Abstract
The paper brings new insights into the reception and use of Andrea Pozzo’s figures, published in his treatise Perspectiva pictorum et architectorum (1693, 1700), in 18th-century painted altarpieces in Croatia. Certain figures can be established as models for the design of painted altarpieces in the oeuvres of Ivan Krstitelj Ranger, Anton Jožef Lerchinger, and Antun Archer. Each of these painters used Pozzo’s models and principles in an idiosyncratic way, reflecting thereby different approaches and stylistic developments in 18th-century wall painting in Croatia.¹
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Illusionist altarpieces, that is, wall paintings representing altarpieces appeared in Croatia in the 18th century, mainly in churches located in the north-western part of the country.² As a visual arts phenomenon, they fit well into the artistic landscape of 18th-century Europe. Many countries, such as Bohemia, Poland, Italy, Germany, Austria, Slovenia, Hungary, Lithuania, to name just a few, have a wealth of Baroque heritage including a great number of illusionist altarpieces.³ In addition to formal similarity in the early stages of their development and use, this multitude of painted altarpieces spread over such a broad territory is partially a sign of a successful visual flow of artistic ideas from Italian Baroque art, particularly the theory and practice of the versatile artist Andrea Pozzo (Trent, 1642 – Vienna, 1709). The reason for Pozzo’s extensive influence in painted altarpieces lies primarily in the applicability of his treatise Perspectiva pictorum et architectorum, which served as a set of carefully elaborated art guidelines offering principles and explanations for the execution of such structures.⁴ The two-volume treatise was first published in the Latin and Italian languages in Rome in 1693 (Volume I) and 1700 (Volume II).⁵ German and French editions of the first volume coincided with the publishing of the second volume in Latin and Italian. Translations of both volumes into other languages followed soon after.⁶ Pozzo’s work and his presence in Vienna (1702 – 1709), in addition to the numerous editions of his treatise and the Jesuit support of its distribution, as well as the work of Pozzo’s students (primarily Christopher Tausch and Johann Hiebel)⁷ throughout Central Europe, helped in promoting the figures in the treatise and contributed to their widespread use. In addition to three-dimensional altars, ceiling and vault paintings, it is the painted altarpieces in Central European churches that testify to the adoption of Pozzo’s models. As a result, all these different examples of the use of these models come under the umbrella term of pozziìn in art historical literature.⁸ It is important to stress that, within the body of recent research into 18th-century illusionist altarpieces in Croatia, it is Sanja Cvetnić’s work that has contributed to the knowledge on the impact of Pozzo’s figures on painted altarpieces in the former Pauline church of St Mary in Olimje (1740), made by Ivan Krstitelj Ranger (Ioannes Baptista Rangger; Götzens, 1700 – Lepoglava, 1753). In addition to pointing out the resemblance in the works of these two artists, she also suggested that Pozzo had a great, although indirect, influence on Ranger’s painting style.⁹ This paper broadens the knowledge on the similarities between Ranger and Pozzo by establishing the same relationship of Pozzo’s models with the painted altarpieces of two other painters –
Anton Jožef Lerchinger (Rogatec ?, ca. 1720 – after 1787) and Antun Archer († ca. 1807).

The corpus of Croatian illusionist altarpieces shows an exceptionally wide range of quality in the treatment of illusionist painting and the manner in which illusionist scenes are brought into relationship with the architecture of the sacral buildings in which they are painted. Illusionist paintings feature carefully devised scenes containing the Baroque theatrum sacrum, whose central stage is formed by an altarpiece incorporated into an overall series of wall paintings in the chancel or the church interior as a whole. This type of painted scenes are discernible in the oeuvres of Ranger and Lerchinger, who are considered to be the most significant 18th-century fresco painters in Croatia. The works of Antun Archer, a younger artist, also share the same characteristics, which can be explained by the fact that he worked with Lerchinger as a member of his workshop on projects in Hrvatsko Zagorje. The paintings of all three artists show the influence of Pozzo’s ideas and figures, but they also differ amongst themselves in terms of interpretation and the design of altarpieces and the illusionist transformation of the built architecture.

The influence of Pozzo’s models is especially visible in the altarpieces painted by the Pauline painter Ivan Krsitelj Ranger in Pauline churches and chapels. His works are the earliest examples of Croatian illusionist altarpieces and they were produced at the time in which painted altarpieces were accepted and encouraged by the Pauline order almost as a trend in furnishing sacral spaces in Croatia. They soon started to be used in other monastic churches, such as Franciscan (Samobor, 1752; Marija Gorica, 1758) or Jesuit (Zagreb, 1762), as well as in parish churches, castle and parish chapels. As has already been mentioned, Ranger’s altar in the Olimje church (1740, Ill. 1) was first pointed out by Sanja Cvetnić as an example of the use of Pozzo’s very popular Figure LXIV (Ill. 2), published in the first volume of the treatise. Ranger adopted it for the Annunciation Altar on the south wall of the chancel. Painted on the flat wall surface, the domed, pavilion-like structure serves as a stage.
opening up to reveal the Nativity scene with the Virgin Mary standing next to the kneeler and Archangel Gabriel hovering above her. Ranger’s treatment of the figure was not literal. Instead, he reduced the architectural elements to a certain degree and used a smaller number of sculptures. Still, Ranger undoubtedly drew on Pozzo for the altar, but also for other parts of the interior, which is evident in the chancel vault, where he modelled the dome on Pozzo’s famous trompe-l’œil dome in St Ignatius in Rome (1684 – 1685), published as Figure XCI in the first volume of the treatise.

Figure LXIV was also used by Pozzo to design the high altar of the Jesuit church of St Francis Xavier in Mondovi (1676 – 1679, present-day Chiesa della Missione), where the painted altarpiece provides a stage-like setting for various religious scenes, and in the Franciscan church of St Jerome in Vienna (1706/7). These altar compositions demonstrate a fusion of different media and impressive scenographic effects with which Pozzo built a sort of macchina d’altare. In his explanation of the figure, Pozzo claimed that it was a suitable model for high altars, but that he himself frequently used it for theatrical scenes for the Forty Hours’ Devotion. It was a widely adopted form of altar that served as a model for numerous painted altarpieces in Central European churches between the 18th and 20th centuries. Some of them include (the former) St Catherine’s Chapel in Wernberg Castle, Austria (1730 – 1735) by painter Josef Ferdinand Fromiller (Oberdrauburg, 1693 – Klagenfurt, 1760), the altarpiece in the parish church of the Holy Trinity (a former Jesuit church) in Sibiu, Romania (1774, Anton Steinwald), St Rocco’s Parish Church in Stari Trg pri Ložu, Slovenia (1872) by painters Janez Šubic (Poljane, 1850 – Kaiserslautern, 1889) and Juraj Šubic (Poljane, 1885 – Leipzig, 1890), and the altarpiece in the Franciscan church of St Joseph in Prešov, Slovakia (Konrád Švestka). However, all these examples show that Pozzo’s model was not merely translated, but also interpreted and modified, although always in keeping with its core elements.

Among Ranger’s works, there is not a single altarpiece that demonstrates Pozzo’s influence to a greater extent than that in Olimje. Nevertheless, Ranger did draw on Pozzo’s figures and scenographic principles described in the treatises for the majority of his altarpieces. The model he most frequently used was Figure LXXIII (Ill. 3) from the second volume, its ground-floor plan and cross section illustrated in Figure LXXIV. Ranger’s altarpiece of the high altar at the chapel of St John the Baptist (1731) in Gorica near Lepoglava (photo: D. Šourek, 2011) is a thoughtfully executed structure with complex layers and scenic qualities, most likely pointing to the fact that Ranger was familiar with Pozzo’s aforementioned structures. In his figure descriptions, Pozzo gives advice on how to design the central opening in the altarpiece that can contain a sculpture,
credence to the supposition that Ranger followed Pozzo’s principles can be found on the Gorica altarpiece, which lends contemporary Baroque scenographic ideas into Croatian art. This is why ornaments (faux marbling and architectural decorations), and layered design of scenery undoubtedly demonstrate well-devised scenographic ideas. This is why this Ranger’s altar is a visual confirmation of the influx of modern and well informed the painters were, and the conceptual design of their altarpieces can be compared with almost simultaneously built altarpieces representing the ceremonial Baroque altar scenes. One of the most prominent examples is certainly the renowned high altar at St George’s Church in Weltenburg (Egid Quirin Asam, 1721), where the fusion of painting and sculpture is even more manifest.

In Figure LXXIII (Ill. 3), Pozzo also suggests the opening up of architecture towards heavenly landscapes and a scene in the section above the altar, which can be compared in its treatment with Ranger’s painted altarpieces in the Pauline chapels of St Jerome in Strigova (around 1744) and St George in Purga near Lepoglava (1750). In Strigova, the entire wall surface of the chancel containing three apsidal chambers is covered with Ranger’s frescoes. Two side chapels have identical illusionist paintings of altars dedicated to St Anne and St Mary (Ill. 5). Their altarpieces are represented as simply ornamented built marble altars, with an altar painting in the centre and a low attic on the top. The apses are visually transformed by illusionist frescoes to appear as if they were built only up to the foot of the vault, while the space above is filled with a celestial landscape with angels. Discernible similarities between the painting and the model include the visual integration of the altarpiece architecture and the architectural articulation of the rear wall, the articulation of the entablature, and the visually emphasized boundary between the terrestrial and celestial spheres and their treatment.

In Purga, the east-end wall of the chapel has a scene that seems to be in full swing in front of an observer (Ill. 6). Architecture was not painted in the form of a typical altarpiece, but as a free-standing, rounded scenographic structure with an arched opening (balcony) in the centre, which divides the two protagonists from the depicted event. One of them is St George on a rearing horse, shown in an expressive moment of stabbing a dragon-like monster, while the other protagonist is the princess who was saved from the dragon by the saint according to the legend. The princess is shown by the saint according to the legend. The princess is shown by a depiction of the Holy Trinity and a heavenly entourage, which takes up the entire apsidal vault of the chapel. Two little angels leaning onto the painted architecture touch a cross on its top, while one of them points with his finger to the scene below. The earthly and heavenly spheres are thereby connected both thematically and scenographically, which also affirms the same degree of their illusionist persuasive-


how to use various media in executing it, and how to deliberately place hidden windows, which can contribute to the dramatic and stage-like effects of the entire scene. The same principles can be found on the Gorica altarpiece, which lends credence to the supposition that Ranger followed Pozzo’s instructions. A wooden board, which completely closes off the altar at St George’s Church in Weltenburg (Egid Quirin Asam, 1721), where the fusion of painting and sculpture is even more manifest.

In Figure LXXIII (Ill. 3), Pozzo also suggests the opening up of architecture towards heavenly landscapes and a scene in the section above the altar, which can be compared in its treatment with Ranger’s painted altarpieces in the Pauline chapels of St Jerome in Strigova (around 1744) and St George in Purga near Lepoglava (1750). In Strigova, the entire wall surface of the chancel containing three apsidal chambers is covered with Ranger’s frescoes. Two side chapels have identical illusionist paintings of altars dedicated to St Anne and St Mary (Ill. 5). Their altarpieces are represented as simply ornamented built marble altars, with an altar painting in the centre and a low attic on the top. The apses are visually transformed by illusionist frescoes to appear as if they were built only up to the foot of the vault, while the space above is filled with a celestial landscape with angels. Discernible similarities between the painting and the model include the visual integration of the altarpiece architecture and the architectural articulation of the rear wall, the articulation of the entablature, and the visually emphasized boundary between the terrestrial and celestial spheres and their treatment.

In Purga, the east-end wall of the chapel has a scene that seems to be in full swing in front of an observer (Ill. 6). Architecture was not painted in the form of a typical altarpiece, but as a free-standing, rounded scenographic structure with an arched opening (balcony) in the centre, which divides the two protagonists from the depicted event. One of them is St George on a rearing horse, shown in an expressive moment of stabbing a dragon-like monster, while the other protagonist is the princess who was saved from the dragon by the saint according to the legend. The princess is shown by a depiction of the Holy Trinity and a heavenly entourage, which takes up the entire apsidal vault of the chapel. Two little angels leaning onto the painted architecture touch a cross on its top, while one of them points with his finger to the scene below. The earthly and heavenly spheres are thereby connected both thematically and scenographically, which also affirms the same degree of their illusionist persuasive-
ness. The illusionist paintings on the wall of the apse form part of a larger ensemble of frescoes in the chapel, which includes two lateral illusionist paintings of the altarpieces of St Anthony of Padua and Our Lady of Sorrows. They are painted to look like built altarpieces, with an altar painting of St Anthony of Padua and Our Lady of Sorrows. They are part of a larger ensemble of frescoes in the chapel, which includes two lateral illusionist paintings of the altarpieces in Štrigova, which were shown in the same manner as Pozzo’s – containing a profiled cornice with volute-shaped endings. Paintings in Purga and Štrigova also show that Ranger managed to create a harmonious connection between the painted and the real space by making the painted space appear as a part and logical continuation of the real architecture. Ranger does not do that with a strongly emphasized quadratura in the walls or by setting the painted architectural elements more deeply into the space, but by logically connecting the illusory and the real (Ill. 6). In doing that, he is concerned with the visual extension of painted architecture into the three-dimensional one (such as the correspondence between the cornices of the actual building and the colours he uses in his paintings). He also takes care to produce a harmonious composition of painted structures in relation to the dimensions of physical space. Regardless of the heterogeneous themes of the painted scenes, in which he merges earthly and heavenly realities, Ranger never articulates illogical structures in the architecture of church chancels and altars. Whether Ranger was in fact familiar with the entire text of Pozzo’s treaties, we can only speculate. Ranger’s interpretation of Pozzo’s figures suggest that his knowledge of the treatise in terms of altars was comprehensive, but they also show his personal approach to Pozzo’s ideas about scenography, stratified structures, and the illusionist painting as such. Moreover, Cvetnić has pointed out that certain segments in the treatise are recognizable in the architectural details and decorations of Ranger’s wall paintings. Among the Croatian illusionist altarpieces, a somewhat different treatment of the relationship between the wall paintings and the built architecture is found in the works of Anton Jožef Lerchinger, an important fresco painting active in the second half of the 18th century in north-western Croatia. Lerchinger was also familiar with Pozzo’s works, or at least some of them. This is evident in his almost literal translation of Pozzo’s altar model, Figure LXXIII (Ill. 7) from the second volume of the treatise, which Lerchinger used for the altar-piece painting of the high altar at St Anne’s chapel (Ill. 8) in Završje Začretsko (before 1760). Unfortunately, the lower parts of the chancel paintings and the painted altarpiece have been partly destroyed and are today almost completely hidden behind a neo-Gothic wooden altar from 1933. The altarpiece shows how Lerchinger repeats Pozzo’s architectural altar with a central painting and flanks the painting by clusters of recessing supports. They carry segments of the entablature and a segmental pediment, and are topped by a richly articulated attic with concave sides. The shape of individual segments faithfully follow the model – the painter used the same broken entablature above the altar painting,
large volutes on both sides of the entablature, which appear as the roots of the attic, a shell-like decoration that he placed on the sides of the attic, and a large painting of a double shell on the top. However, there are certain departures from the model – columns are not twisted, the painted sculptures are positioned on the insides of the columns, the little angels are placed on entablature segments, and a personification of the Church is situated in the attic. Furthermore, a garland with fruit hangs above the altar painting and there are no foliage ornaments on the top of the attic. Assumingly, Lerchinger interpreted the model rather freely or else he drew on a later copy (print) of the model created according to Pozzo’s original. That the latter was most likely the case is suggested by the angels on the attic, which resemble Pozzo’s angels in their posture, but differ in the orientation of their bodies.

In the second volume of the treatise, the altar in Figure LXXX (Ill. 7) shows a particular similarity to the altar in Figure LXXIX (Ill. 9). These two figures were often cited and interpreted by various artists in their painted altarpieces. They served as models for the altarpieces in the Jesuit church in Montepulciano (1714 – 1715), painted by Pozzo’s student Antonio Colli, and a somewhat simpler altarpiece created almost at the same time for the church of St Anthony of Padua (1714) in Valcanovero near Trento. The same figures were adopted for the lavishly painted altarpieces in the church of the Holy Trinity in Stadl-Paura in Austria, in which the patron saint of the church is symbolically reflected in the ground plan and the programme of wall paintings (1714 – 1725) produced by Francesco Messente (1675 – 1745) and Carlo Innocenzo Carlone (1686 – 1775). These examples, completed before the altarpiece in Završje Začretsko, share the same characteristics as the altarpiece in the Augustine church of St Laurence in Pšovka near Mělník in Bohemia (1730s), created by painter Johann Ezechiel Wodniansky (1673 – 1758).
other among the many examples that indicate the popularity of Pozzo’s model. However, it should be stressed that two decades before Lerchinger’s paintings, Pozzo’s Figure LXXIX (III. 9) had been used in Croatia as a model for marble side altars of St Augustine (1729, Ill. 10) and the Presentation of the Virgin Mary (1729) in the Jesuit church of St Ignatius in Dubrovnik,\(^\text{38}\) which have been attributed to the Venetian sculptor Giovanni Maria Morlaiter (Venice, 1699 – Venice, 1781).\(^\text{39}\) The altars show a great degree of similarity in architectural structure and in small figurative and decorative details such as the cartouche on the predella, the angel’s head above the altar painting, the attic with its side borders decorated with shell-like ornaments, a vase, and a decorative shell with foliage ornamentation in the attic. The differences include the shape of supports – Pozzo uses twisted columns\(^\text{40}\) – and the laterally positioned sculptures symbolizing Virtues. This altar design represents the “purest” rendering of Pozzo in Croatian artistic heritage. Its appearance in the Jesuit church in Dubrovnik is not surprising, since the church was built according to Andrea Pozzo’s designs.\(^\text{41}\) In addition, literature on paintings in the Dubrovnik church has already stated the similarity between the central section of the rear chancel wall and Pozzo’s St Ignatius in Rome (1694)\(^\text{42}\) – the tripartite division of the wall surface with three rectangular wall paintings.\(^\text{43}\) Among all the Dubrovnik frescoes painted by Gaetano Garcia (1735 – 1738),\(^\text{44}\) two lateral scenes in the chancel – St Ignatius Receives St Francis Xavier and St Ignatius Receives St Francis Borgia – were linked by certain scholars with the homonymous paintings from one of the Camere di S. Ignazio in the Jesuit monastery next to Il Gesù in Rome.\(^\text{45}\) Therefore, these two marble altars additionally attest to the connection between the Jesuits in Rome and Dubrovnik, which was established through Pozzo’s indirect role in furnishing the Dubrovnik church.

---


10. Giovanni Maria Morlaiter (attributed), Altar of St Augustine, 1729, St Ignatius’ church, Dubrovnik (photo: D. Šoureč, 2013)

Giovanni Maria Morlaiter (attributed), Oltar sv. Augustina, 1729, crkva sv. Ignacij, Dubrovnik
Among the painted altars drawing on Pozzo’s Figures LXXIX and LXXX, there are some that are more immediate renderings and others that are rather freely interpreted. Lerchinger’s works belong to the latter group, which is evident in the aforementioned details. However, his greatest personal intervention was in the visual effects created by the illusionist paintings on the rear chancel wall. It should be noted that Pozzo did not specify a spatial context for this models. However, in addition to the altarpiece in Završje Začretsko, Lerchinger painted the entire wall of the apse encircling the altarpiece in a manner that produces the impression of the altar being situated in a domed chancel. This model, which is almost always modified to some extent, is discernible in the illusionist transformations of the chancel in almost all painted altarpieces and frescoes in the apses that were attributed to Lerchinger or his workshop. Examples where this sort of treatment was applied in more detail and on a larger scale include the altarpieces of the high altars and frescoes in the chancel of St Joseph’s Chapel in the Oršić Castle in Gornja Bistra (before 1777) and those in the parish church of St Cosmas and Damian in Kuzminec (before 1778, Ill. 11). All of these painted altars are situated in a trompe-l’œil chancel covered with a dome with a lantern on the top. With the use of what might be called hypertrophic perspective, these structures leave a stronger impression of advancing down towards the observer, and their foreshortenings are treated in such a way as to simulate a look from below (dal sotto in sù). The painted architecture on the back wall of the apse has the effect of heightening the actual space of the church. Unlike Ranger, Lerchinger built a solid and enclosed architecture of the painted chancel, which is never opened up in order to infuse heavenly landscapes into the real space. His approach actually results in illogical and incomprehensible spatial relationships between the painted architecture and the structure of the church. For example, domes without pendentives or squinches require a circular base, which makes the realis-
tion of his painted architecture impossible. Additionally, a certain, so to say, lack of logic is also manifest in other segments, such as the way in which the cornices visually continue into the built ones and thereby negate the illusion of the separately domed space of the chancel. The painted space is confined especially to the zone of the dome and sometimes seems too little and too flat to take in a painted altarpiece. Despite this, the painted structure gives certain lightness to the built architecture and shows gradual foreshortenings that do not create the effect of longitudinal spatial extension. Instead, they create an optical effect of a considerably higher chancel area, with a strong view from below upwards. These somewhat exaggerated and limitless perspective views of the paintings cannot be considered as a result of the painter’s lack of skill and talent, but as deliberate effects, frequent and recognizable characteristics of late Baroque or Rococo frescoes – it is evident that the logical interaction between architecture and painting is broken. The decorative effects of these painted structures, which also include colourful faux marbling of the altarpieces and its rich ornaments, overcome its unconvincing illusionist transformation of space. They are even more obvious when set against Pozzo’s illusionist rendering of the chancel and the painted altarpiece (III. 12) in the Jesuit church of Frascati (1681 – 1684, completed in 1701),48 which Pozzo published as Figure LXIX in the second volume of his treatise. He used illusionist painting to transform the architecture of the chancel into a domed space, in which he placed a stage-like ceremonial architecture and the scene of the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple depicted with the immediacy of a live event. The wall paintings are not visually independent of the church space, but are strongly interconnected, creating thereby a persuasive integration of physical and painted architecture. The capitals and the entablature of the actual architecture are repeated in the paintings. The flow between real and illusionist space is in Pozzo’s works set as an imperative and achieved through a well-executed quadratura. A similar chancel design, also inspired by Pozzo’s Frascati model, can be found in the wall paintings by Johann Hiebel (Ottobeuren, 1681 – Prague, 1755) in the Jesuit church of the Immaculate Conception and St Ignatius in Klatovy (1716) in Bohemia,49 and in the works of the Jesuit painter Johann Kuben (1697 – 1770)50 in the church of the Holy Cross in Brzeg in Poland. The convincing effects of these frescoes are based on the logically painted architectural structures and the relationship between the painted scenes and the built architectural elements. Lerchinger’s concepts are closer to illusionist painting in the following churches: St Peter and Paul’s church in Nová Říše (Bohemia) by Johann Lucas Kracker (Vienna, 1719 – Eger, 1779),51 the parish church of Vörösberény (1779, Hungary) by Franz Xaver Bucher (Tettnang, 1743 – Veszprém, 1811),52 and the parish church of Trstěnice (1804, Bohemia) by Josef Winterhalder Jr. (Vörenbach, 1743 – Znojmo, 1807).53 Paintings in these churches show similar cases of the trompe-l’œil chancel with a lantern dome, but without a properly executed quadratura or the logical flow between the painted and the real space and architecture. Lerchinger’s illusionist transformations of the built architecture grew distant from Pozzo’s convincing illusions and became closer to the work of his contemporaries, who subjected the logic of spatial flow to other effects in painted architecture.

Both Ranger and Lerchinger incorporated their illusionistic altarpieces into comprehensive series of wall paintings, whether those in the chancel area or in the entire church interior. By that, they visually confirmed the importance of high altars in scenic compositions. However, their re-
spective approaches to developing a relationship between the depicted architecture and the built church architecture are significantly different and reflect the stylistic changes occurring in wall painting during the second half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, as well as their different personal and education backgrounds. Whereas Ranger was a Tyrolean painter who adopted elements of Italian baroque art via Egid Schor (Innsbruck, 1627 – 1701) and Caspar Waldman (Innsbruck, 1657 – 1720),\textsuperscript{54} introducing to Croatia all the most important principles and topics of illusionist painting, Lerchinger was a Styrian painter who studied under Johann Chrysostom Vogl (Steingaden, 1679 – Graz, 1748) and later assisted the Ptuj-based painter Anton Pachmayer († 1748). In contrast to Ranger, his works do not show strong links to the Italian painting tradition, but rather belong to the Central European artistic circle and show his adoption of Rococo elements.\textsuperscript{55} Even though Ranger introduced to Croatia a high artistic culture and resonances of superior ideas that simultaneously resonated in a wider European area, his altarpieces, although the oldest in Croatia, did not live to be taken as models for the later ones. It is also important to note that Lerchinger’s models and his manner of painting had a more lasting legacy and influence on other painters in Croatia, primarily due to the long-term activity of both Lerchinger and his workshop. One of the painters associated with this workshop is Antun Archer († ca. 1807), who painted the trompe-l’oeil altarpieces of the high altars at the parish church of St John the Baptist in Zagreb (1792, Ill. 13)\textsuperscript{56} and in the parish church of Holy Trinity in Legrad (1793, Ill. 14),\textsuperscript{57} both of which were most likely made by drawing on the same model. They have the same architectural structure – the central part is flanked by massive, stepped supports projecting towards the front and carrying a strongly projecting entablature and a pediment with a blue fabric ceremonial curtain on the top. Archer’s painted architecture design reflects Pozzo’s monumental ideas of painted and built altars. Pozzo’s painted altarpiece of Annunciation (Ill. 15) in the transept of St Ignatius’ church in Rome (1685),\textsuperscript{58} which was replaced with a marble altar (Filippo della Valle, 1749),\textsuperscript{59} provides a good comparative example. Its appearance is known today only owing to the treatise in which it was depicted as Figure LXVII. In the textual instruction accompanying the figure, Pozzo praises
the execution and optical illusion created by the altar as one of the first such works in Rome, where the use of light and shadow was guided by the rules of perspective. Association of this altar with the Archer’s altarpieces is based on the design of the central section – especially in the segments of the pediment, the continuous semi-circular cornice above the central area, the broken entablature, and the sculptures placed on the outer side of the supports (Zagreb). The same model was used by C. Tausch for the central part of the built altarpiece on the high altar in the Jesuit church of St Matthew in Wroclaw (1725). Common features can also be found between the painted altars in Croatia and Pozzo’s built altar in the Jesuit church of Vienna (1703 – 1705), and they are also discernible in Tausch’s monumentally built high altar at the former Jesuit church of St Francis Xavier in Trenčín (1717). In addition to monumentality, these examples are characterized by pairs of strongly projecting columns, markedly slanted, and the foreshortened entablature, segments of the cornice, and a pediment with emphasized dentils. Moreover, all three artists – Pozzo (in Vienna), Tausch (in Trenčín) and Archer (in Zagreb and Legrad) – place juvenile angels with highly raised right arms on the pediment segments. Although it cannot be claimed with certainty that Archer found a direct inspiration in Pozzo’s or Tausch’s works, it is nevertheless important to stress that his altarpieces cannot be analysed without any reference to the fact that he was familiar with their altars. Naturally, one thing that should be born in mind is that certain altar design concepts and ideas were constantly being exchanged among painters through communication channels other than the treatise. Regarding Archer’s relationship to the built architecture, he painted altarpieces in the aforementioned churches on the rear wall of shallow apses, which he shaped in a single colour and painted a trompe-l’oeil segment on their top suggesting a domed vault. These paintings are performed much more modestly, and unlike Lerchinger’s paintings, they have fewer details and no strong visual impact on the built architecture. Archer’s altarpieces and other wall paintings in the chancels of the said churches show distancing from Lerchinger’s colourful and more decorative altars and the adoption of an approach that favours bare architecture, peaceful colours, and almost no ornamentation, which are all characteristics and tendencies of neo-Classicism.

The presence of Pozzo’s models in Croatia only confirms his wide recognition and popularity, which owes much to two specific features he emphasized in his treatise: models could simultaneously be executed in various materials as well as for various purposes. The same or similar models could often serve as an apparatus for different church festivals. This is especially the case with the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament and the Holy Sepulchre, with which they share an identical intention: the wish to achieve perfect illusion of either an altar, a chancel or a temporary sacred theatre by means of carefully executed perspective with scenographic devices. In the entire corpus of Croatian altar paintings, Pozzo’s ideas were most consistently implemented in the oeuvre of I. K. Ranger. As Cvetnić claims, »(…) it is safe to conclude that the influence of the Jesuit lay brother from South Tyrol on the Pauline lay brother from North Tyrol was critical for the formulation of the visual language that allowed for a transformation of church interiors into a passionate theatrum sacrum.« His painted altarpieces are exceptionally versatile in their compositions, and range from almost literal citations to completely free interpretations of certain elements from Pozzo’s figures. In contrast to Ranger, Lerchinger followed Pozzo only sporadically in his altar in Zavrsje Začretsko. The architecture of his altarpieces is never based on the scenographic approach to structural elaboration. Instead, he shaped them as three-dimensional, freestanding objects (like imitations of built marble or wooden altarpieces) and placed them in single domed units. He also did not follow Pozzo’s principles of illusionism in his treatment of paintings with built architecture. Archer’s altarpieces did draw on Pozzo’s model, but their similarities lie less in adherence to the models and more in free interpretation by members of his workshop. It is significant that Pozzo’s figures played an equally important role in the early development of illusionist painting in Croatia as they played for the same mode of painting in Central Europe. Therefore, the analysed altars confirm the significance of Pozzo’s treatise not only in the spread of specific models of illusionist painting, but also as a new trend in furnishing church buildings in general, especially in the 18th century. Although the reverberations of Pozzo’s ideas in Croatian art was not as strong, systematic, or frequently implemented as in the art of Bohemia or Poland, the altarpieces painted by the three artists, in addition to the architecture and fresco series in the interior of the church in Dubrovnik, are valuable examples of pozisim in Croatian 18th-century art.

(Translation: Željka Miklošević)

Notes

1 This paper is an extended version of the presentation given at the international scientific conference Between Rococo and Classicism: Ceiling Painting in the Second Half of the 18th Century, Zagreb, October 2014, organized by the Institute of Art History Zagreb and Croatian Association of Art Historians.

2 The 18th century illusionist altarpieces have been a topic of research of the following authors: Anica Ceve, Sanja Cvetnić, Marija Mirković, and Mirjana Repači-Braun. Their published works relevant for the topic of this paper will be referenced further in this paper.

3 Due to limited space, references on altarpieces from these countries had to be reduced. They include the following: HERBERT KARNER, Zur Rezeption des Scheinarchitektonischen Werkes von Andrea Pozzo in den habsburgischen Ländern nördlich der Alpen im 18. Jahrhundert, doctoral thesis, Faculty of Philosophy,

4 For the purpose of this paper, I have used the Latin-German edition from 1709: ANDREA POZZO, Perspectivae pictorum atque architectorum. Der Maler und Baumeister Perspectiv, vols. I & II, Augsburg, published by Jeremias Wolffius, 1709.


12 Due to the already extensive topic of painted altarpieces, other types of wall paintings by these artists, such as vault frescoes, or their relationship to Pozzo’s figures, have not been considered in this paper.

13 SANJA CVETNIĆ (as in note 9), 215–222.

14 The architectural design of the altar shows that Pozzo drew on the high altar at St Giovanni e Paolo’s church in Venice, making a slight change in comparison with the original. More in: ULRIKE KNALL-BRSKOVSKY, Italienische quadraturisten in Österreich, Vienna – Köln – Graz, 1984, 128.

15 Cvetcin claims that by painting angles and clouds in the central space, and figures in the lower space, Ranger followed Pozzo’s textual instructions accompanying this figure. SANJA CVETNIĆ (as in note 9), 218.


19 See in: ANDREA POZZO (as in note 4), vol. I, Figura LXIV.

20 HERBERT KARNER (as in note 3, 1995), 75.

21 More in: RICHARD BÖSEL (as in note 18), 219; SZA- BOLCS SERFŐZŐ (as in note 8), 119.


24 ANDREA POZZO (as in note 4), vol. II, Figura LXXIII and Figura LXXIV.


27 SANJA CVETNIĆ (as in note 9), 217–218, 227.
Jasmina Nestić: The Influence of Andrea Pozzo's Models from His Treatise Perspectiva pictorum...
Iluzionirani, na zidu naslikani oltarni retabl važan su dio sakralne baštine 18. stoljeća u sjeverozapadnoj Hrvatskoj. Kao likovna pojava uklapaju se u umjetnički krajobraz barokne Europe, pa ih nalazimo u Češkoj, Poljskoj, Italiji, Njemačkoj, Austriji, Sloveniji, Mađarskoj, Litvi... Nijihova rasprostranjenost i međusobna oblikovna srodnost svjedoče o iznimnoj protočnosti likovnih ideja poizažlih iz okrilja teorije i prakse svestranog umjetnika i isusovca Andrea Pozzo (Trento, 1642 – Beč, 1709.), a najjasnije iz njegova traktata *Perspectivae pictorum et architectorum* (1693., 1700.). Odjeke Pozzovih oltarnih modela iz traktata prepoznajemo i na pojedinim iluzioniranim retablima u Hrvatskoj, a najjavnije na onima koje je slikao pavlin Ivan Krstitelj Ranger (Götzens, 1700. – Lepoglava, 1753.). Na oslanjanje skjoj, a najranije na onima koje je slikao pavlin Ivan Krstitelj poznajemo i na pojedinim iluzioniranim retablima u Hrvat-
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U Lerchingerovoj radionici najvjerojatnije je određeno vrijeme djelovaš u slikar Antun Archer († oko 1807), na čijim naslikanim retablima u župnoj crkvi sv. Ivana Krstitelja u Zagrebu (1792.) i župnoj crkvi Presvetoga Trojstva u Lgradu (1793.) također primjećujemo forme Pozzova na-

*Ključne riječi:* iluzionirani retabl, zidno slikarstvo, Andrea Pozzo, Ivan Krstitelj Ranger, Antun Jožef Lerchinger, Antun Archer, XVIII. st.