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The search for antique models for Tullio Lombardo’s pathbreaking *Adam* (Figure 1) has occupied many scholars, who have proposed various possible sources in classical and Hellenistic sculpture and in late antique ivories.¹ So far, their quest for a prototype has yielded no definitive answer. Tullio (ca. 1455–1532) remains an elusive historical figure: his artistic formation and influences are still mostly matters of conjecture. What, then, might he have seen and studied that could have inspired his *Adam*?

Identifying ancient sources is rarely a straightforward task. Determining which ancient works were available, either directly or indirectly, to a Renaissance artist is often complicated by the existence of replicas and by uncertain identifications and generic descriptions of the kinds found in sixteenth-century documents. In addition, the condition of ancient sculptures seen during the Renaissance must be ascertained, along with what was known about them and, more important, how they were understood and interpreted.

Venice, where Tullio worked in the studio of his father, the sculptor Pietro Lombardo (ca. 1435–1515), presents its own unique set of challenges for researchers. Information about antiquities collections that were present in Venice in the second half of the fifteenth century is far from complete. Such collections were rarely documented in drawings or by other visual means, and they are now mostly dispersed. An investigation into Tullio’s sources is further hampered by the lack of records—contracts or drawings, for instance—that might convey some sense of which ancient works the artist himself studied. Without solid evidence, the best we can do, based on what we do know, is to develop hypotheses about models he may have consulted.

That Tullio and the Lombardo family looked at ancient sculpture is certain.² In 1532, the Venetian art collector and connoisseur Marcantonio Michiel (1484–1552) noted that an ancient carving in the collection of the wealthy Milanese merchant Andrea Odoni had once been in Tullio’s workshop.³ In Michiel’s words, the “marble figure of a fully draped but headless and armless woman is ancient and had been in Tullio Lombardo’s shop, where he reused it a number of times in a number of his works.”⁴ According to Debra Pincus, the sculpture described by Michiel corresponds to a Greek marble kore, perhaps from Crete, that was in the Contarini collection in the second half of the sixteenth century and is now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Venice (inv. 164–A). The kore may well have been the source of the figures of the Virtues on the Vendramin tomb,⁵ the earliest known examples of the Christian Virtues rendered in the form of the ancient Muses. This valuable piece of evidence suggests that there was an ancient sculpture in the Lombardo workshop by the end of the 1480s or the beginning of the 1490s. Combining this information with what is known about Venetian workshops during the Renaissance, from Francesco Squarcione’s to Lorenzo Lotto’s,⁶ we can hypothesize that Tullio was surrounded by genuine antiquities, and not just by plaster casts and reliefs.

Even more direct contact with antiquities would have come through the business of restoring ancient sculpture that Tullio ran with his younger brother, Antonio (ca. 1458–1516).⁷ Pincus was the first to note that the second century B.C. *Muse of Philiskos*, the so-called *Cleopatra Grimani*, at the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Venice (Figure 2) is, in its present state, the result of an early modern restoration that can be attributed to Tullio by reason of its quality and technique. She dates the restoration about 1492–93, very close in time to the carving of *Adam*.⁸ This important identification led Marcella De Paoli to study the collection of ancient sculpture at the Museo Archeologico, singling out works that had been subject to restorations. Eight of these interventions she attributed to the Lombardo shop.⁹

It is difficult to imagine that restorations of such historic significance would have been entrusted to Tullio if he had not been reputed to possess a profound knowledge of ancient sculpture. The Neapolitan Pomponio Gaurico (1481/82–1530) wrote in his *De sculptura* (Florence, 1504) a detailed description of the ideal sculptor in which he
suggests that Tullio, whom he regarded as “the most talented of sculptors” of all time, had a thorough understanding of ancient art. A good sculptor, Gaurico stated, needs to know ancient art, must be able to recognize and distinguish between subjects and iconographical attributes, and has to possess both technical knowledge and what we might call an “archaeological” understanding of antiquities.

In a letter dated July 18, 1526, Tullio, then in his late sixties, argued for the superiority of sculpture over painting by invoking the work of the ancients. Writing to his patron Marco Casolini of Rovigo about the Madonna della Pietà, which he was preparing to execute for the church of San Francesco in Rovigo (the sculpture remains there to this day), Tullio asserted, “Painting is an ephemeral and unstable thing, while sculpture is much more incomparable and not to be compared in any way with painting, because the sculpture of the ancients can be seen up to our time, while of their painting there is really nothing to be seen.” The letter demonstrates, among other things, that the artist was familiar with the paragone, a fashionable topic of debate at the time, and had a command of the vocabulary needed to discuss it.

Tullio’s knowledge and sophistication were probably enhanced by travel. Unlike the cities that Venice controlled on the mainland—Verona and Padua, for example, which possess the ruins of ancient theaters and walls as well as collections of inscriptions and fragments of indigenous antique statues—Venice itself has no ancient remains of its own. Any antiquity to be seen in Venice was imported either from elsewhere in Italy—usually Rome—or, more often, from Venetian dominions in the Greek world, especially Crete, Rhodes, and Asia Minor. While it is difficult to reconstruct detailed inventories of antiquities collections that were formed in the Veneto during the Renaissance, that task is even more problematic when it comes to collections formed in Venice itself. Unlike many, much better documented assemblages of antiquities in Rome, Venetian collections, which are known to have existed as far back as the mid-fourteenth century, were dispersed very quickly and at an early date. Some, such as the Roman collection of the Venetian cardinal Pietro Barbo (1417–1471), who became Pope Paul II in 1464, were noted for their quality as well as their variety.

It is reasonable to suppose that Tullio, like many other artists of his time, visited collections in cities such as Padua, Bergamo, Ravenna, Mantua, and Ferrara, as well as in more distant Roman cities, such as Aquileia and Pula, in Istria, the
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Ancient Sources for Tullio Lombardo’s Adam


3. Detail of Adam

Adam’s head tilts gently to his left as he casts his gaze upward (Figure 3). His facial features are regular: the eyes large, the nose and jaw prominent, and soft lips slightly open, revealing the upper teeth. His head is crowned by a mop of curly hair, its regular, thick coils skillfully articulated with the use of a drill (Figure 4). The locks are carefully arranged across his forehead, and their luxuriant mass covers his ears, giving his hair the appearance of a helmet, in the style of the time.

The figure’s left leg is drawn back only slightly, a placement dictated by the shallowness of the niche for which the sculpture was intended. The body is solid, supple, and full; the linea alba is emphasized, the epigastric arcade is just visible, and the navel recedes inward. The pose, which derives from the Doryphoros of Polykleitos, one of the territories that supplied the white stone used by the Lombardo family in Venice. Moreover, as discussed below, there is a chance that Tullio visited Rome before beginning work on Andrea Vendramin’s tomb, for which he conceived his Adam.

Adam represents a young male nude in a classical contrapposto stance. The figure’s weight-bearing right leg is straight, while the relaxed left leg bends slightly and rests effortlessly on the ball of the foot. The right arm descends naturally, with a slight bend, and the right hand, propped on a low branch, barely touches the right hip. Adam holds his bent left arm at a slight distance from his torso, his extended forearm slightly raised to show a small, round fruit held with the open fingers of his left hand. The supporting element to the figure’s right is carved in the form of a tree trunk, with ivy and a small serpent wrapped around it.
greatest sculptors of classical antiquity, follows that prototype quite literally: the bent left arm corresponds to the taut or engaged right leg, and the extended right arm to the relaxed left leg. Several scholars have observed that an obvious instability in the balancing of load-bearing and free elements in Tullio’s Adam results in a posture that is on the whole uncertain and unnatural. Adam’s cursorily defined back, shoulders, and buttocks probably served Tullio as aids in constructing a solid and believable figure. Although summarily finished, they were not intended to be seen by the viewer.

Among the candidates most often cited as possible sources for Adam are portraits of Antinous for their melancholy facial expression, and for their posture and modeling, the Apollo Belvedere, the Mantua Apollo, and various Doryphoros figures. To these proposed prototypes, we may add the Apollo Lykeios/Bacchus type for the sensual fullness of its pose and the delicate treatment of its surfaces.

Scholars unanimously agree that Adam’s head is modeled on that of Antinous, the handsome, much-depicted favorite of the Roman emperor Hadrian (r. A.D. 117–138). Most portrayals of Antinous, especially in their most diffuse form, the Haupttypus, are easily recognizable. Their most distinctive feature, the head, has thick, well-defined curls arranged naturally but carefully around a wide, square face with prominent but still boyish features (Figure 5). Some thirty mentions have been found in Renaissance documents of replicas or fragments of Antinous portraits in a variety of collections in Italy, including heads, busts, reliefs, and statues, but not counting ancient coins and gems. The young Antinous appears in diverse poses and roles, from the heroic nude to the dignified figure of an Egyptian pharaoh. But which head of Antinous might have inspired Tullio?

That Antinous was well known in the circles frequented by the Lombardo family can be inferred from a passage in a passage in the De varia historia, written in 1523 by the Paduan philosopher Niccolò Leonico Tomeo (1456–1531) and published in 1531. The author, who is one of the interlocutors in Gaurico’s De sculptura, recounts how he recognized Antinous’s portrait in one of the “infinite number of medals” he owned, and then narrates the sad events of the youth’s life. About that time, Cardinal Pietro Bembo (1470–1547) owned a beautiful marble bust of Antinous, although its provenance remains unknown. It passed to the Farnese after his death and, in the second half of the sixteenth century, was mounted on the ancient torso of the Doryphoros now in Naples’s Museo Archeologico Nazionale. The conjoining of the two pieces is so successful that many scholars believe the head and torso originally belonged to the same sculpture (Figure 6).

Tullio’s Adam resembles the Antinous type particularly in the modeling and inclination of the head, in the facial expression and contemplative gaze, and, more generally, in
the figure’s heroic, even proto-Romantic aspect. Specific details, too, come from the ancient Antinous model: the strigilated eyebrows, the structure of the nose, and the fleshy lips. As Matteo Ceriana has noted, the Adam is “the most faithful and at the same time the most innovative reading of the ancient Antinous type in the whole of the Italian Renaissance.”

Especially relevant to Tullio’s conception of his Adam are the several extant marble copies of Polycleitus’s Doryphoros (Spear Bearer), a bronze sculpture dated about 440 B.C. and now lost. The finest and best preserved of the copies is currently in Naples’s Museo Archeologico Nazionale and seems to have come from the excavations at Pompeii at the end of the nineteenth century (Figure 7). Originally portrayed carrying a spear in his left hand, the figure poses in mid-stride, following Polycleitus’s prototypical example of the use of contrapposto to create a sense of potential movement in a static figure. The right leg supports the weight of the body, while the left leg is bent, with only the ball of the foot touching the ground. Pliny the Elder was the first to assign the invention of contrapposto to Polycleitus (Naturalis Historia 34.56). It is worth noting that Pliny was an important source for Tullio and his circle, which included Gaurico and Andrea Vendramin’s nephew Ermoalo Barbaro (1453–1494), the author in the 1490s of the Castigationes Plinianae, and also, some have suggested, one of Tullio’s patrons.

The only clearly documented sculpture of the Doryphoros type that Tullio might have known is the Satyr, or Martinori Bacchus, now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen (Figure 8). The work is a variant made between the first and second centuries by a Roman copyist who represented...
Polykleitos’s figure as the god Pan, recognizable by the animal pelt tied at his right shoulder. The first mention of this sculpture in Rome is found in the Antiquarie prospetiche romane, a pamphlet in verse by an unidentified author generally known as Prospetivo Milanese, who visited Rome between January 1495 and March 1496. The anonymous Milanese (his origins are worth noting, since the Lombardo family, too, was from the Lombardy region) wrote that the Satyr was at that time in the collection of the Santacroce family, one of the first among the Roman nobility to create a collection of antiquities. A drawing after this sculpture, from a sketchbook (the so-called Codex Wolfegg, 1500–1503, fol. 47v) of the Bolognese artist Amico Aspertini (ca. 1474–1552), shows the work intact. However, Maarten van Heemskerck (1498–1574), a more reliable recorder of facts than Aspertini, represented it as headless and with broken arms in the sketchbook from his trip to Italy about 1532–36. Although the Satyr was not mentioned until about 1495–96, this does not preclude the possibility that the sculpture was discovered earlier.

There may have been a Doryphoros figure in Venice, also. In one of Michiel’s several mentions of fragments of walking figures, he notes, for instance, that a “marble, male nude, without head and hands, in the act of walking, which is beside the door” in the Odoni collection “is antique.” Michiel’s description suggests that the Odoni sculpture could have been a Doryphoros. Moreover, Wendy Stedman Sheard observed that the figure of the Sick Man (Tabula quinta de anathomia) in a print by an unknown engraver (Figure 9) derives from the Doryphoros. This plate, which Richard Stone was the first to associate with Tullio’s Adam, is an illustration in the first Latin edition of the Fasciculus Medicinae, published in Venice in July 1491 under the name of the Viennese physician Johannes de Ketham. The book, a collection of six short medical treatises, achieved immediate popularity. Although we may never know which
Doryphoros figures Tullio actually saw, the type remains, along with the Antinous and Apollo models, one of his most likely ancient sources.

The possibility that Adam descends from the Apollo Belvedere rests upon a hypothetical trip made by Tullio to Rome. The white marble Apollo is a Hadrianic copy, carved about A.D. 120–140, of a lost bronze original dated 340–320 B.C. and attributed to Leochares, a student of Praxiteles (Figure 10).38 Discovered in 1489 in Rome in a vineyard “above Santa Pudenziana,”39 the Apollo Belvedere was first displayed in the Loggia del Viridario at the Palazzina della Rovere in the Palazzo dei Santi Apostoli.40 It was moved to the Belvedere Gardens at the Vatican complex in 1508, several years after Giuliano della Rovere had became Pope Julius II.41 One of the most admired ancient artworks of all time, the Apollo is considered the sculptural embodiment of the ideal male nude and one of the most perfect expressions of classical art. It is also characterized by a sense of organic volume similar to that found in Tullio’s Adam, which reproduces almost exactly several details of the Apollo, including the cleft at the base of the tree trunk from which a small snake emerges.

Could Tullio have seen the Apollo Belvedere in Rome before starting work on his Adam about 1490? Scholars are cautious on the subject, since there is no evidence that Tullio traveled to Rome at such an early date, but they are inclined to suggest a trip taken prior to 1521, the year of his only documented visit, recorded by Cesare Cesariano.42 Sheard was the first to suggest one or more Rome trips at the end of the 1470s and in the early 1480s, and certainly before 1485.43 Since the first visual records of the Apollo Belvedere are two drawings in the Codex Escurialensis (fols. 53, 64) that are generally dated between 1491 and 1506–8,44 it is tempting to think that Tullio visited Rome—and maybe not for the first time—about 1489. Otherwise, it must be supposed that he saw drawings of the Apollo Belvedere that predated those in the codex—graphic records that so far have not come to light.45 Some years later, the Apollo Belvedere sculpture had become well known in Venice. The Milanese sculptor and architect Cristoforo Solari, called il Gobbo (1468–1524), carved an Apollo there that was about fifty inches high and “similar to that seen in the garden of the Cardinal of San Pietro in Vincoli [Giuliano della Rovere].”46

The extraordinary Apollo of Mantua (Figure 11) now in Mantua’s Palazzo Ducale can be dated to the first to second century A.D. Carved from Parian marble, this Kassel-type Apollo is in very good condition, but unfortunately, nothing is known of its provenance.47 Sheard was the first to mention the Mantua Apollo as a possible source for Tullio’s Adam, although no drawings from the late fifteenth century allow us to say that the Apollo was known at that time.48

Similarities in modeling and pose prompt the suggestion for the first time here that the Apollo Lykeios could have served as a model for Tullio’s Adam.49 It is not clear where the name Lykeios comes from, but this sculpture type (see Figure 12) has been associated with Praxiteles’s late work at the end of the fourth century B.C. and is easily recognizable from the position of the right arm, which rests on top of the head in a posture of repose.50 The figure’s weight is on its right leg, leaving the left leg relaxed and angled to the side, creating a twist in the pelvis. There is a supporting element,
sometimes to the figure’s right (as in the case of Tullio’s Adam) and sometimes to its left, where it is thought to have been situated in Praxiteles’s original.

Various fragments of the Apollo Lykeios type survive, as do several representations of it on coins from the first century B.C.—evidence of its longevity as an iconographical type. This type of Apollo is widely diffused and is found in numerous variations, most commonly in representations of the god Bacchus. Tullio’s Adam shares the Apollo Lykeios type’s fullness of form, the position of its right, weight-bearing leg, and especially the position of the left leg, which is slightly bent, in contrast to the Apollo Belvedere’s more pronounced flexion. In addition, Adam’s right side, like that of the Apollo Lykeios, projects outward. Might Tullio have had direct knowledge of the Apollo Lykeios type?

In all probability, the sculptor knew the figure from statuettes and/or from ancient Greek coins, which were plentiful in Venice and constituted the nuclei of the principal collections of antiquities there in his day. But this is not the only possibility. There are two Lycian Apollos, Greek in origin, in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Venice, and both were originally in the collection of Cardinal Domenico Grimani. The first is the monumental Apollo Lykeios shown in Figure 12, often considered one of the most complete and faithful replicas of Praxiteles’s original work. The other is the figure of Dionysos in the sculpture group Dionysos Leaning on a Satyr (Figure 13). This figure of the god is clearly similar in its conception to the Apollo Lykeios type. The Dionysos group (second-to-first century B.C.) was discovered in Rome in the fifteenth century in the area around Porta Maggiore. In 1483 it was noted among the antiquities that Grimani left to the Statuario Pubblico in Venice. When this transfer of ownership took place and what the sculpture’s condition was at the time...
are not known; the work was later extensively restored. The most complete and original parts of the Dionysos figure, the torso and legs, seem to share a softness of modeling with Tullio’s Adam.

Other examples of this type of Dionysos with a satyr include *Bacchus and Cupid* (Figure 14) and an Apollo Lykeios in the guise of Dionysos, both now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Naples.55 Sketches in Van Heemskerck’s notebooks show these works in fragmentary condition in the vast collection at the Palazzo Medici, later known as the Palazzo Madama, in Rome (Figure 15).56 There are no surviving records indicating when they were discovered, and nothing is known of their provenance; they are noted here simply to emphasize how widely diffused the Apollo Lykeios type was in Tullio’s time.

The many ancient works that Tullio might have known suggest that he drew inspiration for his *Adam* from a wide range of sources, both Greek and Roman, and then combined them in original ways. *Adam* reveals a blending of influences from Praxiteles and Polykleitos: from the latter comes the detail of the left leg resting on the ball of the left foot, and from the former, the overall modeling of the figure. Tullio’s use of a drill to mark the irises and the semicircular pupils of *Adam’s* eyes stems from a traditional technique in Roman Imperial portraiture that was adapted in the Lombardo workshop to give expression to a figure’s gaze. It also seems plausible that Tullio could have drawn from works in a variety of media, including paintings, medals, bronze statuettes, and coins. The fact that only the head of *Adam* is influenced by Antinous suggests that the sculptor might have had access to no more than a bust of that figure—perhaps a marble head or a likeness struck on a coin.

In borrowing from multiple sources to create an Adam that was manifestly *all’antica* yet whose direct lineage...
would have been impossible to pin down, Tullio was in line with ancient precedents, notably the Greek painter Zeuxis, and could well have been guided by Seneca’s and Petrarch’s theories of creative imitation. Referring to the art of literature, Petrarch (1304–1374) wrote: “Similarity must not be like the image to its original in painting where the greater the similarity the greater the praise for the artist, but rather like that of a son to his father. While often very different in their individual features, they have a certain something our painters call an air [umbra quedam et quem pictores nostri aerem vocant], especially noticeable about the face and eyes, that produces a resemblance; seeing the son’s face we are reminded of the father’s.” He went on to recommend that “the similar be elusive and unable to be extricated except in silent meditation, for the resemblance is to be felt rather than expressed.”

Having several sources allows Adam to be all’ antica without citing one celebrated antecedent in particular. If recognized, such a prototype would have conferred distracting associations. Adam, after all, could not too closely resemble an Antinous, a Bacchus, or an Apollo without changing the meaning of the work. So instead, Tullio took elements from a variety of sources and transformed them—just, as Lucius Seneca (4 B.C.–A.D. 65) taught, as bees collect pollen from many types of flowers to make honey.

The success of the Adam was immediate but relatively brief and limited to a local sphere. In the end, Tullio’s experiment with neo-antique classicism did not enjoy widespread or long-lasting favor, and the artist did not revisit it in his ambitious, large-scale projects, such as the Giovanni Mocenigo tomb in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, begun just after the Vendramin monument. Into those he channeled his abiding interest in architecture, evident in works he executed in Venice, Treviso, and Belluno, and in high-relief sculpture, exemplified by two double portraits, one in Venice (see Figure 14 in “Adam by Tullio Lombardo,” by Luke Syson and Valeria Cafà in the present volume) and one in Vienna, and by the Chapel of Saint Anthony in the Basilica of Saint Anthony in Padua.
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1. For research on the antique sources of Tullio’s Adam, see Planiscig 1937, p. 103, where it is suggested that there is no specific prototype because “it is the spirit of the antique which, having been assimilated, is expressed here” (Es ist der Geist der Antike, der, assimiliert, hier zum Ausdruck kommt), and where Adam is characterized as a “soft bacchic ephebe with the Antinous-like face” (bacchische Ephebe mit dem Antinoos-Gesicht); Remington 1937, p. 61, “the work is not a servile copy, it has as yet been impossible to trace the particular statue which may have provided him with the basis of his idea”; Mariacher 1954, p. 370, “a new Greek Apollo” (no type specified); Pope-Hennessy 1958, p. 111, Apollo Belvedere, Capitoline Antinous; Sheard 1971, p. 168, “the Classical rigor of Doryphorus,” Mantuan or Kassel-type Apollo, and p. 169, Antinous; Wilk 1978, p. 22, Mantuan or Kassel-type Apollo and (late) Classicistic ivory sculpture for the “unstable contrapposto, unclassical proportions and abstract description of skin surfaces”; Smyth 1979, p. 212, “an Apollonian, square-shouldered nude in the spirit of the antique, drawing on various Hellenistic and Roman models—types of Apollo and Antinous—and yet by no means a copy”; Huse and Wolters 1990, p. 150, “Apollo of Mantua”; Luchs 1995, p. 45, “Greek and Roman nudes descending from Polykleitan models of the fifth century B.C.”; Ceriana 2005, p. 532, “the most faithful and at the same time the most innovative reading of the ancient Antinous type in the whole of the Italian Renaissance”; Morresi 2006, p. 67, “neo antique and nude Adam”; Blake McHam 2007–, “The idealized male nude type derives from antique statues of Apollo, although its unstable contrapposto, unclassical proportions and abstract description of skin surfaces also suggest the influence of Late Antique ivory sculpture”; Sarchi 2008, p. 96, “a very graceful version of the tradition of the Apollo Ephebe that descends from Polykleitos.” The artist also had other influences, including the work of contemporary painters, and especially their treatment of faces and coiffures. See Luchs 2009, p. 5.

2. It has also been noted, for example, that Antonio Lombardo’s relief Putto Riding on a Dolphin on the Vendramin tomb derives from an antique cameo owned by the jeweler Domenico di Piero. See Schofield 2006, pp. 161–62, with ample earlier bibliography.

3. For this, see Lorenzo Lotto’s Portrait of Andrea Odoni (1527) in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court. For Odoni’s collection, see Favaretto 1990a, pp. 75–79. For Odoni’s house and collection, see Martin 2000.

4. “La figura marmorea de donna vestita intiera, senza la testa e mani, è antica; e soleva essere in bottega de Tullio Lombardo, ritratta da lui più volte in piu sue opere”; Michiel 1800, p. 60. Michiel’s Notizia d’opere di disegno was written between 1522 and 1532 but was not published until 1800. It is useful to note that its editor, Jacopo Morelli, pointed out that Bellini, too, owned antiquities, as is also mentioned in De marmoreo Platonis capite antiquo, in Venerem Centilis Bellini; see Michiel 1800, p. 194. Michiel’s observation was first noted in Planiscig 1921, p. 228. Pietro Aretino also saw the Odoni collection; see Favaretto 2002, p. 130.

5. Pincus 1981. This suggestion was accepted and discussed in Favaretto 1999, pp. 238–39. See also De Paoli 2004, p. 132. For the sculpture itself, see Traversari 1973, pp. 167–68.

6. Favaretto 1990a, in particular for Squarcione; she also cites the workshops of Bellini, Mantegna, and Lotto.


8. Pincus (1979, p. 38) suggests that this restoration was commissioned by Ermlao Barbaro. See also De Paoli 2004, p. 153, and De Paoli in Ceriana 2004, p. 190 (“Musa, detta Cleopatra Grimani”).


10. Critical edition with parallel text in Gaurico (1504) 1999. Pomponio Gaurico’s first treatise on sculpture was published when he was not much older than twenty. The Neapolitan’s friendship with Tullio is documented; see Paolo Cutolo in ibid., pp. 246–55.


15. For the ties between Venice and Greece, see Beschi 1986, pp. 326–38; P. Brown 1996; and Favaretto 2002.


17. This topic has been treated widely; see for instance Favaretto 1990a; Favaretto 1990b; Favaretto 2002; and Bodon 2005.

18. For the Barbo collection, which consisted primarily of coins and gems, see Salomon 2003, with earlier bibliography.


20. See Sheard 1979, where this figure is compared in particular with the youths in Giorgione’s work.

21. Wilk 1978, p. 22; Blake McHam 2007–.

22. See note 1 above.

23. See Vout 2005, with earlier bibliography.

24. John Pope-Hennessy (1958, p. 111) suggested the Antinous Capitolinus as a reference despite the fact that it was not discovered at Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli until the early eighteenth century. See Haskell and Penny 1981, p. 143.


26. See Michiel 1800, p. 20 (for Bembo’s collection); Gregory and Woolson 1995, p. 254; and Lucherini 2007. On this sculpture, see Bober and Rubinstein 1986, p. 163n128, where it is also suggested that the restoration was carried out in the 1520s, perhaps by Lorenzetto. See also Riebesell 1989, pp. 62–64, and more recently, Anna Maria Riccomini, “Testa ritratto di Antinoos su torso antico,” in Beltrami, Gasparotto, and Tura 2013, pp. 332–33 (with earlier bibliography).

27. Sheard 1971, p. 169; Sheard 1985, p. 426. An exhibition dedicated to Antinous was held at Hadrian’s villa in 2012. See the catalogue, Sapelli Ragni 2012, and in particular the essay Cadario 2012.


29. Sheard (1979, p. 202) offers an interesting hypothesis about the possible contribution of Barbaro, one of the most refined, cultured humanists of his time and an editor of Pliny. Reiterated in Pincus 1979, pp. 28, 40–41, and again in Sheard 1997, p. 164, where
Barbaro is given partial credit for the choice of the Arch of Constantine as a model for the Vendramin tomb. For this, see also Sarkhi 2008, pp. 90–91. For Pliny’s reception in the Renaissance, see Blake McHam 2013, especially pp. 259–61, for Gaurico’s debt to the *Naturalis Historia*.

This is the most recent dating; it was suggested by Agosti and Isella 2004, and it is based on information in the pamphlet.


33. Sketchbook 79 D 2, fol. 23r, and details of the head on fol. 36v; Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. For other iconographic sources, see Vicarelli 2007, pp. 71–73. It is interesting to note that in the sculpture’s restored state, its gestures are very close to those of Tullio’s *Adam*: its right hand rests on pipes of Pan, and its left delicately holds an object.

34. “El nudo, senza mani e senza testa, marmoreo, in atto de camminar, che è appresso la porta, è opera antica”; Michiel 1800, p. 60.


36. Stone (1972–73) also proposes it as a terminus ante quem for dating Tullio’s *Adam*.

37. An annotated English translation was published in 1988; see Ketham (1491) 1988. The first vulgate edition, published in 1494, is analyzed in Pesenti 2001, where it is revealed that on June 17, 1496, when Giorgio Ferrari from Monferrato, the doctor who corrected the text, asked the Venetian Consiglio for the privilege, he had already been working on the project for sixteen years.


40. Deborah Brown (1986, p. 236) first identified the “cappel genoves” noted by Prospektivo Milanese as the Genoese Cardinal Paolo Camofregoso, who lived at the Palazzina della Rovere from 1496 to 1498, instead of Cardinal Guilliano della Rovere, who was not from Genoa. For the collection of Cardinal della Rovere, see Agosti and Isella 2004, p. 49.

41. For this relocation, see Nesselrath 1998, p. 1.

42. The only mention of a trip to Rome by Tullio Lombardo in contemporary documents is in Cesare Cesariano’s translation of and commentaries on Vitruvius’s *De architectura* (1521, fol. 48v); this passage was noted in Agosti 1990, pp. 69–70.

43. Sheard 1984, p. 173n58; Sheard 1997, pp. 161, 170. Fabio Benzi (2008, p. 59) reaffirms that Tullio must have visited Rome, perhaps at the end of the 1480s, and posts a “logical” stop in Florence to see Lorenzo de’ Medici’s collection. For a trip to Rome, see also Sarchi 2008, pp. 88–93, 93–101 (for the detailed references to Roman antiquities).

44. The Codex Escurialensis, a Renaissance sketchbook taken to Spain (ca. 1506), is in the collection of the Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Madrid. For a facsimile, see Egger 1905–6; see also Magister 2002, p. 541, with earlier bibliography.

45. *Adam* is not the only figure on the Vendramin monument to have ancient sources. See Pope-Hennessy 1938, p. 112, for the modeling of the two armored warriors and their similarity to the *Mars* in the Musei Capitolini, Rome.

46. “ad similitudinem illius qui in hortis Cardinalis Sancti Petri ad Vincula visitur”; Agosti and Isella 2004, p. 50. This passage from the *Antiquarie prospetiches romane* is also cited by Sheard (1986, p. 9), who suggests that it is perhaps the first written reference to the reception of the *Apollo Belvedere* in Renaissance sculpture.


52. For the Crimani collection, see Perry 1972 and 1978.

53. Traversari 1973, pp. 92–93; Favaretto and Traversari 1993, pp. 70, 72, 74–75.


55. For *Bacchus and Cupid* (inv. 6307), see Carmela Capaldi in Gasparri 2009, pp. 135–36, no. 60; for the Dionysos (inv. 6318), see ibid., pp. 133–34, no. 59.

56. Sketchbook 79 D 2(a), fol. 48r, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. For Van Heemskerck’s drawings of the antiquities at the Palazzo Medici, see most recently Christian 2012, especially pp. 146–47. For the collection at the Palazzo Medici, see Christian 2010, pp. 332–39. For the marble groups, see Gasparri 2009, nos. 59, 60. For the *Bacchus and Cupid*, see Riebesell 1989, p. 44.

57. Well known in the Renaissance, the legend of Zeuxis and the maidens of Croton tells how the renowned painter, commissioned to paint a portrait of Helen of Troy for the temple of Croton, asks to see the five most beautiful women (naked, of course) of the city. When they were assembled, he drew inspiration from all of them in fashioning his image of ideal beauty, since such a thing was not to be found in one single model. For the ample literature on the topic, see Barkan 2000 and Grafton 2001, pp. 146–48.

58. “curandum imitatori ut quod scribit simile non idem sit, eamque similitudinem talem esse oportere, non qualis est imaginis ad eum eum cuius imago est, que quo simulior eo maior laus artificis, sed qualis fillii ad patrem. In quibus cum magna sepe diversitas sit membrorum, umbra quedam et quem pictores nostri aerem vocant, qui in vultu inque oculis maxime cernitur, simulitudo illam facit, que statim viso filio, patris in memoriam nos reducat, cum tamen si res ad mensuram redate, omnia sint diversa; sed est iibi nescio quid occultum quod hanc habeat victam. Sic et nobis providendum ut cum simile aliquid sit, multa sint dissimilia, et id ipsum simile lateat ne deprehendi possit nisi tacita mentis indagine, ut intelligi similique quaeque potusquam dici. Utendum igitur ingenio alieno utendumque coloribus, at stenium verbis; illa enim simulitudo latet, hec eminet; illa poetas facit, hec simia”; Petrarca, *Familiari* 23.19.11–13 (1942, p. 206). For both the English translation by Aldo S. Bernardo (Petrarca 1985, pp. 301–2) and a discussion of the text, see Bolland 1996, p. 481.


60. Guerra, Morresi, and Schofield 2006.
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