

The parallelism between the dignity of subjects in literature and painting is familiar to us from Alberti's classification. But while Alberti correlated landscape painting as such with the lowest rung in the social ladder, the passage from Vitruvius could serve as a starting point for a subdivision of the landscape genre itself according to social 'degrees'. Thus when Lomazzo in 1585 came to write the first systematic account of landscape painting—five years after Cristoforo Sorte's more technical observations—he was evidently influenced by these distinctions.<sup>59</sup>

Those who have shown excellence and grace in this branch of painting, both in private and public places, have discovered various ways of setting about it—such as fetid, dark underground places, religious and macabre, where they represent graveyards, tombs, deserted houses, sinister and lonesome sites, caves, dens, ponds and pools; [secondly] privileged places where they show temples, consistories, tribunals, gymnasiums and schools, [or else] places of fire and blood with furnaces, mills, slaughterhouses, gallows and stocks; others bright with serene air, where they represent palaces, princely dwellings, pulpits, theatres, thrones and all the magnificent and regal things; others again places of delight with fountains, fields, gardens, seas, rivers, bathing places and places for dancing.

There is yet another kind of landscape where they represent workshops, schools, inns, market places, terrible deserts, forests, rocks, stones, mountains, woods, ditches, water, rivers, ships, popular meeting places, public baths or rather *terme*.<sup>60</sup>

Lomazzo's enumeration is anything but logical. What is the difference between his 'privileged places' and his 'bright places'? Why do schools and even bathing places occur in two categories? Systematization is nowhere Lomazzo's strongest point and his distinction of various landscape genres is particularly muddled. Nevertheless, the Vitruvian categories provide a clue to all this. That they were present in Lomazzo's mind is clear from the reference to 'regal objects' such as fill the tragic scene. The 'caves' of the satyric scene were elaborated in his sinister mode, while the comic scene is probably responsible for his last category of realistic landscapes.

In view of the casual and arbitrary origin of these distinctions their subsequent fate is truly astonishing. For Lomazzo's 'privileged places' are clearly turned into the heroic landscape of Poussin, his 'places of delight' become the Pastoral of Claude, his 'sinister dens' the subject matter of Salvator Rosa and Magnasco, and his inns and market places the Dutch *bambocciate*.<sup>61</sup>

Nor, as we know, did the strange career of these categories end there. The process by which they, in turn, were projected into nature has often been told.<sup>62</sup> There are countless passages in eighteenth-century literature like the one from a guide-book through the Lake District promising to lead the tourist

from the delicate touches of Claude, verified at Coniston Lake, to the noble scenes of Poussin, exhibited at Windermere water, and from there to the stupendous romantic ideas of Salvator Rosa, realized in the Lake of Derwent.<sup>63</sup>