meno che l’incostanza della stagione Mons.re di Canillach hà anche pensato di differire le allegrezze per il Matrimonio del Delfino fin dopo il ritorno della Santità Sua».

6. *Ivi*, p. 210: «In the case of the set piece erected in 1745 to celebrate the marriage of the dauphin Louis, sculptures were “blackened and ruined”, acts apparently committed by individuals moved by their dislike of France».

went to their country villas. Because there was no-one of importance still in Rome to see his *festa*, Canillac postponed it until the pope’s return. The pope returned on June 15 and the festivities began on the morning of Saturday June 19 with a Te Deum at San Luigi dei Francesi, the French national church, which had been decorated by Canillac for the occasion. There was music and the firing of 150 firecrackers (*mortaretto*). The interior façade of the church was decorated with portraits of the pope, the King and Queen of France and the bride and groom. Cardinal Troiano Acquaviva d’Aragona (1694-1747), the Spanish ambassador, arrived from the Palazzo di Spagna at the head of a procession of carriages. Within the church a *coretto* at ground level had been erected for the King and Queen of England, that is, James III and his second son, Henry Benedict Stuart, the Duke of York, but they did not arrive in time from *villeggiatura* at Albano. The Stuarts were in particular demand at social events in Rome, because they were the only royalty resident there. Various ambassadors were installed in *coretti* on either side of the choir.

The public events began in the evening. Because the wedding was between French and Spanish royalty these involved the premises of both countries, with public illuminations at San Luigi dei Francesi (the French national church), San Giacomo degli Spagnoli (the Spanish national church), the Palazzo di Spagna, residence of the Spanish ambassador, Cardinal Acquaviva, Canillac’s palace, and the French Academy at Palazzo Mancini.

On the same evening, Palazzo Farnese, its piazza and the *macchina* were all lit up. The windows of Palazzo Farnese and the piazza were illuminated with candles on large two-armed candelabras (*doppieri*) painted in chiaroscuro, and festooned with greenery (these are not visible in Panini’s painting). Two large *palchetti* (viewing boxes) were erected beside the entrance to Palazzo Farnese,

[...] Hanno poi continuato le belle giornate, onde molti altri sono partiti per le reciproche Villeggiature, e atteso questo spopolamento di Roma non meno che l’incostanza della stagione Mons.re di Canillach ha anche pensato di differire le allegrezze per il Matrimonio del Delfino fin dopo il ritorno della Santita Sua».

8. The Stuarts at this point were preparing for the Jacobite rising of 1745. James III’s, Charles Edward Stuart, *Bonnie Prince Charlie*, was in France, which he left to invade Scotland on 15 July with French support.


10. *Ivi*, p. 7: «furono in quella prima sera anche illuminate di torce non solo tutte le finestre degl’Appartamenti di quell vasto Palazzo, ma tutta la Piazza all’intorno da quantità di torce sopra copiosi Doppieri dipinti a chiar’oscuro, e disposti con tutta simetria, e buon’ordine tra varji festoni di verdure, il che ne rendeva anche più vaga la comparsa». 
where musicians played\textsuperscript{11} (in Panini’s painting there is a box with coats of arms built over the central balcony).

On 17 June the French ambassador, Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld (1701-1757) had arrived, to be received by the pope on the Tuesday after the \textit{festa} (22 June), which they discussed\textsuperscript{12}. He thus displaced the somewhat prickly Canillac\textsuperscript{13}, who was until that point \textit{chargé d’affaires}, the senior representative of the French crown in Rome in the absence of an ambassador, but for the time being La Rochefoucauld kept in the background. La Rochefoucauld viewed it in private, while the formal viewing was hosted by Canillac, and involved Cardinal Acquaviva, Cardinal Silvio Valenti Gonzaga (1690-1756), the pope’s secretary of state, and other foremost members of the nobility\textsuperscript{14}. They were treated «with a profusion of exquisite refreshments»\textsuperscript{15}.

During the following day (Sunday 20 June) a throng of nobles and the people visited both piazza and palazzo, kept in order by grenadiers and papal soldiers. The openings to the streets had barriers erected across them to prevent carriages entering. According to \textit{Diario ordinario}, the pope made a supposedly unplanned visit to view the \textit{macchina}. He had left the Quirinal palace to visit the \textit{Quarantore} in Santa Maria dell’Anima, as was his daily practice, and had decided to take some air\textsuperscript{16}. Passing along Via Giulia

\textsuperscript{11. \textit{Ibidem}: «Erano ancora eretti due grandi Palchetti ai lati del Portone dello stesso Palazzo, ed in essi continuamente fecero diversi ben composti concerti quantità di scelti stromenti musicali, e da fiato».}

\textsuperscript{12. \textsc{Kerber} 2017, p. 94; \textsc{de Brimont} 1913, pp. 54-56, 59-61. \textit{Diario ordinario}, no. 4356, 26 June 1745, pp. 17-18: «Monsig. Arcivesc. di Bourges nuovo Ambasciatore di Francia Martedì mattina [Tuesday 22 June] fu ammesso per la prima volta all’udienza di Sua Santità privatamente; e nel dopo pranzo il sudetto Monsig. Ambasciatore si transferì a disporto fuori di Roma, di dove pero fece ritorno la medesima sera». La Rochefoucauld’s term ran from 6 June 1743 until 13 March 1748.}

\textsuperscript{13. \textsc{Kerber} 2017, p. 94.}


\textsuperscript{15. \textit{Ibidem}.}

\textsuperscript{16. \textit{Ivi}, pp. 8-10: «Proseguendosi l’accennata festa, nel dopo pranzo della Domenica in occasione di essere sortito N. Sign. dal suo Palazzo Apostolico Quirinale per portarsi, come suol praticare quasi ogni giorno, alla visita del SS.mo Sagramento, che era esposto in quell dì per le 40 Ore in S. Maria dell’Anima; e siccome suol compiacersi ancora di prendere alquanto di aria, passando poi per la Strada Giulia in vicinanza del Palazzo Farnese, supplicatone da Monsig de Canilliach, che se le fece incontro per inchinarlo, smontò da Carrozza, ed entrato da quella parte per la Porta segreta, si degnò ascendere nel Palazzo, e sempre servito dallo stesso Prelato si condusse per tutto quell nobile Appartamento fatto da d. Monsig. In congiuntura della festa con ogni signorile proprietà addobbare; Quindi corrispondendo la Ringhiera dirimpetto a cui si godeva la vista della descritta Machina si degnò anche il Santo Padre osservarla per poco tempo, ricevutane prià dal medesimo Monsign. de Canilliach la stampa in seta guarnita di merletto d’oro; e sugli anche presentato un nobile rinfresco, che gradì senza gustarne. Delle medesime stampa in carta una gran copia ne fu distribuita ancora alla Famiglia Pontificia, a cui di più fu apprestato in quell brevissimo tempo un grandioso rinfresco, & indi partisene la Santità Sua per il Quirinale».}
near Palazzo Farnese, Canillac approached him, bowing and making a humble entreaty. The pope got
down from his carriage and entered the palazzo through a secret doorway, evidently accompanied by
his retinue. He was led through the noble apartment «that in conjunction with the festa was furnished
with every seignorial propriety»\(^\text{17}\). From the balcony (the box visible in Panini’s painting) he looked at
the macchina for some time. He received from Canillac a print on silk trimmed with gold lace, evidently
the one by Le Lorrain, and other copies of the print on paper were distributed to the papal household.
The fact that Canillac had these ready suggests that a visit from the pope was not entirely unexpected.
The pope was presented with a noble rinfresco that he accepted with pleasure without tasting it, and
his famiglia also were offered a rinfresco that «was prepared in that very short space of time»\(^\text{18}\). Then
the Holy Father departed for the Quirinal.

Canillac, who was not on good terms with pope, who preferred to work around him until an
ambassador was appointed\(^\text{19}\), himself gave an account of the pope’s visit in a letter to d’Argenson,
French secretary of state for foreign affairs, on 23 June, making no mention of greeting him in Via
Giulia, and stating that the pope made the visit «as a public display of his consideration for the King»\(^\text{20}\).
He adds that from the balcony the pope blessed the people who were attracted by the music within
and without the palace.

Matters were orderly even in the evening, when the macchina was “burned” at the third hour
(about 10 pm), to general satisfaction. This was viewed from the balcony and windows of the palazzo,
which were richly furnished (as Panini shows) by the Duke of York (Henry Benedict Stuart, second son
of James III, who two years later was to become Cardinal York and who had come that morning from
Albano for the occasion, as well as “eminent persons”, prelates, princes and princesses, knights and
ladies and ministers of foreign princes and their associated nobility, all of whom took refreshments\(^\text{21}\).

\(^{17}\) See note 16.
\(^{18}\) Ibidem.
\(^{19}\) Kerber 2017, p. 94.
\(^{20}\) De Brimont 1913, p. 61, letter from Canillac to d’Argenson, Rome, 23 June 1745: «Le Pape s’y transporta, l’après diner,
pour voir les préparatifs de cette fête et pour donner, en même temps, une marque publique de sa considération pour le Roy,
qui a d’autant plus surpris qu’elle est san exemple. Sa Sainteté parcourut tout l’apartement et s’y arrêta une heure entière pour
examiner la décoration. Elle se fit voir ensuite à un balcon qui étoit en face du feu d’artifice, et d’où elle donna la bénéédiction
à un peuple innombrable qui s’étoit rassemblé dans la place, attiré par des symphonies continuelles qui se faisoient entendre
du dehors et du dedans du palais. Enfin, elle se retira après m’avoir comblé de mille témoignages de ses bontés».
\(^{21}\) Diario ordinario, no. 4356, 26 June 1745, pp. 10-11: «In tutto il giorno [Sunday 20 June] vi fu indicibile concorso di
Nobilità, e Popolo, stativi alia custodia tanto del Palazzo, che nella Piazza, e de capistrade (tutti sbarrati da travi per evitare
l’imbarazzo delle Carozze) queste Compagnie di Granatieri, e Soldati Pontifici, sicchè il tutto segui con somma quiete ancora
nella sera, che circa le tre ore fu arsa la gran Machina con commune sodisfazione. Dalla Ringhiera, e Fenestrelle del Palazzo
Canillac noted the presence of the Venetian ambassador, and Acquaviva’s disapproval of the absence of the ambassador of Malta. La Rochefoucauld, still incognito, watched it from a neighbouring palazzo, writing that Canillac had spared nothing to give the King proof of his zeal and recognition, and had been attentive to him since his arrival[^22].

The “eminent persons” then departed, and a ball (conversazione di ballo) was held, led by the Duke of York and directed by the maestri di sala. According to Canillac, this was the pope’s idea, which he had mentioned also to the Duke of York[^23]. The pope had been admiring the decoration of the palace, one room in particular (presumably the main Sala dei Palafrenieri of the palazzo, which would be the site of the ball held in 1751 recorded in Panini’s two paintings at Waddesdon) and suggested that it was a pity that the noblewomen should be limited to assembling in so beautifully decorated a room and should put it to use after the fireworks by holding a ball. The Duke of York took up this idea with enthusiasm, and after the cardinals had left directed the ball, which was a great success with the nobility, not least because of the informality that was a consequence of the pope’s absence. According to the Diario ordinario, the ball ended with a rinfresco for the whole noble group in a room that was richly decorated with sconces and crystal chandeliers and two large «orchestre di suoni». Afterwards the Duke of York returned to his father, James III, at Albano[^24].

[^22]: De Brimont 1913, p. 62, quoting a letter from Rochefoucauld to the King: «Tout Rome a applaudi à cette fête, et M. de Canillac n’a rien épargné à cette occasion pour donner à Votre Majesté la preuve de son zèle et de sa reconnoissance. On ne peut d’ailleurs rien ajouter à toutes les attentions qu’il e eues pour mou, depuis mon arrivée, et je les dois attribuer encore plus au caractère dont Votre Maesté m’a honoré qu’à l’extrême amitié qui nous unit depuis notre jeunesse».

[^23]: Ivi, pp. 61-62, letter from Canillac to d’Argenson, Roma, 23 June 1745: «et me dit, en passant, qu’il seroit dommage que les dames se bornassent [limited to] à s’assembler dans une sal si bien décorée san en faire usage, après avoir veu tirer le feu, pour prolonger la fête le plus qu’il seroit possible. Sa Sainteté avoit déjà fait les mêmes insinuations au fils du Chevalier de Saint-Georges qui les mit à profit, et aussitôt que le feu fut tiré et que le Sacré-Collège se fut retiré, il proposer aux dames de danser, ce qui fut accepté de leur part avec avidité, et le jeune prince se chargea de faire les honneurs de cet espèce de bal, qui fit d’autant plus plaisir à la noblesse qu’elle ne s’y attendoit point et que c’est un amusement qui lui plaît beaucoup. C’est par là que finit la fête qui a été extrêmement goûtée, et la noblesse y a concouru avec un empressement qui me repond de son respect pour le Roy».

[^24]: Diario ordinario, no. 4356, 26 June 1745, pp. 11-12: «Dopo il fuoco partirono gl’E.mi, e si tenne una conversazione di Ballo, a cui intervennero Principessa, Dame, et ogni range di Nobilità; La Danza fu principiata da Sua Altezza Reale sudetta, e si continuò fino al fine da Cavalieri, e Dame secondo la buona direzione, e regolamento della Signori Cavalieri Maestri di Sala; seguì questa in una Sala fra le altre più vagamente, e pomposamente ornata, con quantità di Placche, e Lampadarj di cristallo, che maestosamente l’illuminava con due grandi Orchest[re] di suoni erettevi per tale effetto; replicandosi quivi pure il grandioso rinfresco a tutta la nobile comitiva, conchê terminò la stessa, seguita con splendidezza, e decoro; ritornandosene dopoi il Principe Reale in Albano presso la Maestà de Rè suo Genitore». 
One person who was absent from all of this was the Contestabile Colonna, who, with his wife, family and servants has been on a trip to various Italian cities\textsuperscript{25}. They arrived on the Monday evening (21 June). Colonna needed to be back in Rome for the festival of the Chinea, which took place on the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul on 29-30 June.

\textit{The Chinea 29-30 June 1745}

The Chinea involved a feudal tribute from the King of Naples to the pope consisting of silver ducats carried by a white horse (\textit{haquennée}, or hack, hence the name \textit{Chinea}). The horse itself was paraded in Saint Peter’s Basilica.

Since 1722, apart from an interruption in 1634-1637, it had been customary for the head of the Colonna family, who was hereditary Grand Constable of the Kingdom of Naples and its representative, to set up two \textit{macchine} to celebrate the event. These had earlier been situated outside Palazzo Colonna in Piazza Santi Apostoli, but from 1738 the site was shifted to Piazza Farnese in front of Palazzo Farnese, which, because of the marriage of Elisabetta Farnese to Philip V of Spain in 1714 and the installation of their son Charles as King of Naples in 1735, had become the «embassy and residence of the plenipotentiary of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, real estate office, and centre for the conduct of Neapolitan affairs in Rome»\textsuperscript{26}.

Since the revival of the Chinea in 1738 the \textit{macchine} had been essentially pictorial and designed by painters, including the first \textit{macchina} in 1744 that depicted \textit{Virgil Crowned Prince of the Latin Poets} which was designed by the French \textit{pensionnaire} and painter Louis le Lorrain\textsuperscript{27}. Such designs, it is generally supposed, were painted on canvas that was stretched over a wooden frame\textsuperscript{28}. From 1745 the designs returned to the practice that prevailed before 1734 of constructing three-dimensional architectural structures, made of wooden framing, painted canvas, and \textit{papier maché} sculptures added to a substantial wooden armature. Their design was, until 1751, shared between \textit{pensionnaires}.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Diario ordinario}, no. 4356, 26 June 1745, p. 17: «In questa sera di Lunedi [Monday 21 June] si restituirono in Roma dal giro fatto in varie Città dell’Italia gli Ecc.mi Sig. Contestabile, e Contestabilessa Colonna, con la di loro Famiglia, e Servitù, che l’ha seguiti nel viaggio».

\textsuperscript{26} \textsc{Moore} 1998-1999, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{27} Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain (designer and etcher), \textit{The Glorification of Virgil, for the Chinea Festival, 1744, etching and engraving on laid paper}, Plate 39,0 x 45,0 cm; sheet: 43,8 x 56,7 cm. Washington, National Gallery of Art, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gourary, Accession No. 1996.48.3. As captioned by Antinori: Gabinetto Comunale delle Stampe (GCS) 688 (see note 28).

\textsuperscript{28} \textsc{Antinori} 2015, p. 64.
at the Frech Academy such as Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain, Ennemond-Alexandre Petitot and Jérome-Charles
Bellicard, and Francisco Preciado de la Vega (1713-1789), a Spanish painter associated with the Accademia
di San Luca who was supported by a pension from Philip V of Spain. Michelangelo Specchi (c. 1684-after
1750) is sometimes named on the prints as architetto, indicating his role in supervising the installation,
rather than the design, of the macchine.

In 1745, because Canillac’s festa had been delayed, there were only nine days between this and the
Chinea, which was insufficient to construct the intended first Chinea macchina. Such macchine could
take up to two months to prepare: preparations for the 1759 Chinea macchine ran from 7 May to 7 July,
while Canillac’s macchina construction was underway in Piazza and Palazzo Farnese from early April for
an intended festival in mid-May. Consequently the design by Preciado de la Vega was abandoned and
the prints recording it by Miguel de Sorellò (c. 1700-1705) were pulped. It was replaced by one by the
Colonna architect, Giuseppe Doria, recorded in an engraving by Giuseppe Vasi (fig. 3). The armature
from Canillac’s macchina was ceded to Colonna, as recorded in payments published by Moore. These tell
us that the man in charge of the construction, under Giuseppe Panini, was Mastro Ludovico, capo mastro
muratore, and the blacksmith, Simone Moretti. The document refers to payments of 80 scudi to Mastro
Ludovico, and ten to Simone Moretti, to compensate them for the fact that they would have otherwise
kept for themselves the timber and the metal fittings from the armature after the event. The signatures

29. GORI SASSOLI 1994, pp. 18, 44, no. 38.
32. GORI SASSOLI 1994 has argued that the design by Preciado was reused for the second macchina of 1746, as is discussed
below.
33. Giuseppe Doria, Prospettiva della prima Macchina, con cui si rappresenta la fondazione del Regno di Napoli, e Sicilia
fatta dal Conte Rogiero Normanno, il quale doppo di avere conquistate quelle Provincie, distratte prima in varij Pnpi naturali
e la mag.r parte negl’Imperatori di Costantinop. prese poi il titolo di Re datogli dal Sommo Pontefice Rom.o [...] Fatta ardere
detta Macchina d’ordine di Sua Ecc.za il Sig.r P.npe D. Fabrizio Colonna Gran Contestab.e del Regno di Napoli [...] a dover
presentare il censo, e Chinea nella Vigilia de SS. Pietro, e Paolo Apostoli a Sua Beattitudine Papa Benedetto 14 l’anno 1745 /
Giuseppe Doria Architetto inv. e dis.; Giuseppe Vasi incise, etching, 40,3 x 48,7 cm. GORI SASSOLI 1994, p. 113, no. 39.
principale Padrone del Lavoro di Muratore, e Castello della Macchina fatta fare dall’Eccell.mo Monsignore di Canilliac Ministro
di Francia in occasione del Matrimonio del Real Delfino, in Piazza Farnese, avendo Sua Eccellenza Monsignor di Canilliac
ceduto al Sig:re Contestabile Colonna il sudetto Castello per le sue Macchine di fuoco in occasione della Chinea, il Sud:o Capo
Mastro, e restato d’accordo con il Sig:re Giuseppe Doria Architetto per nolo, di d.o Castello scudi novanta m.ta de quali, me
sotto scritto presente promise di rilassare a Mastro Simone Moretti Ferraro per nolo de Ferramenti di detto Castello Scudi
dieci m.ta in fede il Sud:o Sig:re Giuseppe Doria potrà liberamente ritenerli, e pagarli al sudetto Moretti queso di p.mo Luglio
1745: / [signed] Giuseppe Panini Architetto / Mi contento che li sudetti scudi Novanta si paghino [scudi] 80=m.ta a M.ro
Figure 3. Giuseppe Doria, *Prospettiva della prima Macchina, con cui si rappresenta la fondazione del Regno di Napoli, e Sicilia fatta dal Conte Rogiero Normanno*, etching by Giuseppe Vasi, 1745, 40,3 x 48,7 cm. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense.
on this document are dated 1 July, two days after the *macchina* was “burned”, perhaps the first point at which there was time to do the paperwork\(^35\).

The ceremony surrounding the first *macchina* began at vespers (evening prayers, around 7.15 pm) on Tuesday 29 June when the cavalcade of Contestabile Colonna departed from Palazzo Farnese to Saint Peter’s, where the Chinea ceremony took place. The pope then returned to his apartment for the night, while the *contestabile* returned to Piazza Farnese where the festivities began with fountains of wine made available to the public. From the palace the nobility watched the ‘burning’ of the fireworks machine (*machina di fuoco artificiale*), which represented the founding of the Kingdom of Naples by Count Roger of Sicily\(^36\).

Paolo Sforza al quale spettano in tutto come sopra cedendo a tale effetto tutte, e singole mie ragioni perché così e non altrimenti che li restanti [scudi] 10=m.ta spettano a M.ro Simone Moretti Ferraro per nolo come sopra / [signed] Io Ludovico Rasi mano pp.». Subiaco, Santa Scolastica, Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale di Santa Scolastica, Archivio Colonna, I.A.332/494.

35. Cited in Moore 1998-1999, p. 223, no. 139: «E adì 27: detto [July] [scudi] 30=m.ta in cro ad Sudetto [Francesco Andreini], per tanti pagati a Fran.co Perziado [sic] Spagnolo per aver disegnato la p.ma Macchina del Fuoco Artefice, che non ebbe effetto»; «E adì detto [27 July] [scudi] 30=m.ta in c.to ad Sudetto[Francesco Andreini] pagati a Michele Sorellò Incisore de Rami per aver inciso la detta Macchina» (Subiaco, Santa Scolastica, Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale di Santa Scolastica, Archivio Colonna, I.B.46, fol. 1196 left); «Francesco Andreini Nostro Mro di Casa, pagate a Giovanni Petroschi Incisore de Caratteri in Rame Scudi Trentadue e [baiocchi] 45 m.ta, che se li fanno pagare per Saldo, ed intiera Sodisfazione di havere inciso le Lettere delli due rami fatti intagliare da Noi, e per le 2 Machine de fuochi artificiali fatti fare le 2 Sere del 28, e 29 del mese di Giugno pros.to, che l’Intaglio della prima Machina, non ebbe effetto, per averla fatta rimutare» (ivi, I.A.323/278); «E adì 24: detto [July] [scudi] 50=m.ta in cro ad Sudetto [Francesco Andreini], per tanti pagati a Giuseppe Doria Architetto dell’Ecc.ma Casa, per rimborsio di tanti Spesi, e pagati in aver fatto incidere nel Rame da Giuseppe Vasi Incisore, come pure da Gio: Petroschi le lettere in detto rame del p.mo Fuoco Artefice rappresentante le dodici Provincie del Regno» (ivi, I.B.46, fol. 1196 left).

36. *Diario ordinario*, no. 4359, 3 July 1745, pp. 9-13: «Correndo Lunedi [Monday 28 June] la vigilia de gloriosi Principi degli’ Apostoli SS. Pietro, e Paolo Protettori di quest’ Alma Città di Roma, la Santità di N. Sig. per maggiore suo comodo d’intervenire il giorno al solenne Vespero nella Basilica Vaticana, la mattina si trasferì (from the Quirinal to St Peter’s’) [...] Intanto, che si cantava il Vespero si diede principio alla consueta solenne Cavalcata per la presentazione del Celso, e Chinea per il solito tributo del Regno di Napoli, & c, che venne fatta, come suoi praticarsi da molti anni, dal Ecc.mo Sig. D. Fabrizio Colonna Gran Contestabile del Regno di Napoli [...] Partì la medesima Cavalcata, preceduta da una Compagnia di Cavalleggeri Pontificij, dal Palazzo della Maestà Sua in Piazza Farnese, dove prima furono fatti dispensare dal Signor Ambasciatore esquisiti rinfreschi, & era composta di Principi, Prelati, Cavalieri, a Gentiluomini di questi Sig. Cardinali, e di altra Nobiltà Feudataria, o aderente alla stessa Corona, tutti in pomposa gala, essendo circondati la Chinea dalla Guardia Svizzera di N. SIGNORE.

Pervenne in tal modo tra la moltitudine del Popolo per tutte le strade, le di cui fenestre erano ornate di vaghe tappezzarie, fino al Vaticano, & in quell Sagro Tempio, essendosi già terminato il Vespero, la Santità Sua nel ritornate alla stanza dei parimenti, stando assisa nella Sedia Gestatoria, tra l’uno e l’altro Pileo d’Acqua benedetta, all preferenza de Sign. Cardinali, e de’ R.mi Chierici della R.C.A., e suoi Ministri, ricevè con le solite formalità da Sua Ecc.nza il Sig. Contestabile Ambasciatore straordinario, come si è detto, la presentazione del sudetto Censo, e Chinea.
The “burning” of the second *macchina*, which was also located in Piazza Farnese, took place on the following day, Wednesday 30 June. This represented a triumphal arch in honour of the return of Charles III (Carlo di Borbone) to Naples after the Battle of Velletri in 1744 (the occasion that prompted Panini’s two important paintings in Capodimonte)\(^3\) (fig. 4). The *Diario ordinario* reports that the event began at the 22\(^{nd}\) hour (about 5 pm), when the *contestabile* with his retinue collected Cardinal Acquaviva from the Palazzo di Spagna\(^3\). While waiting, Acquaviva gave a generous *rinfresco* to «tutto il nobile corteggio». Both cortèges made their way to Palazzo Farnese where Colonna and Acquaviva, with other nobles, enjoyed a grandiose *rinfresco* and watched from the balcony and windows the “burning” of the second *macchina*.


38. *Diario ordinario*, no. 4359, 3 July 1745, pp. 16-17: [Tuesday 29 June] «e proseguedosi ancora da Sua Eccelenza il Sig. Contestabile, come Ambasciatore straordinario per la presentazione della Chinea, la sua publica Festa in Piazza Farnese, il giorno circa le ore 22. con il suo nobile treno delle mute, Paggi, e numerosa Servitù portossi in Piazza di Spagna e levare da quel Regio Palazzo l’E.mo d’Acquaviva, incaricato degl’affari di Sua Maestà il Rè delle due Sicilie, il qual Porporato fece apprestare all’arrivo di Sua Eccelenza un generoso rinfresco a tutto il nobile corteggio. Poscia ambedue i sudetti Personaggi unitamente, avendo anche il Sig. Cardinale il suo proprio ricco treno di Carozze, e corteggio, si trasferirono al Palazzo di Sua Maestà in Rè di Napoli, ed ivi, essendovisi anche portati alcuni E.mi, ed altra molta Nobiltà Feudataria, o Aderente a quella Corona, oltre di un grandioso rinfresco, vi goderono da quella Ringhiera, e Fenestre, l’incendio della seconda Machina di fuoco arteficiato, rappresentante Il ritorno del Rè delle due Sicilie alla sua fedelissima Città di Napoli. / Nella sudetta mattina di Martedì nella Basilica [dei] SS. Apostoli». 
Figure 4. Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain (designer and etcher), Prospettiva della seconda macchina rappresentante il Ritorno del rè delle due Sicilie alla sua fedelissima città di Napoli, 1745, etching, 39,5 x 45,9 cm. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense.
The armature

Although the Diario ordinario, like other sources, refers to «l’incendio della prima sontuosa Machina di fuoco d’artificio» (the burning of the first sumptuous fireworks machine)39 evidently this “burning” did not extend to the substantial wooden armature that supported it. Indeed, it is unlikely that the macchina was burned at all, which would have left the armature charred and dangerous to handle, and not easily reused. Rather, in the best baroque tradition, it only appeared to burn, the effect being created by the fireworks display. This was dangerous enough: as Moore points out, the figures seen standing on the roof of Palazzo Farnese in the print of the Canillac macchina were there to put out any fires generated by sparks from the fireworks40. Almost all of the macchina was probably available for re-use. Although painted canvases may have been destroyed in removing them from the armature, and in any case would have been less useful on other macchine, papier maché sculptures would have been both relatively expensive to make and relatively simple to re-use, as they would have had their own internal wooden armatures. However it is not easy to recognise the same statues in representations of different macchine. At the point when the prints were made their form was probably fluid, as in demonstrated by a comparison between the statues in the print and painting of the Canillac macchina, which do not correspond (fig. 6). Giovanni Paolo Panini probably showed them as they were actually executed, based on “life” drawings of the macchina as built, whereas Le Lorrain, at the beginning of the process, shows figures that were probably drawn from his own pictorial repertoire rather than being based on designs by the architect.

If we compare the prints of the Panini and Doria macchine (figs 2-3) it will be apparent just how dependent the second macchina was on the former because of the shared armature. As figure 5 shows, the main components correspond closely. Moore publishes a German illustration of 1600 that shows what such armatures were like (fig. 6). It is possible from this to infer what the Panini/Doria armature was like (fig. 5). The ground level (yellow) would have been square and the middle section hexagonal (although the hexagon might also have gone all the way to the ground). From the Doria design we might expect the upper section also to have been hexagonal, but the superstructure in the Panini is much narrower. Indeed, from the Panini it could at best have been four posts close together on a square plan. This would have had to support not only a little gallery but also a tall obelisk. Even though the obelisk could have been constructed of four thin timbers covered in painted canvas, it would still have been difficult to brace.


It is possible that the Paninis had not fully thought through the structure underlying the design at the moment that the print was made. If we look at the painting, there is a tree-trunk visible through the upper opening (fig. 7). There is no sign of this in the print, and there seems to be no iconographic reason for its presence. It is likely that this is in fact the central post of the armature, dressed up in *papier maché* to look like a tree-trunk. It probably went from the second level up the centre of the obelisk, a distance of up to 20 meters, although it would not have been necessary for the main post to have gone all the way. There is no indication from Panini’s painting that it went lower than the third level, as it would have been visible through the lower arched opening. The third level housed the main figure group of Hymen and Love, which is quite a complex figure composition which would have been easier to do as a painted canvas, except that it needed to have been visible from all four sides of the *macchina* and so was probably

Figure 5. Diagram based on figures 2 and 3 indicating the probable nature of the armature shared by the Canillac *macchina* of 1745 and the first Chinea *macchina* of 1745 (graphic elaboration by D.R. Marshall).
a three-dimensional construction in *papier maché*. If so, we should be inclined to believe Panini when he shows empty space above it. The vertical obelisk post would need to have been braced in some way, and diagonal struts could perhaps have been fitted into the third level.

The Doria design avoids these problems by placing a simple domed octagonal lantern on the third level, and omitting the fourth. This could easily have been constructed on a second octagonal armature. Seen from the point of view of the armature it will be apparent why Doria’s design is so conservative. It is a basic dressing-up of the armature, and many of the three-dimensional elements, such as the trophies, may have been re-used from other *macchine*. The prominent reliefs of the basement could have been executed quickly on canvas, while the Berninesque rock basement could well have re-used old *papier maché* rockwork, which frequently appears in earlier Chinea designs of the 1720s and 1730s.
Three-dimensional or two-dimensional macchine?

The sequence of events concerning the three 1745 macchine – the Canillac macchina being burned on 20 June, necessitating the replacement of the intended first Chinea macchina with Doria’s, using the Canillac armature, which was “burned” on Tuesday 29 June, followed by the second Chinea macchina, which was “burned” a day later on 30 June – raises a question. If the nine-day space between the Canillac macchina and the first Chinea macchina gave insufficient time to erect the first Chinea macchina, how was it that the second Chinea macchina could be set up and “burned” in a single day? The sources are explicit about both being in Piazza Farnese, and although the print by Le Lorrain of the second Chinea macchina shows an setting inspired by the colonnade of Saint Peter’s (fig. 5), this has been explained by Aloisio Antinori as a consequence of the involvement of Gabriel-Pierre-Martin Dumont (1713?-1794), like Le Lorrain a pensionnaire at the French Academy, Dumont at the time being engaged in a study of Saint Peter’s.41

41. ANTINORI 2015, p. 68.
It is significant that the series of Chinea macchine by Paolo Posi that begin in 1751 and continue until 1775 consisted of manageable components that could readily be constructed in three dimensions, and that the underlying shapes of each pair of macchine (the first and second) are essentially the same, indicating that a single set of armatures was used for both. Presumably after the first day canvas panels on wooden frames, papier maché ornaments and minor features were taken down overnight and exchanged for new ones. It seems likely that in the years from 1745 to 1750 some such strategy was employed to avoid having to construct a new armature for the second macchina, even though, in contrast to the Posi macchine, the first and second macchine are quite different from each other and are designed by different artists.

What is noticeable about these macchina pairs is that the first is three-dimensional and the second is more planar. This is particular true for 1746 where the first Chinea, Le Lorrain’s startlingly original Temple of Minerva, is quite three-dimensional in concept (fig. 8) whereas the second macchina, Francisco Preciado de la Vega’s Le Terre del Regno di Napoli is a flat two-storey façade accompanied by two, evidently three-dimensional, wine forts (fig. 9). The two-storey structure looks like a painted canvas. Some elements may have been in relief, such as the central projection and primary figure groups and the trophies on top, but it is hard to believe that the niche statues on either side were anything but painted (Gori Sassoli has argued that this design by Preciado was intended to have been used for the first macchina of 1745, the one that was pulped and replaced by the one by Doria, on the grounds that while a payment to Preciado appears in the Colonna accounts for 1745 there is none in 1746). In view of the arguments presented here, this seems unlikely.

This raises the question of where such two-dimensional macchine were installed. It is generally assumed that they were erected in the middle of the piazza, as the three-dimensional ones certainly were. It is clear from the descriptions of the Canillac macchina cited above that these macchine

44. On Preciado’s design, see Deupi 2015, p. 88.
46. Ivi, p. 17. «Negli allestimenti per le Chinee borboniche prevalsero apparati concepiti pictorialmente, cioè composizioni
Figure 8. Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain (designer and etcher), *Prospettiva della prima macchina, de fuochi d'artificio rappresentante il Tempio di Minerva dall'antica gentilità tenuta per Dea delle Virtù, ond'è che qui si dimostra corteggiata dalle medesime*, etching, 40.0 x 47.2 cm. Los Angeles, Getty Museum.
Figure 9. Francisco Preciado de la Vega, *Le Terre del Regno di Napoli*, second *macchina* for the Chinea of 1746, etching by Miguel Sorellò, 39.6 x 45.1 cm. Courtesy Washington, National Gallery of Art.
needed to be seen from Palazzo Farnese, from where they would be viewed by the “eminent persons” and their entourages, whereas when the setting is shown, as in the painting (fig. 1) and print (fig. 3) of the Panini design and the print of the Doria design (fig. 4), they give the public’s view with the macchina in the foreground and Palazzo Farnese behind. Consequently a macchina installed in the centre of the piazza needed to be at least two-sided. Yet for Preciado’s 1746 design to be installed as a two-sided structure in the middle of the piazza it would need to be painted on both sides of a flat two-storey structure. This seems implausible. It makes more sense to suppose that it was installed on or against one of the palazzi surrounding the piazza, but not Palazzo Farnese, as it would not have been visible from the prime site within the palazzo. Other temporary palace facades, such as those on Santi Apostoli Palace for the creation as cardinal of Henry Benedict Stuart (1725-1807), Duke of York on 3 July 1747, and Palazzo della Valle for the the nomination as Cardinal of Carlo Vittorio Amedeo delle Lanze on 22 July 1747, were located on the blank rear facades of the relevant palaces.47

It is possible, therefore, that as a rule the second Chinea macchina, unlike the first, was essentially two-dimensional and did not require an elaborate armature constructed in situ over a period of several days, but rather was a single or several canvas-covered frames that could be wheeled into place from storage points in the surrounding streets and assembled quickly overnight. Presumably the first macchina armature could be dismantled overnight as well.

Various other options to the same effect may have been explored. In 1748 the first macchina by Louis-Joseph Lorrain is assumed to have been a three-dimensional structure.48 The second, probably by Preciado de la Vega, was pictorial, Il divertimento delle caccie reali.49 The engraving showing large scale figures with a building in the background. Was this building part of the painting, or could it have been a three-dimensional building using the same armature as Le Lorrain’s macchina? Both buildings have strongly projecting column pairs, in this case forming porticoes. If so, the figure groups might have been constructed in sections using a mix of painted canvases and three-dimensional papier maché figures.

Le Lorrain’s etchings of his first macchine of 1746, 1747, and 1748, with their clouds, smoking altars and multitude of small figures, are so atmospheric, that one wonders whether these, too, might be paintings. But even though the clouds lack the clear three-dimensionality of the rockwork in other Chinea

47. MARSHALL 2010.
49. Ivi, no. 46, pp. 118-119.
Monsignor de Canillac’s macchina

designs, clouds do appear in some of the Chinea macchine installed earlier in Piazza Santi Apostoli (such as the first and second macchine of 1732)\(^{50}\), but always in combination with rockwork. In an anonymous etching showing the first 1746 macchina set in a symbolic topography between Palazzo Farnese, Castel Sant’Angelo and Saint Peter’s these atmospheric elements have been stripped way (apart from a small cloud at the top)\(^{51}\). Although the macchina is clearly based on Le Lorrain’s print, its assertive three-dimensionality here probably does indeed signify that the structure was three-dimensional.

In Miguel Sorellò’s more prosaic rendering of the second 1747 macchina (Gli orti pensili)\(^{52}\) (fig. 10) the three-dimensionality of the macchina is established by an unusual oblique viewpoint and the presence of the bathtub fountains in the foreground and the Palazzo Farnese in the background\(^{53}\). The print does not indicate the designer, but Gori Sassoli suggests that it was Preciado de la Vega again\(^{54}\). This is a second macchina, but it is interesting that it shares with Le Lorrain’s first macchina a central building on a circular plan, surrounded by four towers on a square plan corresponding to Le Lorrain’s four obelisks. Could they have shared the same armature, thus anticipating Posi’s strategy?

In 1749 the first macchina, Il Tempio della Pace, probably by Preciado de la Vega, shows a small tempietto on clouds with large scale figure groups\(^{55}\) (fig. 11). The second macchina, Il Teatro di Ercolano,

---


53. It is an interesting question what the palace at the right is intended to represent. If the composition is not reversed it is more or less in the right position for the convent of Santa Brigida, which is clearly not what is being represented; moreover the awkward angle suggets that it refers to something else, such as one of the palaces opposite, or Palazzo Mandosi, especially if the composition is reversed.


55. Francisco Preciado de la Vega (?), *Prospettiva della prima Macchina de fuochi d’artifizio rappresentante il Tipo della Pace abbracciata per festeggiaie nel giubilo commune di un tanto bene la Concordia, che godiamo vedere oggi finalmente firmata, è stabilita, tra le Corone Cattoliche, e l’alte Sovrane Potenze che erano in guerra, ciò che alla Maestà del Re delle Due Sicilie, di Gerusalemme 6c. &c. &c., darà maggior campo di far fiorire li vantaggi de suoi Regni [...] Incendiata detta Macchina d’ordine di Sua Eccellenza il Sig.r Principe Don Fabrizio Colonna, Gran Contestabile del Regno di Napoli [...] come Ambasciatore Estraord.o di Sua Maestà, a dover presentare la Chinea, e Censo, la Vigilia de Gloriosi Apostoli SS. Pietro, e Paolo, a sua Beattitudine Papa Benedetto 14 l’anno 1749 / Michelangelo Specchi Architetto Deputato; Michele Sorellò inc.;
Figure 10. Francisco Preciado de la Vega (?), Prospettiva della seconda Macchina, con cui vengono rappresentati Orti Pensili ad allusione di quelle Delicie [...] Michele Sorellò inc., 1747, etching by Miguel Sorellò, 39.6 x 46.9 cm. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense.
Figure 11. Francisco Preciado de la Vega (?), Prospettiva della prima Macchina de fuochi d’artifizio rappresentante il Tipo della Pace abbracciata per festeggiare nel giubilo commune di un tanto bene la Concordia, che godiamo vedere oggi finalmente firmata, è stabilita, tra le Corone Cattoliche, e l’altre Sovrane Potenze che erano in guerra, etching by Miguel Sorellò, 1749, 40,3 x 46,7 cm. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense.
designed by Ennemond-Alexandre Petitot, who also did the etching, is a grandiose circular building in
the radical French style set in an capriccio Roman landscape\textsuperscript{56} (fig. 12). This building would be hard to
realise in three-dimensions, and although this work is “architectural” and Preciado’s “pictorial”, the
former would be the easier to construct in three dimensions using traditional tecniques, while the
latter would work best as a painting.

Finally, in 1750 the first \textit{macchina}, \textit{Il Molo nuovo di Napoli}\textsuperscript{57}, is a towered structure of the kind
that lent itself to being constructed in three-dimensions with an armature, while the second, \textit{Il Monte Vesuvio}, is wholly pictorial\textsuperscript{58}.

This brings us to the second 1745 Chinea \textit{macchina}, the one that succeeded Doria’s first \textit{macchina}
that had re-used Canillac’s armature\textsuperscript{59} (fig. 4). Although wholly an architectural conception that in the
upper sections recalls earlier Chinea designs\textsuperscript{60}, it may be significant that, as been mentioned, it is set,
like Petitot’s \textit{Teatro di Ercolano}, in a Roman capriccio landscape, this time based on the colonnade of
Saint Peter’s. Could this be because it was a painting, and the colonnade was in fact the background to
the painting rather than an indication of the setting?

---

\textit{Francesco Scardovelli Capo Bombard.e e Capo Fuocarolo di Cast. S. Ang.o}, etching by Miguel Sorellò, 40,3 x 46,7 cm. Roma,
Biblioteca Casanatense. GORI SASSOLI 1994, p. 119, no. 47.

56. Ennemond Alexandre Petitot, (designer and etcher), \textit{Prospettiva della seconda Macchina de fuochi d’artifizio
corrente rappresentante un Idea alludente alla nuova scoperta del Teatro di Erculano, che il perfetto gusto, ed intendimento dell’antichità
Romane della Maestà del Re delle Due Sicilie, di Gerusalemme, [...] con immenso dispendio, è venuto a ravvivarne la memoria,
che s’era cancellata dall’oblivione di tanti secoli trasandati, e stata tuttavia si può dire ampiamente ricompensata tale spesa,
e cura, dalli acquisti d’innumerevoli tesori di Statue Equestri Consolari [...] Fatta incendiare detta Macchina da Sua Ecc.za il Sig.r P.ppe Don Fabrizio Colonna
Gran Contestabile del Regno di Napoli [...] la sera della Festa della Gloriöö SS. Pietro, e Paolo Apostoli doppo aver presentato il giorno avanti la Chinea, e Censo, a Sua Beatitudine Papa Benedetto 14 l’anno 1749 /
S. Angelo, etching, 40,0 x 46,2 cm. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense. GORI SASSOLI 1994, p. 120, no. 48.

57. GORI SASSOLI 1994, p. 121, no. 49.

58. Ivi, p. 122, no. 50.

59. Louis Joseph Le Lorrain, \textit{Prospettiva della seconda macchina rappresentante il ritorno del re delle Due Sicilie alla Sua
fedelissima città di Napoli, lieta perchè sia felicemente uscito dalla collera, e fatiche della guerra costantemente sofferte
dall’intrepido suo Real animo diffendendo dall’aggressori li confini della sua monarchia. Incendiata detta Macchina con
abbondanti Fuochi di vago artificio d’ordine di sua Ecc.za il Sig.r P.ppe Don Fabrizio Colonna [...] a presentare la solita Chinea, e
Censo alla Santità di Nostro Sig.r Papa Benedetto 14 l’anno 1745 / l. Louis Le Lorrein inv. dis. e incise, etching, Roma, Biblioteca
Casanatense. GORI SASSOLI 1994, pp. 113-114, no. 40.

60. See the analysis in ANTINORI 2015.
Figure 12. Ennemond Alexandre Petitot (designer and etcher), *Prospettiva della seconda Macchina de fuochi d’artifizio rappresentante un Idea alludente alla nuova scoperta del Teatro di Erculano, che il perfetto gusto, ed intendimento dell’antichità Romane della Maestà del Re delle Due Sicilie, di Gerusalemme [...], con immenso dispendio, è venuto a ravvivarne la memoria, che s’era cancellata dall’oblivione di tanti secoli trasandati, 1749*, etching, 40,0 x 46,2 cm. Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense.
Criticism of the Canillac macchina

From the analysis given above of the probable armature of the Canillac macchina it is apparent that, structurally, the Panini macchina was highly problematic. This may have contributed to its poor critical reception.

While it was under construction, on 28 April 1745, two weeks after it is first mentioned by Diario ordinario, Jean-François de Troy, director of the French academy in Rome, wrote to his superior, Philibert Orry in Paris that Canillac was preparing to present great festivals for the marriage of the Dauphin. De Troy was clearly annoyed that Canillac did consult with him about it, pointing out that the Italians themselves have been impressed by the work of the pensionnaires, both in decorations and architecture, which honours France:

«M. de Canillac se prépare à donner de grandes fêtes pour le mariage de Mgr le Dauphin. L’on espéroit qu’il consulteroit en quelque façon l’Académie là-dessus. Il y avoit lieu de s’en flatter par la justice que les Italiens mêmes rendent à plusieurs de nos pensionnaires, qui, soit pour les décorations, soit pour l’architecture, sont bien en état de faire honneur à la nation».

He observes that the Constable of Naples has for many years used the pensionnaires to design the firework constructions for the Chinea: «Le connétable de Naples, depuis bien des annés, ne se sert que d’eux pour les compositions des feux qu’il fait faire ici tous les ans à l’occasion de la haquenée qu’il présent au Pape pour l’hommage du roy de Naples au Saint-Siège».

He then acidly remarks that «our minister doubtless has his reasons for having preferred Signor Pannini, painter of perspective in a small way («le s.r Pannini, peintre de perspective en petit»), to the painters and architects of this Academy, whose talents, however, are not known to strangers».

Bad relations between Canillac and de Troy had existed since at least the previous year. At the end of September 1744 the pensionnaires at the French Academy produced a festa in the courtyard of Palazzo Mancini where they were housed to celebrate the recovery of Louis XV from an illness. These are recorded in an anonymous print made at the time and involved Dumont, who later in 1772

61. Correspondance, 10, 1900, pp. 82-83, letter no. 4516, 28 April 1745.
64. «Notre ministre aura sans doute ses raisons pour avoir préféré le s.r Pannini, peintre de perspective en petit, aux peintres et aux architectes de cette Académie, et don’t cependant les talens ne laissent pas que d’être connus par les étrangers». Ibidem.
published a print of the event based on the anonymous one. This initiative had been opposed by Canillac, much to de Troy’s puzzlement. Possibly Canillac was discomforted that the initiative did not come from him, as chargé d’affaires, and that knowledge of this back in France would damage his career. Later, with the arrival in June of La Rochefoucauld, who praised de Troy, Canillac would have been further marginalised.

Panini may have to some extent been caught in the cross-fire, but the critical tone of de Troy towards him clearly goes deeper than this. Panini, who had been made a member of the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in Paris in 1732, an honour rare for Roman artists, would have


66. Correspondance, 10, 1900, pp. 75-76, letter no. 4508, Orry to de Troy, 4 November 1744: «J’ai reçu la lettre que vous m’avés écrite, Monsieur, le 7 du mois dernier, par laquelle vous me faites part des réjouissances qui ont été faites à l’Académie à l’occasion du rétablissement de la santé du Roy et de la fête qui a été donnée par les pensionnaires et dont vous m’avez envoyé une estampe. Je ne puis trop approuver leur zèle et je veux bien entrer dans une partie de la dépense qu’ils ont faite à cette occasion, afin de les indemniser en quelque façon du chagrin qu’ils ont eu de trouver un obstacle à ce qu’ils missent entièrement leur projet à exécution. Je ne conçois pas trop quelles raisons a eu M. de Canillac pour s’y opposer, et je ne serois même pas fâché que vous m’apprit que vous me donnerez la raison de ce que vous me donnerez là-dessus; pour ce qui est des raisons que M. de Canillac a eues pour empêcher l’exécution de cette fête, je n’ai pas pu les pénétrer. Lorsque je lui représentai qu’il n’en étoit pas de ces réjouissances comme d’une comédie en temps de Carnaval, qu’on donne pour son propre plaisir, et plus souvent pour le plaisir des autres, et qu’on peut interdire quand on le juge à propos, au lieu que cette fête se faisant pour une occasion aussi intéressante, on ne pouvait l’empêcher sans faire murmurer le public, on me répondit que le public n’approuvait point cette fête. La noblesse et le peuple passèrent cependant devant l’Académie le second jour et se plaignoit qu’on ne l’eût fait qu’une seule fois».

67. Canillac did, however, organise a Te Deum at San Luigi dei Francesi on 27 September, followed by three days of illuminations and musical concerts.

68. Correspondance, 10, 1900, p. 85, letter no. 4519, l’Archevêque de Bourges to Orry, 7 July 1745: «J’ay déjà été à l’Académie de France; on ne peut pas [sic] qu’on ne soit charmé de l’honneur que cette maison fait à la Nation. M. De Troy se fait aimer et considérer dans tout Rome. Il paroist que, parmi les élèves, il y a nombre de bons sujets et tous se comportent très sagement. J’espère que j’aurai toujours, dans la suite, à vous en rendre le même témoignage. La maison est meublée et tenue à merveille».

69. ARISI 1986, p. 207.
been supported by Nicolas Vleughels, director of the French Academy in Rome until 1737. They were friends, and each married a Gosset sister, Panini marrying Caterina in 1724, and Vleughels marrying Marie Thérèse in 1731. At this time Marie Thérèse was in dispute with de Troy over the pension she was owed as Vleughels’ widow. Panini had been a rival to de Troy for the post of director of the French academy in Rome, so there was probably no love lost between them. 

The Designer of Canillac’s Macchina: Giovanni or Giuseppe Panini?

The print of Canillac’s macchina by Le Lorrain states that the designer of the macchina was Giovanni Paolo’s son, Giuseppe. The Diario ordinario reports so too. He is also named in the payment concerning the transfer of the armature to the Colonna (discussed above). Consequently Kerber has suggested that in his letter de Troy was really referring to Giuseppe, but because he would not have been known in Paris refers to his father instead, and that Panini senior “presumably agreed to oversee the work of his relatively inexperienced son”72. But the reference to “le s.r Pannini, peintre de perspective en petit” is both explicit and charged, and there is also the evidence of a caricature of the elder Panini with a detail of the obelisk based on Le Lorrain’s print beyond by Pier Leone Ghezzi that states that it is by “Giovan’ Pauolo Pannini Pittore di Prospettive Parmigiano” (fig. 13)73.

This kind of slippage between father and son is common. Reporting on the dedication of the altar of the chapel of Santa Maria della Scala on 23 October 1745, four months after the Canillac macchina, the Diario ordinario reports that the “inventore, e architetto” of the whole chapel was “Giuseppe Panini Romano”74. Yet this chapel, as well as the pavement of the church, is extensively documented with payments and contracts involving Giovanni Paolo from 1732 (when Giuseppe was 14) to 1738. “Signor Giuseppe Pannini Architetto” is, however, documented as being responsible for the design and

70. Lapauze 1924, vol. 1, p. 214; Arisi 1986, p. 211.
71. Diario ordinario, no. 4356, 26 June 1745, pp. 6-7, “una nobilisima Machina di fuoco d’artificio [...] la cui invenzione è stata del Sig. Giuseppe Pannini Romano”.
72. Kerber 2017, pp. 89, 204 (note 23), who writes that de Troy “who – had he intended to – would certainly have explained to his correspondent in Paris that he was referring to the barely known son”.
74. See my forthcoming article that documents this project.
construction of the organ loft (*coretti*) and walnut swing doors (*bussola*) at the back of the nave. The most plausible explanation of all this is that Giovanni Paolo designed the chapel in 1734 and in 1738 designed the pavement. At some time after 1738 (when Giuseppe would have been 20), Giovanni Paolo handed over to Giuseppe his responsibilities at Santa Maria della Scala.

It seems likely, therefore, that Panini senior, as head of the family workshop and experienced in architectural design and in the depiction of festival decorations, was involved in the design of the Canillac *macchina*. Giuseppe, as the practical architect, was certainly responsible for its construction. It is perhaps academic who was responsible for the most problematic element, the obelisk.

The obelisk, as we have seen, would have been structurally problematic. Ghezzi refers to «the blunder of putting a spire (*guglia*) on the top of the Temple of Hymen». Ghezzi’s drawing is dated 28 June, that is, the day before the event of Doria’s first Chinea *macchina*, which suggests that he had just witnessed its completion following the dismantling of the Panini *macchina*. Bernini, in his Four Rivers fountain in Piazza Navona, often considered to be like a festival *macchina* made permanent, placed an obelisk on top of a rocky outcrop, daringly undermining its foundations with rock arches. The Panini *macchina*, however, displays no such playing with the viewer’s structural expectations. The fictive structure below the obelisk is simply insubstantial, relying as much on Borrominesque palm fronds as on architecture proper. Winged cupids supporting swags paradoxically ask to be read as flying buttresses, while the balustrade with balls is fussy and unarchitectonic. The design that Le Lorrain (probably with Dumont) would produce for the second Chinea *macchina*, which he would have begun at about the same time that he was etching the Panini design, was assertively architectonic.

The criticism of the Panini design may therefore have been the consequence not only of personal hostility between the Canillac-Panini camp and the De Troy-pensionnaires one, but between different conceptions of what festival *macchine* should be. For the Paninis, they should be like the interior set pieces that Giovanni Paolo would depict and sometimes design in such paintings as *The Musical Performance in Teatro Argentina in Honour of the Marriage of the Dauphin (1747)* and the *Ball and Concert Given by the Duc de Nivernais to Mark the Birth of the Dauphin in Palazzo Farnese (1751)*, whereas for the French it was an opportunity to experiment with innovative architectural design that would eventually lead to the betterment of French architecture.

**Panini’s painting in the Chrysler Museum**

Panini’s paintings has in the past occasionally been considered to be a *bozzetto*, but it is of considerable size and clearly unfinished. The publication of the inventory of the collection of Panini’s son Francesco by
Cola has allowed Kerber to establish the circumstances surrounding the work."Cola 2012." Presumably because of La Rochefoucauld’s arrival the painting was never finished, but Canillac took possession of it and hung it in his palace along with other works he had commissioned from Panini. After his death in 1761 the other Paninis were sent to France but this remained, probably being returned to Panini because it had not been paid for, appearing in his son Francesco’s inventory in 1800."Kerber 2017, p. 94.

At the time he was working on it, the actual macchina had been constructed, and, as I have been arguing, the painting was based on this, rather than the preliminary drawings that would have been the basis of Le Lorrain’s print. Print and painting correspond well enough, once one allows for the fact that the absence of reliefs and balustrade and balls is due to the unfinished state of the painting. The main differences are found in the figures, where genders have been swapped and attributes changed. In the prints they are fairly rudimentary, and may as been as much Le Lorrain as Panini. Presumably Giuseppe was not so good at figures as his father, and there are Panini drawings for the Teatro Argentina both for the figure of real people and for the figures in the decorations. It may therefore be the case that the figures in the painting are doubly Panini: that he is painting representations of his own designs for the macchina. Or did he rework the actual figures in his own more lively style? (When he came to do the figures of the spectators, Panini largely recycled figures and groups that he had created earlier)"Kerber 2017, pp. 116-117.

The slight change in angle of viewpoint between print and painting shows Panini the vedutista coming to the fore, endeavouring to give the composition pictorial vitality by avoiding the front-on view of the macchina adopted in the purely documentary engraving. He did a similar thing earlier in 1727 when he showed Piazza di Spagna in a painting recording a festa designed by Sebastiano Conca for Cardinal Bentivoglio."Kerber 2017, pp. 116-117.

There, however, he went much further in the direction of vedutismo, giving an oblique view of the palace as well. In the Canillac painting Panini retains the didactic frontality of the Palazzo Farnese found in the prints, but as in the earlier picture shows a perspective view down the street at the side of the palace, in this case in order to draw attention to Ferdinando Fuga’s recently built Santa Maria dell’Orazione e Morte.

75. COLA 2012.
76. KERBER 2017, p. 94.
77. One is the woman with a fan which corresponds to the fifth drawing in the British Museum sketchbook, in reverse which was made for the Drawing of the Lottery at Palazzo di Montecitorio (1743-1744). There is evidence of figures in the British Museum sketchbook being traced onto the verso, which was a common and simple way of effecting such a reversal. Another is the man on the scaffolding at the right, which corresponds to a drawing of a man on a tree made for the King Charles III Visiting Pope Benedict XIV at the Coffee House of the Palazzo del Quirinale (1746).
78. KERBER 2017, pp. 116-117.
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