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This is the first survey of the Museum’s outstanding collection of European sculpture dating from the Renaissance through the nineteenth century. Visitors to our galleries may be impressed by the monumental statues in the Carroll and Milton Petrie European Sculpture Court or captivated by a group of French Rococo terracottas or Italian Renaissance bronzes. Yet they are often unaware of the range and depth of the collection that is displayed throughout the sixty galleries of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts. This book singles out ninety-two of the finest examples, from famous masterpieces to unpublished acquisitions of the last decade. Based on the latest research by Museum curators and scholars in other institutions, each entry focuses on a single sculpture’s most interesting or remarkable aspects—its commission, history, iconography, or style. The author, Ian Wardroper, a sculpture specialist, writes with authority and discernment about the great collection that he has supervised for ten years as Iris and B. Gerald Cantor Chairman of the department.

This is the second book in a series that celebrates the quality and depth of the Museum’s sculpture and decorative arts collection. Furniture was the subject of the first volume; porcelain, textiles, and clocks and watches are scheduled to follow. It is my pleasure to thank friends of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts who have generously contributed to support this publication: Mr. and Mrs. J. Tomilson Hill, Assunta Sommella Peluso, Ignazio Peluso, Ada Peluso and Romano I. Peluso, and the Parnassus Foundation.

Thomas P. Campbell, Director
THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART
Writing about the extraordinary sculptures featured in this book has been a pleasure; selecting them was difficult. While some famous statues were obvious choices, the richness of the collection and the large number of works we hold by certain masters, such as Jean-Antoine Houdon and Auguste Rodin, made it a painful task to pick one or two objects that might stand for a larger set. Inevitably, personal taste informs the final selection. Early in the process, I decided to focus on full-length and medium-sized sculptures prominently presented in our galleries; but I have included others that show how widely the objects in the collection range—in size, medium, date, and subject. Some of our small-scale objects, such as cameos, have already been published, while others, such as boxwood and ivory statuettes, waxes, medals, and plaquettes, await their own dedicated studies. One important ivory group is included here to remind the reader of our extensive holdings of works in that medium. For several years, a comprehensive catalogue of our Italian bronzes has been in preparation, and it is scheduled for publication in 2014; accordingly, I have chosen only a handful of works from that important category of Museum sculpture.

This book benefits enormously from the new photography undertaken specifically for the project by Joseph Coscia, Jr. Three-dimensional objects are best understood through views from multiple angles and through details that reveal their surface textures. It would have been impractical to publish here all of the images that were made. Instead, we have selected the most essential and informative ones for this book and placed the entire portfolio on the Museum’s website (the address is given on page xi).

The texts on the sculptures are based on extensive research and the latest scholarship, but I have tried to write them in such a way that a wide audience may find the historical and technical issues they raise comprehensible and interesting. Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of each object’s provenance and exhibition history, and the bibliographical references are as up-to-date as possible. Those sections of the entries will undoubtedly be more useful to scholars than to the general public, but they have been placed alongside the texts to give the reader a sense of the critical fortunes of the sculptures.

I am grateful to the previous director of the Metropolitan Museum, Philippe de Montebello, and his successor, Thomas P. Campbell, for supporting this book and the series of publications highlighting the Museum’s collection of European sculpture and decorative arts, of which it is the second volume. Several friends of the Museum who have a particular interest in European sculpture, Mr. and Mrs. J. Tomilson Hill, Assunta Sommella Peluso, Ignazio Peluso, Ada Peluso and Romano I. Peluso, the Farnsworth Foundation, and Cyril Humphris have provided funding, and I am grateful to them for their generous contributions.

This first survey of the sculpture in the care of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts reflects the energy and wisdom of five previous heads—William R. Valentiner, Joseph Breck, Preston Remington, John Goldsmith Phillips, and Olga Raggio—who oversaw its activities from its inception in 1907 as the Department of Decorative Arts, through several reorganizations and renamings, to its present configuration. My predecessors’ crucial contributions to the formation of the collection and to our understanding of the individual pieces through their research is gratefully acknowledged.

Current curators in this department contributed substantially to this volume—both by researching individual sculptures when they were first acquired and more recently by reading my texts for accuracy. Chief among the colleagues to whom I owe a debt of gratitude is James Draper, whose articles and books written during the course of four decades were fundamental sources of information about many sculptures, and
whose acumen as a member of the editorial board of the Metropolitan Museum Journal prevented me from making a number of factual and grammatical errors. Wolfram Koeppe and Clare Vincent both kindly reviewed my essays on objects that they have long studied and often published. Many other department members helped move this project along smoothly, whether by accessing and typing records—notably, Melissa Smith, Alisa Chiles, and Collections Manager Denny Stone, who also measured the ninety-two sculptures presented here—or by transporting objects to be cleaned and photographed—our technicians Juan Stacey, Bedel Tiscareño, and Jacob Gobel. I am particularly indebted to the administrator of the department, Erin Pick, for assistance with countless details as well as for shielding me from many demands so that I could write.

I owe special thanks to the chairman of the Education Department, Peggy Fogelman, who as a former curator of sculpture at the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, was uniquely placed to offer invaluable commentary on the history of sculpture as well as advise me on the accessibility of the text entries to my readers.

I am fortunate to have had the assistance of the following people, some current or former members of my department, with various aspects of this book. Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Curatorial Fellow Valeria Cañà untangled a number of convoluted historical problems and also compiled the glossary. Research Associate Paola D’Agostino shared her knowledge of the Italian Baroque. Stephanie Deproux, who was an intern under my supervision and is now a curator at the Musée National de la Renaissance, Écouen, helped with research on Renaissance sculpture. Lorraine M. Karafel, who for a couple of years reviewed the provenances of departmental sculptures, returned to vet these entries. All of this activity could not have been accomplished without the continuing support of Arthur K. Watson Chief Librarian Kenneth Soehner and the dedicated staff of the Museum’s Thomas J. Watson Library.

One of my keenest pleasures in preparing this book has been the opportunity to work with Chief Photographer Joseph Coscia, Jr. His superb eye and extensive experience with the lighting of artworks are combined with remarkable patience and dedication.

Erin Coburn, Chief Officer of the Digital Media Department, and Matthew Morgan enthusiastically supported the creation of a resource for viewing on the Web all the fine images he produced. A host of people assisted the photography process, from building sets in the galleries to performing postproduction digital work. I am grateful to General Manager for Imaging and Photography Barbara Bridgers and the staff of The Photograph Studio. Many sculptures require specialized mounts in order to be photographed, and Frederick J. Sager and his colleagues were frequently called upon to make them.

The Objects Conservation Department inevitably played a key role in this endeavor. I thank Lawrence Becker, Sherman Fairchild Conservator in Charge, as well as individual conservators, including Linda Borsch, Carolyn Riccardelli, and consultant Michael Morris for their assistance in many matters. Jack Soutanian, Jr. conserved several sculptures in preparation for this book and supervised the cleaning of others before photography. His reports often became the basis for understanding the physical characteristics of a work. Richard E. Stone’s ground-breaking studies of bronze sculpture and his profound knowledge of that medium proved to be important resources for me.

I am fortunate that both the late John O’Neill and his successor as Editor in Chief, Mark Polizzotti, saw value in this publication and in the Highlights of the Collection series as a whole. I am especially grateful that Ellyn Allison was assigned to edit this volume as she had the previous one. With tact and modesty but also with tenacious pursuit of the facts, she polished the text from beginning to end with the greatest of care. Jayne Kuchna’s exacting redaction of the bibliography and footnotes contributed fundamentally to the accuracy of the book. The complex task of securing photographs and permissions for the comparative illustrations was managed by Jane Tai, and Elizabeth Zecchella facilitated the editorial process in ways great and small. Associate Publisher Gwen Roginsky, Chief
Production Manager Peter Antony, and Managing Editor Michael Sittenfeld contributed their expertise to various aspects of the book's preparation. Robert Weisberg's practiced hand guided the typesetting and layout processes, and Bonnie Laessig oversaw every aspect of the production of the book. Lucinda Hitchcock is responsible for its lively design.

I was able to accomplish some important research for this project while participating in an exchange program in London at the Victoria and Albert Museum in the summer of 2009. Paul Williamson, head of the Sculpture Department, and Christopher Breward and Liz Miller, head and deputy head, respectively, of the Research Department, were gracious hosts. Finally, I am pleased to thank the many scholars who shared advice and information that, directly or indirectly, proved useful to me in preparing the manuscript. I cannot mention them all here but I am most grateful for their help. My special thanks are due to the following: Denise Allen, Sergei Androssov, Manuel Arias, Andrea Bacchi, Gordon Balderston, Giulia Barberini, Peter Barnet, Peter Bell, Anthony Blunka, Antonia Boström, Bruce Boucher, Geneviève Bresco-Bautier, Andrew Butterfield, Francesco Caglioti, Julien Chapuya, Alan Darr, C. D. Dickerson, Sabine Haag, Michael Hall, Johanna Hecht, Catherine Hess, Charles Janoray, Donald Johnstone, Daniel Katz, Volker Krahm, Claudia Kryza-Gersch, Manfred Leithe-Jasper, Mary Levkoff, Stuart Lochhead, Jonathan Marsden, Jennifer Montagu, Peta Moture, Marina Nudel, Anne Poulet, Guiliem Scherf, Eike Schmidt, Frits Scholten, Margaret Schwartz, Anthony Sigel, Marjorie Starkey, the late Dean Walker, Jeremy Warren, Jonathan Winter, and Dimitrios Zikos.

A NOTE TO THE READER

The order in which the objects are presented is chronological, except in one sequence, numbers 60–62, where it seemed important to keep two busts together. The life dates of artists mentioned in the entries are included in the index, whenever they are known. The dimensions of works of art are given in inches and centimeters, with height preceding width preceding depth. In the provenance for each work, the use of brackets denotes a period of ownership by an art dealer. References are cited in abbreviated form in the endnotes and the exhibitions and literature sections of the entries; the corresponding full citations are given in the bibliography.

Additional views of the sculptures can be accessed online at: http://www.metmuseum.org/EuroSculpture.
European Sculpture, 1400–1900 IN THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART
A Brief History of the Collection

During its 140-year history, the collection of European sculpture at The Metropolitan Museum of Art has experienced exciting spurs of growth as well as a gratifying steady accumulation. Occasional splendid gifts and bequests from private collectors conferred distinction virtually overnight on aspects of the Museum’s sculptural holdings. Building on those strokes of good fortune made possible by generous collectors, departmental curators have patiently filled out the history of sculpture presented in our galleries by making astute purchases with the help of established funds and interested donors. In the process we evolved from two separate departments—Sculpture and Casts—established in 1886 and abolished in 1905, to a single Department of Decorative Arts in 1907, which housed most of the three-dimensional art in the Museum. As some areas of knowledge became increasingly specialized, new departments, such as Medieval Art, split off and became important entities in their own right. Since then, the name of our department has changed several times: in 1934 to Renaissance and Modern Art, in 1961 to Western European Arts, and most recently, in 1977, to European Sculpture and Decorative Arts. Our collection—some sixty thousand objects, many of which are on display in sixty galleries—ranges in date from the Renaissance to the early twentieth century.

Two of the earliest gifts to the Museum forecast directions the sculpture collection would take. In 1872 John Bard donated a marble bust of Benjamin Franklin carved by Jean-Antoine Houdon in 1778 (acc. no. 72.6). Ten years later, Henry G. Marquand contributed The Assumption of the Virgin, a large glazed terracotta altarpiece by the workshop of Andrea della Robbia, dating to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century (acc. no. 82.4). Given such a foundation, perhaps it was inevitable that French eighteenth-century and Italian fifteenth- and sixteenth-century art became the collection’s great strengths.

From the beginning, the Museum set a course to acquire multiple works by three of the leading French sculptors active in the decades just before and just after 1900. When Samuel P. Avery gave Auguste Rodin’s bust of Saint John the Baptist, modeled by the artist in 1878 and probably cast in 1888 (acc. no. 93.11), he initiated a spate of gifts to the Museum of works by the greatest contemporary European sculptor, including donations from the artist himself (fig. 1). Today, the Museum’s collection of Rodins includes some ninety examples, amplified in more recent years by gifts from Iris and B. Gerald Cantor. Thomas F. Ryan’s magnificent gift of ten monumental sculptures in 1910 (see no. 92) led a couple of years later to the creation of a Rodin gallery. This rare tribute to a living artist by the Metropolitan Museum preceded the establishment of the Musée Rodin in Paris. In 1885 Avery also presented the Museum with its first work by Antoine-Louis Barye (no. 81). Four years later, admiration for the recently deceased French sculptor ran so high in America that an exhibition of his work was held in New York to raise funds for a monument in his honor. The Museum subsequently acquired nearly sixty of Barye’s bronzes, plasters, and waxes. A final example of the enthusiastic collecting of contemporary sculpture by early patrons—to the Museum’s great benefit—is provided by Louise Havemeyer. She had avidly followed the career of Edgar Degas, buying many of his paintings and drawings before his death in 1917. When the artist’s heirs arranged for the foundry of A. A. Hébrard to cast bronze editions of the wax models he had left in his studio, Mrs. Havemeyer purchased the first set and bequeathed it to the Museum (see no. 90).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some of the great private collections of earlier European art were formed in New York. Bequests and gifts from those repositories became the nuclei of holdings in the Museum at extraordinarily high levels of quality. Benjamin Altman acquired not only Chinese porcelain and quattrocento painted panels but also
Italian and French sculpture from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century (fig. 2). While today, one hundred years later, the Museum displays world-class groups of fifteenth-century Italian reliefs and terracottas by the French Rococo artist Clodion, each of Altman's bequests in those areas remains arguably our finest example (nos. 2, 67). J. Pierpont Morgan's contributions to the Museum were bountiful. In 1907, while president of the Museum, he gave a collection of architectural elements that became the core of the newly formed Department of Decorative Arts, as well as Renaissance jewels, eighteenth-century gold boxes, and important medieval sculpture; however, the superb array of Italian Renaissance bronzes that he exhibited here in 1914 was largely dispersed. Some examples entered the collection, but it is in the category of northern European carvings, such as Hans Daucher's astonishingly fine allegorical honeystone relief (no. 18), that Morgan's interest in sculpture is most strongly felt in our displays.

Another president of the Museum, George Blumenthal, whose Park Avenue living room was fashioned from a sixteenth-century Spanish courtyard from Vélez Blanco—now one of our grandest period rooms—bequeathed some of the Museum's finest sculptures (fig. 3). Among Blumenthal's many significant gifts was Benedetto da Maiano's Madonna and Child (no. 8); it provided excellent company for Altman's Madonna and Child with Angels by Rossellino (no. 2). Blumenthal's bust of Louis XV by Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne (no. 61) presided grandly over French Rococo sculpture and decorative arts given by Morgan and Altman. Through the 1940s, bequests continued to enrich our eighteenth-century French holdings. For example, the Jules Bache collection, which arrived in 1949, united Louis XV with Madame de Pompadour, one of Jean-Baptiste Pigalle's exquisite works in marble (no. 60). The following year, Mary Stillman Harkness's bequest brought us one of Jean-Antoine Houdon's most personal creations, a portrait of his ten-month-old daughter, Sabine Houdon (no. 71). Mrs. Harkness's purchase of the child's bust occurred at a moment when the taste for the French Rococo was at a high-water mark, and she paid a record price for it, more than any other sculpture would fetch at auction until decades later.

In the 1920s, with the aid of purchase funds such as those established earlier by Isaac D. Fletcher and Jacob S. Rogers, Museum curators began buying more systematically at auction or from dealers, rather than relying on bequests and gifts. Their goal was to find specific works that would amplify the strengths of the collection or fill gaps left by private collectors' lack of interest in art made outside of France or Italy.

The first curator of the Department of Decorative Arts (1907–14), the Berlin-trained art historian William R. Valentiner, was succeeded by two curators with a particular interest in sculpture, first Joseph Breck (1917–33) and then Preston Remington (1934–56). The acquisition in 1927 and 1934 of a pair of Spanish reliefs, then attributed to Damián Forment, and in 1936 of a terracotta bust modeled in Renaissance England by the itinerant Italian Pietro Torrigiano (nos. 22, 23, 13) reflects a departmental desire to expand the geographical range of the collection. Many of the major purchases of the 1930s and 1940s, however, were works created on the Italian peninsula or within the borders of France. Still the greatest of the department's acquisitions, Tullio Lombardo's Renaissance Adam, arrived in 1936 (no. 9). Other lifesize marble statues of the period, such as Battista di Domenico Lorenzi's Alpheus and Arethusa (no. 27), followed in relatively short order.

Our collection of Italian Renaissance bronzes began with bequests by Benjamin Altman and J. Pierpont Morgan, amplified by the Ogden Mills collection, given in 1924. Curators soon began selecting works of great distinction to enhance our holdings in that medium. Alessandro Vittoria's Saint Sebastian (no. 25) and Antico's Paris (no. 12) were notable additions in 1940 and 1955, respectively. But only with the major gifts and bequests of Judge Irwin Untermyer in the 1960s did the Italian Renaissance bronze collection exponentially expand (see nos. 11, 45). The collection of Belle and Jack Linsky further amplified those holdings in 1982 and also gave the Museum a much-needed group of northern European bronzes,
fig. 1 This display of Rodin’s sculpture was photographed in the Museum in June 1926. At right, in the near distance, is the artist’s Orpheus and Eurydice.

fig. 2 Some works from the collection of Benjamin Altman, including Antonio Rossellino’s Madonna and Child with Angels (far wall, right), were exhibited in a Museum gallery in 1926.
fig. 3. Seen here in a 2011 photograph is the Véliz Blanco Patio, a gift to the Museum by George Blumenthal in 1941. The sixteenth-century courtyard is being used to display several Italian statues of the late Renaissance, including Cristoforo Stati's Orpheus (left), also a Blumenthal bequest. Next to the door is Giovanni Caccini's Temperance, and at right is seen Battista Lorenzi's Alpheus and Arethusa.
ivories, and boxwoods (see no. 43). Among distinguished acquisitions of French eighteenth-century sculpture made by curators between 1950 and 1960 were Clodion’s captivating terracotta Model for a Proposed Monument to Commemorate the Invention of the Balloon (no. 69), Augustin Pajou’s beautiful marble bust of Madame de Wailly (no. 72), and Clodion’s monumental stucco reliefs from the Hôtel de Bourbon-Condé, in Paris (see no. 68).

The mid-1960s ushered in what may be described as a golden age for collecting European sculpture. Devoted to the acquisition of French sculpture dating from the sixteenth through the nineteenth century, the Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation and the Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation helped bring to our galleries a remarkable series of monumental marble statues (see figs. 4, 5). It includes Charity, credited when acquired to Germain Pilon (no. 24); Andromeda and the Sea Monster, attributed for many years to Pierre-Étienne Monnot but now thought to be by the Italian Domenico Guidi (no. 49); Jean-Louis Lemoine’s scintillating Fear of Cupid’s Daris (no. 56); and Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux’s masterful early work Ugolino and His Sons (no. 84). Other sculptures acquired through the Pauls’ generosity include a pair of marble vases carved by Nicolas-Sébastien Adam and Pigalle—two of the finest monumental French garden decorations in America (nos. 57, 58)—and Guillaume Coustou the Elder’s Samuel Bernard, a work that cemented the Museum’s reputation as a repository of fine French portrait busts (no. 55). In the late 1970s, the Paul Foundation also supported the purchase of a number of terracottas by such French masters as Louis-Claude Vassé, Augustin Pajou, Clodion, Pierre Julien, Philippe-Laurent Roland, and Joseph-Charles Marin, establishing the basis for one of the greatest collections in the world of works in that medium. Already by 1970, with such large-scale sculptures as Antonio Canova’s Perseus with the Head of Medusa (no. 75) under the Museum’s roof, department head John Goldsmith Phillips (1957–71) could report to the acquisitions committee, “Our has suddenly become a great collection of sculpture” (see figs. 4, 5). That collection grew with great rapidity during the next two decades, and in response to the challenge of housing it, the Carroll and Milton Petrie European Sculpture Court opened in 1990 (see fig. 6). Separate galleries have been established for terracottas and Italian Renaissance bronzes. Most departmental sculpture, however, is displayed in galleries or period rooms together with decorative arts of the same era.

During the past several decades, Museum curators continued to acquire great sculpture, with the enlightened support of Museum trustees. With aid from the Annenberg Foundation, department chair Olga Raggio (1971–2001) made such key additions to the Italian Baroque collection as Pietro and Gianlorenzo Bernini’s pair of garden sculptures Autumn in the Guise of Priapus and Spring in the Guise of Flora (nos. 35, 36) and their Bacchus: A Faun Teased by Children (no. 37) as well as Giovanni Battista Foggini’s magnificent busts of Cosimo III de’ Medici and his son Ferdinando (nos. 46, 47). The Wrightman Fund enabled the department to reinforce traditional areas of strength with the purchase of Baccio Bandinelli’s Cosimo I de’ Medici (no. 19) and a bravura exercise in terracotta modeling by the late nineteenth-century French sculptor Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse, Girl in a Straw Bonnet (no. 88). The Wrightman Fund also encouraged departmental expansion into such underrepresented areas as nineteenth-century French Neoclassicism (no. 79) and Russian portrait sculpture (no. 51). Since 2000, Annenberg and Wrightman funds have continued to support departmental acquisitions, supplemented by gifts from donors such as Assunta Sommella Peluso and Ada and Romano I. Peluso (see nos. 52, 53, 64) and the Anna-Maria and Stephen Kellen Foundation (see no. 74). The European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, created in 2003, further increased our ability to acquire important sculpture, such as, for example, the famous Rothschild Lamp by the Italian bronze artist Andrea Briosco, called Riccio (no. 14).

Some recently acquired works build on strengths: Saint Jerome in the Wilderness (no. 5), for instance, complements important quattrocento reliefs of the
Madonna and Child already in the Museum. It was also the first narrative relief of that period to enter the Museum. Pajou’s *Head of a Bearded Elder* (no. 63) displays another side of the great French Rococo sculptor, already well represented in the Museum.

Efforts made in the last decade to expand the collection beyond the areas in which the department’s holdings are rich have yielded some spectacular results. Masterworks by leading German artists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including examples by Balthasar Permoser, Ignaz Günther, Franz Xaver Messnerschmidt, and Philipp Jakob Scheffauer (nos. 48, 62, 65, 74), have established a core collection of important sculpture characteristic of northern European Baroque and Neoclassicism. The first major works by Bertel Thorvaldsen and Charles-Henri-Joseph Cordier to arrive at the Metropolitan (nos. 78, 82, 83) make significant statements in the fields of Neoclassical relief and mixed-media work of the nineteenth century.

Acquired by gift, bequest, and purchase, European sculpture at The Metropolitan Museum of Art forms a collection whose quality is rarely exceeded elsewhere in the world, yet there remain opportunities for curators and collectors to expand its scope in the future. Our holdings of small northern European ivories and boxwoods are rich—one masterpiece has been included here to represent this aspect of the collection (no. 43).

When they are compared with our recently acquired works of medium size, it becomes evident that the acquisition of German wood and marble statuary of larger scale must become a priority. The Museum’s examples of English sculpture from the seventeenth through the nineteenth century are choice (see no. 59), but they need more company in the permanent collection. Work by the great Spanish carver Juan Martínez Montañés (see no. 38) would gain even more interest if it were surrounded by sculpture from the hands of Spanish artists of comparable stature.

This brief history of the Metropolitan’s European sculpture collection reveals that the passionate acquisition of objects from two great traditions in France and Italy determined its current composition, heavily weighted toward the taste of collectors in its formative years—a pattern that characterizes the holdings of most American museums. What the highlights of sculpture presented in this book can only hint at, however, is the collection’s depth. In the Museum’s galleries are thousands of pieces in a wide range of materials, types, and sizes. They constitute one of the broadest and finest public holdings of European sculpture, a magnificent resource.
fig. 4 (opposite, left) View of a European Sculpture and Decorative Arts gallery in the 1970s. In the right foreground, Jean-Louis Lemoyne’s eighteenth-century group The Fear of Cupid’s Darts faces Domenico Guidi’s seventeenth-century Andromeda and the Sea Monster.

fig. 5 (opposite, right) This photograph shows a different configuration of the gallery seen in figure 4. Sixteenth- through nineteenth-century sculpture is on display.

fig. 6 (above) The Carroll and Milton Petrie European Sculpture Court in 2011. At left is Antonio Canova’s Perseus with the Head of Medusa, and in the center is Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux’s Ugolino and His Sons.
1. Sprite (Mercury/Favonius)

**SCULPTOR CLOSE TO DONATELLO**
Florence, ca. 1432
Gilt-bronze statuette
24⅛ × 8⅝ × 11⅜ in. (61.6 × 20.6 × 29.8 cm)
Purchase, Mrs. Samuel Reed Gift, Rogers Fund, by exchange, and Louis V. Bell Fund, 1983, 1983.356

**PROVENANCE:** Sir John Ramsden (until 1930; sale, Christie, Manson and Woods, London, July 8, 1930, no. 35); Sir William Pennington-Ramsden, Muncaster Castle, Ravenglass, Cumbria (until 1983); his daughter Mrs. Patrick Gordon-Duff-Pennington (1983; sale, Christie’s, London, June 20, 1983, no. 109, to MMA)


This brilliant bronze figure of a boy contains clues to its original placement and function. The right leg is raised, and the weight is shifted to the left foot, which is arched to conform to a now-missing curved shape. The lad’s puffed cheeks and the remnants of interior piping indicate that water once flowed up through the left leg and the torso to spout out of the open mouth. The left arm is akimbo, but the right one rises just above the level of the mouth. The fingers of that hand curl to grasp an object that must have been positioned in the path of the jet of water. Clearly this was a fountain figure; moreover, its resemblance to some well-known Florentine Renaissance bronzes helps to explain its pose. Most relevant is Giovanni Francesco Rustici’s Mercury Taking Flight (fig. 7), originally atop a fountain in the courtyard of the Palazzo Vecchio, Florence. It stood on a ball and, as we know from the account of Giorgio Vasari, held a whirligig that spun as the water propelled its four blades.1 Judging from the posture of the Museum’s boy, he, too, balanced on a sphere and spat water at a spinning device; thus, he may have been the model for Rustici’s Mercury.

These details have led several authors to connect the Metropolitan’s boy with a fountain constructed in the garden of the Casa Vecchia, a Medici edifice that preceded the Palazzo Vecchio on the via Larga. In a forthcoming book, James Draper reviews documents that indicate this fountain was topped by a spiritello—a sprite, or winged infant—and that a painter named Antonio was paid on March 26, 1432, for the gold with which it was gilt.6 Inventories of the Casa Vecchia made in 1503 and 1516 describe what is likely to be the same figure: respectively, “a marble column with a bronze idol on a ball” and “a marble column either fixed or built against a wall, with a ball and idol above.”3 The Casa Vecchia bronze is not mentioned in later Medici records, but the existence of two small sixteenth-century versions of the model suggest that it remained in Florence for some time.4

The style of the Museum’s Sprite accords with an early fifteenth-century date. Many scholars have noted in the arrangement of the arms and in the facial features its close relation to the famous Florentine sculptor Donatello’s gilt-bronze Dancing Angel on the font of the Baptistery at Siena Cathedral (fig. 8).5 Francesco Caglioti assigns the model of Sprite to Donatello (1386/87–1466) but the execution of the bronze to a collaborator.6 Finding its pose less fluid than those of Donatello’s known bronzes of this period and the engraving too artless to have been done under his direct supervision, Draper regards Sprite as a work by a close collaborator of the master. For him, this is a work that follows Donatello’s inventions and displays many of his stylistic hallmarks but appears to be a step away from the master himself.
If Rustici’s Mercury was a replacement for the damaged Sprite, as Draper has suggested, then this earlier work may also have represented the child Mercury. While that god is often seen with winged sandals, this figure’s shoulder wings and tail have no place in his usual description. A suggestion has been made that the Museum’s figure may represent one of the four classical wind gods, especially since images of them exist with shoulder wings and tail, supporting this interpretation. For Draper, it is the west wind, Zephyr, whose breath is gentle, that should be considered. This scholar notes that Mercury and Favonius (the Latin name for Zephyr) were sometimes conflated by medieval authors. The association of Mercury, god of commerce—so critical to the Medici fortunes—with a favorable wind is the kind of hybrid meaning admired in the Renaissance. The doubling of associations would have intrigued the viewer’s mind at the same time that the gleaming form of the boy, rising above splashing water, would have delighted eye and ear.

2. Draper’s publication will be a study of Italian bronzes in the Metropolitan Museum.
4. One, now in the Museo Nazionale Bargello, Florence (inv. no. 425), was once part of the Medici collections in the Palazzo degli Uffizi, Florence (unpublished). The other was sold from the Cyril Humphris collection, at Sotheby’s New York, on January 11, 1995, no. 101.
2. Madonna and Child with Angels, called the Altman Madonna

ANTONIO ROSSELLINO (ITALIAN, 1427–1479)
Florence, ca. 1455–60
Marble relief with gilt details
28¾ x 21¼ in. (73.7 x 73.3 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913. 14.40.675

PROVENANCE: Count Cosimo Alessandri, Florence (until 1877; sold to Hainauer); Oscar Hainauer, Berlin (1877–1906); [Duveen Brothers, by 1906; sold to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (until d. 1913; his bequest to MMA)

ITALIAN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY MARBLE RELIEFS OF THE MADONNA and Child were highly esteemed by New York collectors in the first half of the twentieth century, and many were given to the Museum. Of these, the Altman Madonna by Antonio Rossellino is arguably the finest. The strong composition, subtle carving, and partial gilding distinguish it among Rossellino reliefs in American collections.

Florentine sculptors of Antonio’s generation—including his older brother Bernardo, as well as Desiderio da Settignano and Mino da Fiesole, who trained alongside Antonio in Bernardo’s workshop—refined and varied the format of this revered and popular subject. For example, the Madonna’s three-quarters pose, seated in a throne with her left arm extended across the panel, is very close to the pose of the Virgin in Antonio’s probably earlier relief in the Morgan Library and Museum, New York, yet the effect is very different.1 In the Morgan Museum’s work the Christ Child nestled in the Virgin’s right arm faces across her body, one foot resting on her left wrist. In the Altman relief the child faces in the same direction as his mother, and his body twists dynamically to follow his gaze. The toddler’s pose is awkward but energetic and independent, necessitating the maternal and protective gesture that restrains him. In 1970 John Pope-Hennessy noted other devices that make this relief so successful: the chair arm juts forward to position the Virgin in space; the asymmetry of three cherubim heads in the Morgan relief resolves here into the symmetry of four heads, which plays effectively off the angled poses of the principal figures; and the Virgin’s left hand, splayed flat in the Morgan relief, is fully three-dimensional and turns in space.2 One of Rossellino’s great accomplishments in the Altman Madonna is his handling of drapery: both Christ and his mother are clothed in transparent garments over thick ones—the Child’s tight swaddling can be seen through his light tunic, and the Virgin’s veil trails down from her headdress over her mantle. The sculptor twisted her belt so that it pinches the mantle precisely where one would expect it to. The complex pattern of pleats reflects the shape of her body, and the drapery lying over the chair rail places her in space. Patterns painted in gold on her garments and halo pick out edges and enliven surfaces.

The attribution of the Museum’s relief to Antonio Rossellino originated in 1897 with the German art historian Wilhelm von Bode, and it has been nearly universally accepted.3 Pope-Hennessy dated the relief to 1455–60 by relating it to works that are documented or whose date is inferred. He thought that Rossellino’s bust of Giovanni Chellini (dated 1456) in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, his statue of Saint Sebastian in the Museum of the Collegiate, Empoli (whose
EXHIBITED: “Masterpieces of Fifty Centuries,” The Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 12, 1970–June 1, 1971

LITERATURE: Bode 1897, pp. 9, 61, no. 6 (sculpture), ill. p. 8; “Benjamin Altman Collection” 1913, p. 238; Metropolitan Museum 1914, pp. 126–27, no. 66, ill. facing p. 128; Metropolitan Museum 1928, pp. 125–26, no. 57, ill. facing p. 126; Gottschalk 1930, p. 42; Joseph Breck in Metropolitan Museum 1933, n.p., fig. 9; Duveen Brothers 1944, n.p., no. 88, ill.; Phillips 1946, p. 75, ill.; Phillips 1954, ill. p. 153; Pope-Hennessy 1958, pp. 38, 391, pl. 60; Haskell 1970, p. 273, n. 55; Masterpieces of Fifty Centuries 1970, p. 206, no. 192, ill.; Pope-Hennessy 1970a, figs. 1–6; Apfelstadt 1987, vol. 1, p. 29, n. 76, vol. 2, fig. 165; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1987b, p. 70, pl. 47; Zuraw 1996, pp. 184; Coojin 2003, p. 115, fig. 14; Negri Arnoldi 2003, p. 61, fig. 15; “Rossellino: Madonna and Child with Angels” 2006, ill. date, he argues, is about 1460), and the present work were all carved from the same stone; however, it seems more likely that their mottled appearance is attributable to cleaning with oil in the modern era. His argument that the flesh and hair of the Museum’s Madonna are close to Chellini’s is not especially convincing, but the connection he saw between the ambiguous stance of the Christ Child and of Saint Sebastian seems entirely valid. He confidently placed the Museum’s relief in Rossellino’s early period because after the artist completed his most famous commission, the tomb of the cardinal of Portugal at the church of San Miniato al Monte in Florence (1461–66), his work took a new direction and his development is better charted. Rossellino’s ambitious, if not completely resolved, posing of the child suggests the exploratory attitude seen in two known early reliefs. Other relief compositions, as Pope-Hennessy notes, depend on formulas developed in those early works.

1. On the Morgan Museum relief, Madonna and Child with Cherubim, see Gottschalk 1930, p. 42; Pluntig 1942, p. 54. There is a polychromed stucco copy by Rossellino of the Morgan marble in the Metropolitan Museum (Bequest of George Blumenthal, acc. no. 41.190.40).
3. Bode 1897, pp. 9, 61, no. 6 (sculpture), ill. p. 8.
5. For the tomb, see Harl, Costi, and Kennedy 1964.
6. Those formulas were first detected in a stucco relief in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Pope-Hennessy 1964, vol. 1, pp. 132–33, no. 10) and a destroyed work formerly in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin (Pluntig 1942, p. 54).
3. Saint Bridget of Sweden Receiving the Rule of Her Order

AGOSTINO D’ANTONIO DI DUCCIO (ITALIAN, 1418–AFTER 1481)
Perugia, 1459
Marble relief
16¼ x 25¼ x 2⅞ in. (42.5 x 63.8 x 7 cm)
John Stewart Kennedy Fund, 1914. 14.45

PROVENANCE: Altar of San Lorenzo, church of San Domenico, Perugia (1455–82); Louis Châtel, Lyons (in 1879); Edouard Aynard, Lyons (until 1915); sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, December 4, 1913, no. 267, to Canessa; [Canessa, New York, 1917–14; sold to MMA]


LITERATURE: Darcel 1877, pp. 180–81, ill. p. 183 (engraving); Bode 1878, col. 754; Giraud 1878, pl. LXXIV; Piot 1878, pp. 587–88; Bode 1879, p. 101; Piot 1879, p. 142, ill. p. 157 (engraving); Courajod 1892, pp. 133–34, ill. (engraving); Bertaux 1906, pp. 92–96, ill.; Brunelli 1906a, ill.; Brunelli 1906b; Bertaux 1907; Brunelli 1907; Michel 1909, p. 93; Pointner 1909, p. 179; Bode 1914, ill.; “Museum Buys Bas-Relief” 1914, ill.; Valentinier 1914, ill.; Ricci 1923, pp. 116–17, ill. no. 150; Gamba 1929, p. 930; Phillips 1934, p. 145, ill. p. 152; Pope-Hennessy 1958, p. 325; Guerrieri 1961, pl. 16; Shearman 1965, vol. 1, p. 48, n. 2; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1972b, p. 41, pl. 21; Mercurelli Salari 1995 (subject identified for the first time with related documents as a scene from the life of Saint Bridget), ill. no. 1; Pasini 1996, p. 456 (as Christ Taking Leave of His Mother); Draper in Fra Carnevale 2004, pp. 238–39, no. 39, ill.; Draper in From Filippo Lippi to Piero della Francesca 2005, pp. 238–39, no. 39, ill.

When this relief was exhibited in Paris in 1878, the German scholar Wilhelm von Bode attributed it to Agostino di Duccio.¹ His identification was accepted by all major scholars; the subject, on the other hand, puzzled many.² Eugène Piot referred to it as a scene from the life of Saint Catherine, and he was followed by Émile Bertaux, who connected it with the Mystical Marriage of Saint Catherine, but with considerable hesitation.³ Others, such as Enrico Brunelli, who doubted the relief’s authenticity, recognized it in the Virgin Taking Leave of Her Son before the Passion.⁴ Bode called it The Return of Christ from the Temple, and his interpretation was followed into the 1960s, when John Shearman identified the subject as Christ Returning to the Virgin from the Dispute in the Temple.⁵

A document that would confirm what is now accepted as the true subject of the relief had already been published in 1875 by Adamo Rossi, but the connection between the document and the relief was not drawn for many years. Rossi transcribed an account of an altar in the church of San Domenico in Perugia that had a relief representing an episode in the life of Saint Bridget.⁶ In 1961, without knowledge of the Museum’s relief, Francesco Santi published a reconstruction of the altar in the church,⁷ and since he described the altar as in terracotta, curators at the Metropolitan decided that the Museum’s marble relief could not have been part of the ensemble.⁸

Finally, in 1995, Paola Mercurelli Salari systematically reviewed known documents and published additional ones that convincingly answer long-standing questions surrounding the relief. The story that emerged is as follows. On January 10, 1459, the heirs of Lorenzo di Giovanni di Petruccio, including his sister Brigida, signed a notarized document commissioning Agostino di Duccio to execute an altar that would be dedicated to Saint Bridget.⁹ With the exception of the predella, the altar was completed and accepted nine months later, and at that time Agostino di Duccio was paid an additional ten florins specifically for the predella.¹⁰ This must mean, Mercurelli Salari points out, that Agostino was paid a bonus to create a better relief for the predella, that is to say, in marble. She further notes that the Museum’s scene can be interpreted as the moment in the life of Saint Bridget, as related in her Revelations, when Christ brought her the rule of her new order: “Rule of the Holy Savior which has been given divinely from the mouth of Jesus Christ to his devoted spouse Saint Bridget of the Kingdom of Sweden.”¹¹ In the relief, the second figure from the left must be the young Christ, to whom, as a nun, Saint Bridget was mystically married. He carries a rolled document in one hand, representing the Bridgettine rule, while the sibylline saint, garbed in the veil and mantle of her order, holds his other hand. Only
twenty-three years after the relief was installed, Piergentile di Lorenzo de' Belli stated that his Aunt Brigida had bequeathed 300 florins to renovate the family chapel in San Domenico. The altar was dismantled, and the remnants were left to the friars of the church to be remounted in an altar dedicated to the Rosary.18

The Museum has long accepted Mercurelli Salari's identification of the scene on their relief, which was rarely represented in fifteenth-century sculpture. The hitherto unknown widow Bridget Gudmarsson (ca. 1303-1373) founded the Order of the Holy Savior in Sweden in 1346 and moved to Rome, where she lived from 1349 until her death, to seek confirmation of her order, which was duly granted by Pope Urban V. Revered for her good works and visions, she was canonized in 1391. Clearly she was admired by the di Petruccio family, who named a child after her and created an altar in her honor.

After carving marble reliefs for the interior of the Tempio Malatesta in Rimini, between 1449 and 1456, Agostino d'Antonio di Duccio moved to Perugia, where his first important commission was for the façade of the Oratorio of San Bernardino. The gothicizing line and highly decorative patterning evident in his Rimini sculptures still governed the style of the angels flying on either side of the San Bernardino door and the image of the saint above. His figure of Patience on the façade holds bunched pleats of drapery with one hand, just as do the figures in the Saint Bridget relief.19 The wreath supported by angels that creates the sacred space for Saint Bridget and the young Christ, a device seen on medieval ivories, is a sign of Agostino's interest in Gothic forms. The hallmarks of his style—heavily lidded eyes, decoratively swirling hair and drapery—are unmistakable. Flattened forms, such as the saint's body splayed across the surface of the marble relief and her angular arms, are more consistent with Agostino's work in the 1450s (for example, the relief figure of Saint Bernardino in the center of the façade of the Oratorio di San Bernardino, Perugia of 1457â€”61) than they are with the more substantial figures of his Virgin and Child with Angels in the Musée du Louvre, Paris, of about 1463, or his Virgin and Child in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., of a decade later.20 A recent biographer of Agostino, Pier Giorgio Pasini, dated the Museum's relief to the sculptor's last years, after he returned to Perugia in 1473, but judging from its style—and taking into account the documentary evidence described above—it must have been executed much earlier.21 Behind the figures, cosmic forces—the sun, the moon, a wind god—as well as the towers of a town-scape, perhaps Perugia, set the stage for this saint who brought her intense spirituality to communities from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.

3. Picot 1879, p. 142; Berthaux 1906, p. 93.
5. Shearman 1963, vol. 1, p. 48, n. 2. Shearman noted that the sphinx at the feet of the woman in the chair, whom he identified as the Virgin, probably characterized her as Sedes Sapientiae (Seat of Wisdom), an idea that Agostino would have borrowed from Donatello's Virgin and Child Enthroned (1446-50, high altar of the church of San Antonio, Padua).
6. A. Rossi 1875. See also Zanoli 1967.
8. Notes in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
10. Mariotti 1788, pp. 48-49, and n. 4.
14. Courajod 1892, p. 133, relates the two angels flanking the Madonna in the Louvre relief to those in the New York relief, but they are quite different in style.
4. Virgin and Child in a Niche, called the Bliss Madonna

LUCA DELLA ROBBIA (ITALIAN, 1399/1400–1482)
Florence, ca. 1460
Glazed terracotta plaque with gilt and painted details
18 1/4 × 15 1/4 × 1 1/2 in. (47.3 × 38.7 × 8.9 cm)
Bequest of Susan Dwight Bliss, 1966 67.55.98

PROVENANCE: Émile Gavet, Paris (by 1894); Henry G. Marquand, New York (until d. 1902; sale, American Art Galleries, New York, January 30, 1903, no. 1198, to Bliss); Mrs. George T. Bliss, New York (1903–d. 1924); her daughter, Susan Dwight Bliss, New York (1924–d. 1966; her bequest to MMA)


ONE OF THE MOST DISTINGUISHED SCULPTORS OF THE EARLY Renaissance, Luca della Robbia created famous works in marble, such as the Cantoria (Singing Choir) for the organ loft of Florence Cathedral, and in bronze, such as the doors of the North Sacristy of the same church. His name is, however, most closely identified—and indeed nearly synonymous with—sculpture in tin-glazed terracotta. In this medium he specialized in images of the Madonna and Child, particularly for private devotions, and began a practice of reproducing them in casts, which members of his family and large workshop continued into the sixteenth century.

The Bliss Madonna, a glazed terracotta known in one other example (see below), is a quintessential Luca della Robbia work. Seen in half-length, the Virgin occupies a niche defined by gold-painted ribs against a turquoise ground. The frame is embellished with a floral design, and its upper corners are emblazoned with the Bartorelli and Baldi coats of arms, likely denoting a marriage between those Florentine families.1 Turquoise is signally rare as a ground color but encountered in other Della Robbia floral reliefs. As if shying from an onlooker, the Christ Child stands on the edge of the niche and leans toward his mother, embracing her neck, while she supports him with one hand on a foot and the other on his hip. Their heads touch, but their blue gray eyes look out at the viewer. The Virgin’s thick mantle and robe and lighter veil envelop her and offer protection to the Child, who steps on her mantle and entwines the veil with his hands.

So popular were images of the Madonna and Child that artists sought to vary and polish their composition. Luca appears to have first essayed the half-length Madonna holding a standing Child in a relatively unrefined work in stucco (Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris) about 1430. The infant does not lean in as engagingly, his pose is not as dynamic, and he does not move back in space as convincingly as in the Metropolitan’s example. Luca developed that composition about 1450–55, producing a type known in several variants as the Genoa Madonna, in which Christ turns to his mother and reaches around her neck, but his right foot is forward and she places her right hand protectively on his waist. The Bliss Madonna shows further improvements in these poses and is more expressive of the emotional bond between the figures. Noting this, John Pope-Hennessy called it “the most beautiful and complex example of applied decoration in Luca della Robbia’s work.” Another example in the Museum, in which the figures are roughly twice the size of those seen here and in which the background is blank, reflects Luca’s architectural commissions, as it may have been intended to fill a lunette over a door.3 It is a forceful representation of the subject, but two very different qualities, intimacy
LITERATURE: Marquand 1894, pp. 2, 14, no. 15 and under no. 20, pl. vi, 1; Bode 1896–1911, iii. p. 12; Reymond 1897, pp. 136, 203–4 (as by Andrea della Robbia); Bode 1900, p. 23 (erroneously as in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum); Bode 1902, pp. 79, 165–70 (erroneously as in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum), fig. 19; Cruttwell 1902, pp. 156–58, 326 (as by Andrea della Robbia); Reymond 1904, p. 98, n. 1; Bode 1906, p. 29; Bode 1908, pp. 101–2 (erroneously as in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum); Bode 1911, p. 144; Marquand 1912a, pp. 7–8, no. 2, and pp. 8, 15, under no. 3, fig. 3; Marquand 1914, pp. 156–58, no. 42, fig. 103; Schubring 1921, p. 76, fig. 80; Planiscig 1940, pp. 23, 35, pl. 77; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1973, p. 236, iii; Patterns of Collecting 1975, p. 8; Pope-Hennessy 1980, p. 255, no. 40, colorpl. xxix; Alan Phipps Darr in Italian Renaissance Sculpture 1985, pp. 157–58, no. 44, iii; Darr in Donatello e i suoi 1986, p. 208, no. 79, pl. xxx; Gentilini 1992, pp. 102, 157, n. 74, p. 163, n. 6, iii. p. 60; Radcliffe 1992, p. 22; Jean-René Gaborit in Les Della Robbia 2002, p. 100, under no. iv.4; Gaborit 2002, p. 17; Draper in Fra Carnevale 2004, pp. 156–97, no. 24, iii; Draper in From Filippo Lippi to Piero della Francesca 2005, pp. 156–97, no. 24, iii.

and modest scale, are what make the Bliss Madonna so successful. The harmony Luca achieved through successive adjustments to the composition have produced a completely satisfying balance between the figures and between them and the space they occupy.

The only other known variant of the subject (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) differs slightly in the treatment of the mantle and is not quite as refined in its modeling, yet it seems to have come from the same mold as the Bliss Madonna. Some earlier scholars disagreed whether the reliefs should be ascribed to Luca or to his nephew Andrea, but in 1914 the Della Robbia authority Allan Marquand attributed them to Luca and advanced the dating from 1440–50, which Wilhelm von Bode had proposed, to about 1460, a date that Pope-Hennessy in turn accepted.

1. Marquand 1914, p. 157, suggests this, but no record of such a marriage has yet been found.
3. It was formerly in the Altman collection (acc. no. 14.40.685).
5. Saint Jerome in the Wilderness

PROBABLY BY ANTONIO ROSELLINO
(ITALIAN, 1427–1479)

Florence, ca. 1470
Marble relief
16 ¼ x 12 ½ x 2 ½ in. (42.2 x 38.7 x 7.3 cm)
Purchase, Rogers Fund and Lila Acheson Wallace
Gift, 2001 2001.593

PROVENANCE: Stefano Bardini (1836–1922), Florence (until 1918; his sale, American Art Galleries, New York, April 23–27, 1918, no. 420, to Freund); Karl Freund, New York (1918–d. 1956); Luigi Bellini, Florence; Carlo de Carlo, Florence; sale, Eredi Carlo de Carlo, Franco Semenzato and Company, Casa d’Aste, Florence, April 19, 2001, no. 135; [Salander O’Reilly, New York, 2001; sold to MMA]


THE METROPOLITAN DISPLAYS IN ITS GALLERIES AN IMPORTANT group of quattrocento reliefs of the Madonna and Child by such Italian Renaissance masters as Antonio Rossellino (see no. 2) and Benedetto da Maiano (see no. 8). Until Saint Jerome in the Wilderness entered the collection, however, the Museum had no example of a classic narrative relief. Beginning in 1424, when Lorenzo Ghiberti’s first set of bronze doors for the Baptistry was set in place, narrative reliefs held signal importance in Florentine art. (It was Ghiberti who invented the device, echoed here, of showing the foreground spilling over the frame in the reliefs for his second set of Baptistry doors, the “Gates of Paradise.”)

Small reliefs like this marble were often made for private devotions in a family chapel. The 1553 inventory of the Palazzo della Signoria, Florence, for example, mentions a low relief of Saint Jerome, which could have been this one, although it is usually associated with a work by Desiderio da Settignano in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. The subject is unsurprising: images of this gaunt ascetic abounded in the 1470s, as is attested by paintings attributed to Andrea del Verrocchio (Palazzo Pitti, Florence) and by Leonardo da Vinci (Pinacoteca, Vatican).

Widely read during the Renaissance, Jerome’s letters vividly describe his physical and spiritual trials in the desert outside Bethlehem, where, he tells us, he would “set up my oratory, and make that spot a place of torture for my unhappy flesh.” Furthermore, the best-selling compilation of saints’ lives, Jacobus de Voragine’s Golden Legend, relates charming stories of his relationships with animals, which are often woven into depictions of the present scene. We learn that he befriended a lion; the lion teamed up with a donkey to carry wood to Jerome’s monastery; and some camel-driving merchants stole the donkey. These tales account for the lion, lioness, and camel in the relief. It is, in fact, a virtual bestiary: the stag, for instance, may be explained by the following passage from the Song of Solomon, “Behold, he cometh leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills. My beloved is like a roe or a young hart,” which is often interpreted in Renaissance exegesis as a reference to Christ, whose cross rises above the animal here. Other creatures—a squirrel and a dragon—also carried symbolic meaning in contemporary writings.

The references to religious and secular literature made this a stirring image in fifteenth-century Florence, yet it is the airy landscape that draws the viewer into the scene and encourages him or her to linger over its delightful details. Jerome and the animals inhabit a mountainous region that conjures atmosphere and depth within the compact limits of the relief. Twin peaks curve toward the saint as if

sheltering him within the hollow at their base. As Jerome kneels on the rocky stage in the foreground, the lions stand or sit on ledges receding to the left; in the distance a trader and his camel disappear behind a crag. Jutting from an outcrop, the crucifix separates Jerome from the right side of the pictorial space, where beasts and foliage hint at a passage behind the peaks. Using a mountainous landscape to separate a composition into discrete areas was pioneered by Ghiberti in the Baptistery reliefs and by such artists as Domenico Veneziano in painting. Borrowing that formal device, the sculptor of this relief carved the marble intuitively, suggesting recession into depth rather than constructing it through the rules of one-point perspective. Careful observations of striated rock, different varieties of leaves, and wispy clouds breathe life into this natural world.

The style of the work closely resembles that of a set of reliefs in Faenza Cathedral (see fig. 10). Giorgio Vasari credited them to Benedetto da Maiano, but many later scholars have attributed them to Benedetto's master, Antonio Rossellino. In 1985, however, Gary M. Radke returned the attribution to Benedetto, finding that they forecast another, slightly later set of reliefs by him in the chapel of Santa Fina, San Gimignano. Radke pointed out that in the Faenza reliefs the manner in which the foreground figure is related to the
mountains, the use of foliage to fill out the middle ground, and the placement of animals in the background are all aspects of Benedetto’s sensibility as well as Rossellino’s. Even Mario Scalini, a scholar who attributes the Museum’s relief to Rossellino, dates it to the 1470s by relating it to Benedetto’s Stigmatization of Saint Francis in the church of Santa Croce, Florence (fig. 9).⁸ And because it is clearly dependent on Rossellino’s sculptural formulas, our relief was not surprisingly identified as his work when it was auctioned in New York in 1918.⁹ Radke’s arguments for Benedetto’s authorship of the Faenza reliefs—citing Benedetto’s keen interest in narrative and his blocky figures and rich surface ornamentation—are attractive, but the eminent scholar Francesco Caglioti continues to believe that Rossellino and his workshop were responsible.¹⁰ Clearly, whoever carved the Faenza reliefs also carved the Museum’s Saint Jerome in the Wilderness.

Although we have no written record of its authorship, this relief’s renown in the Renaissance is confirmed by the existence of two copies. A glazed terracotta of about 1510 attributed to Luca della Robbia the Younger (1475–1548) in the Casa Buonarroti, Florence, is clearly based on the composition, which the artist clarified through color, thereby losing atmospheric perspective.¹¹ There are a few changes in the details, but the basic form and the dimensions are the same. In another version (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), also attributed to Luca della Robbia the Younger, a bearded Jerome has been turned into a contemplative saint reading a book, not mortifying himself with a rock.¹² Rather, his arms are spread wide in adoration of Christ. This different interpretation may have been more appealing in a less fervently religious period than the 1470s, but the survival of the composition speaks for the fame of the relief long after its original conception.

5. Song of Solomon 2: 8–9. For a general study of the symbolic meaning of animals in the Renaissance, see Friedmann 1980.
12. Ibid., pp. 252–93, no. iv.2.
6. David with the Head of Goliath

BARTOLOMEO BELLANO (ITALIAN, 1434–AFTER 1496)

Padua, 1470–80
Bronze statuette with oil gilding of later date
11¼ × 5¼ × 4¼ in. (28.6 × 13.3 × 12.4 cm)
Gift of C. Ruxton Love Jr., New York (1948–64; his gift to MMA)

PROVENANCE: C. Fairfax Murray, London; [Duveen Brothers, New York; sold to Goldman]; Henry Goldman, New York (until 1948; his sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, February 28, 1948, no. 64, to Love); C. Ruxton Love Jr., New York (1948–64; his gift to MMA)


THIS IS A KEY WORK IN THE EARLY RENAISSANCE DEVELOPMENT OF bronze statuettes in northern Italy. Its creator, Bartolomeo Bellano, was a disciple of Donatello’s, as is documented by a payment in connection with that master’s Judith Slaying Holofernes (ca. 1459, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence). His independent work began with a bronze statue of Pope Paul II in Perugia (1466–67, now lost) and a series of Old Testament subjects in relief for the choir screen of the basilica of San Antonio (Il Santo) in Padua (1484–90), which features small-scale figures standing out in high relief from their backgrounds. As we know from Giorgio Vasari’s biography, he went on to execute a number of small metal figures for the pope and for others, and he has been recognized as one of the earliest Italian sculptors to make a specialty of bronze statuettes.

David with the Head of Goliath has long been admired as one of Bellano’s masterpieces in bronze. Its debt to Donatello’s famous nude David (ca. 1455, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence) is reflected in the hero’s pose with hip swung out and one arm akimbo and the gigantic head of Goliath at his feet. Bellano dressed David in a short tunic with many pleats—Wilhelm von Bode once described the sculptor’s boldly chiseled drapery as like crumpled paper. The youthful victor’s accessories include a gorget decorated with a head, probably of Medusa, in a classical allusion; boots rolled down to the calf; and a shoulder bag, whose strap crosses the right shoulder. His weapons are a sling, still weighted by a stone, and a large sword. Having hit his foe with a projectile—stones scattered on the base give a sense that the battle has just taken place—David triumphs over his dead opponent. The triangular gash in the giant’s forehead indicates the cause of death, while the curved blade is clearly the implement that was used to lop off the giant’s head. David’s graceful pose, his limbs in contraposto, emphasizes his youth and suggests serenity in the aftermath of violent conflict.

Scholars divide over the relationship of this to other small bronzes by Bellano, notably a variant David in the Philadelphia Museum of Art and a Saint Jerome and the Lion in the Musée du Louvre, Paris. Hans Wehrhahn saw the Philadelphia example as more clearly derivative of Donatello and believed it therefore to be earlier than the Museum’s David; John Pope-Hennessy followed this line of reasoning in dating the Philadelphia example to about 1466 and the present version later. Museum curator James Draper believed, to the contrary, that the taut pose and sharp faceting of the Museum’s statuette align it with such early works by the artist as the Miracle of the Mule relief in Il Santo (1469–72) and that the bulkier body, more static composition, and chunkier faceting of the Philadelphia David reflect Bellano’s advancing
style, as represented by the Saint Jerome in Paris. Some scholars wondered whether the Davids under discussion are in fact by two different hands, but Draper sees them as from different phases of one career. Most recently Volker Krahn has reaffirmed the early dating of the Museum’s example, calling it Bellano’s masterwork in the small bronze format. A number of later versions testify to the continuing esteem in which this sculpture was held well into the sixteenth century.

7. Prudence

ANDREA DELLA ROBBIA (ITALIAN, 1435–1525)
Florence, ca. 1475
Glazed terracotta relief
Diam. 64¼ in. (164.5 cm)
Purchase, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1921 21.116

ITS LARGE SCALE, BOLD DESIGN, AND BRILLIANT colors indicate that this roundel of Prudence was designed to be visible from a distance. The existence of three related roundels by Andrea della Robbia of other virtues—Faith (Musée Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon), Temperance, and Justice (both Musée National de la Renaissance, Château d'Écouen)—suggests that the group was once part of or intended to be part of a ceiling or wall decoration. The model for such a program would have been Luca della Robbia's allegorical virtues of 1461–62 on the ceiling of the chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal at the church of San Miniato al Monte, Florence (see fig. 11). There, a domed ceiling centers on a glazed terracotta roundel of the Holy Ghost, which is surrounded by roundels of the four cardinal virtues that touch it at equidistant points. Overlapping half circles fill the borders, while a pattern of superimposed cubes forms the background for the dome around the roundels.

Although represented facing right and different in detail, Luca's Prudence at San Miniato was certainly the inspiration for the Museum's virtue. Andrea trained with his uncle Luca and worked under him at San Miniato. In both roundels a three-quarters-length figure with a young woman's head backed by an old man's face holds up a mirror in one hand and a snake in the other, both traditional attributes of this virtue. One telling difference is the juxtaposition of the young woman and the old man: in Luca's Prudence the young woman's hair covers her forehead naturally and streams into the man's beard; Andrea's Prudence has a bolder pate, affirming the bizarre hybrid that she is. The San Miniato virtues are all winged, while the Museum's Prudence and its related roundels Faith and Temperance are not; only the Justice has wings. Because of this and slight differences in dimensions, scholars have questioned whether the Justice was in fact part of the same series. The borders of the two series also vary, the one geometrical, the other composed of swags of fruit and foliage.

Luca della Robbia's first documented use of glazed terracotta relief for decoration—a commission for the church of Sant'Egidio in Florence, of 1441–43—inspired a wave of followers, particularly members of his own extended family. John Pope-Hennessy has argued that what most attracted Luca initially to the medium was neither the inexpensive nature of clay nor the durability that glazing afforded but the potential of color to clarify compositions in large architectural

fig. 11 Luca della Robbia, ceiling vault, chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, San Miniato al Monte, Florence, 1461–62. Glazed terracotta. (Prudence roundel, lower right)

PROVENANCE: Allegedly from the "Certosa near Florence"; Castellani-Valbrœur, Florence (sold to Cheney); Edward Cheney (1803–1884), Badger Hall, Shropshire; his nephew Alfred Capel-Cure, Badger Hall (until 1896); his nephew, Francis Capel-Cure, Badger Hall (1896–1905); sale, Christie's, London, May 5, 1905, no. 122, to Harding); H. W. Harding; Godfrey Braun; (Raoul Hellebrooner, Paris, until 1914, when that dealer fled to Germany, abandoning his collection; confiscated and auctioned by the French government at Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 22, 1921, no. 141, to Seligmann); [Jacques Seligmann and Company, Paris; acquired by MMA]
LITERATURE: Marquand 1912b, pp. 169–74, fig. 3; Marquand 1914, pp. 66–67, no. 48, fig. 105; Breck 1921, ill.; Joseph Breck in Metropolitan Museum 1933, n.p., fig. 4; Planiscig 1948, pp. 56, 73, under nos. 121, 122; Phillips 1954, ill. p. 155; Reitlinger 1963, p. 608 (sold for £2,325; this and the preceding references as by Luca della Robbia); Pope-Hennessy 1980, p. 271, no. 74 and under nos. 72, 73, 75, fig. 52; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1987b, p. 42, pl. 23. Gentilini 1992, vol. 1, p. 170; "Andrea della Robbia: Prudence" 2006, ill.; Knox 2007, p. 14, fig. 5 (the sculpture on view at Badger Hall in 1888); Petrucci 2009, pp. 65, 65

interiors. The close relationships between the Della Robbia artists often make it difficult to distinguish the work of individual family members. The Museum’s Prudence was, in fact, first published by Allan Marquand in 1912 as the work of Luca. Marquand further proposed that the series to which it belongs was intended but not used for the spandrels of the Pazzi Chapel at the church of Santa Croce, Florence (1445–ca. 1470), where Luca and his workshop created tondi of Apostles and Evangelists to harmonize with Filippo Brunelleschi’s serene architecture. Subsequent scholars followed this attribution until 1980, when Pope-Hennessy made a convincing case for Andrea as the responsible artist. For Pope-Hennessy, Prudence was less rhythmical than its prototype in San Miniato, and all the figures of the series seemed more rigid than Luca’s known work. He also rejected the idea that the series to which the Museum’s Prudence belongs could ever have been destined for the Pazzi Chapel. It may also be noted that the exuberant swags of fruit, extensively used by Andrea throughout his career, would have been inconsistent with the simple travertine borders of Brunelleschi’s Pazzi Chapel design. Generally, Andrea tended to add complexity and decorative notes to compositions that Luca would have kept simple. Prudence’s additional layers of drapery and fussily wrinkled sleeves are sure signs of Andrea’s sensibility. Pope-Hennessy also pronounced the closed eyes of Temperance in the present series a stylistic mannerism of Andrea’s, and he related the structure of the backgrounds to one of Andrea’s greatest works, the roundels depicting foundling infants on the loggia of the Ospedale degli Innocenti, Florence (ca. 1487).

Andrea’s practice grew ever larger and the scale of his altarpieces greater and more complex. While the lush sculptural border of the Museum’s Prudence would have appealed to Florentines in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, the graceful gestures and pure silhouette of the central figure recall the artist’s point of departure in his uncle’s work at midcentury.

4. Marquand 1912b, pp. 169–74, first proposed that its larger size, lighter background, and winged figure signaled a different commission. Pope-Hennessy 1980, p. 271, no. 72, agreed with Marquand’s analysis.
8. Madonna and Child

Benedetto da Maiano (Italian, 1452–1497)
Florence, ca. 1490
Marble relief with painted background
28 × 21½ × 6 in. (71.1 × 54.6 × 15.2 cm)
Bequest of George Blumenthal, 1941. 41.190.137

Provenance: Duke of Montpensier, Palazzo Orléans-Montpensier (formerly called Palazzo Caprara), Bologna; George and Florence Blumenthal, New York (by 1926, until her death in 1930); George Blumenthal (until d. 1941; his bequest to MMA)

Exhibited: "Masterpieces in the Collection of George Blumenthal," The Metropolitan Museum of Art, opened December 8, 1943

Literature: Bode 1892–1905, pl. 365, b; Schottmüller 1913, p. 86, under no. 207; Malaguzzi Valeri 1922, pp. 370–71, ill. p. 367; Dussler 1924, pp. 81–82, pl. 37, fig. 47; Rubinsteinn-Bloch 1926–30, vol. 2, pl. xxxiv; Schottmüller 1933, p. 71 (under inv. no. 110); Collection of George Blumenthal 1943, ill. no. 11; Pope-Hennessy 1964, vol. 1, pp. 163–64; Balogh 1975, vol. 1, p. 76, under no. 73; La Moureyre-Gavoty 1975, n.p., under no. 62; Tessari 1975–76, pp. 22, 28, n. 41, fig. 5; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1978, p. 31, pl. 48; Kecks 1988, pp. 120, 139–40, 144, pl. LXXI, fig. 98; Lein 1988, p. 223; Carl 2006, pp. 61, 64–66, 67, 69, 73, 74, pl. xix

This Madonna and Child is the last in a distinguished series of fifteenth-century reliefs in the Museum by some of the foremost Florentine sculptors. In his choice of subject and its treatment, Benedetto da Maiano followed his master Antonio Rossellino (see entry no. 2) and his compatriot and near-contemporary Desiderio da Settignano, but Benedetto's contribution to this staple of Italian art, a late work by the artist, has a particular solidity and monumentality. The Virgin is heavily clothed in a long-sleeved tunic with a mantle over her shoulders; engagingly, a veil circles her head and falls to her breast, where the Christ Child gathers it with one hand and tugs it with the other. He sits on a tasseled pillow in his mother's lap, while she embraces him with one hand and touches his fingertips with the other. Her intimate gesture hints at maternal restraint, an attempt to keep him from pulling too hard. As their haloed heads incline toward each other, the cycle of gestures and the trailing veil connect the figures closely. The beautifully painted floral motif in the background (enhanced by a recent cleaning) and the sumptuous pillow suggest that the setting is a richly appointed house.

Benedetto's conceit of the Child toying with the veil and the play of expressive hands may have been borrowed from Leonardo da Vinci's Madonna with the Carnation (1478–80, Alte Pinakothek, Munich). If so, his success in translating the painted composition into a powerful three-dimensional representation can be measured by the number of copies and reproductions his work engendered. These range from a painted terracotta tondo in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest, to a papier-mâché tondo in the Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris, to a smaller stucco in the Bode Museum, Berlin. In 1952–94 Virginia Budny compiled a list of many variations of the relief in rectangular or tondo shape and in a variety of media. Some of the compositions include angels, some do not, and some depict the Child holding an apple or orb rather than the veil. The existence of so many copies and variants demonstrates how a prime image such as the Museum's Madonna and Child can have a rich afterlife. Benedetto's powerful Christ Child with his solid, fleshy body also had a notable influence on the young Michelangelo.

5. Budny was a Jane and Morgan Whitney Fellow in the Museum's Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts at that time. Her manuscript is in the department's curatorial files.
9. Adam

**TULLIO LOMBARDO (ITALIAN, CA. 1455–1532)**

*Venice, ca. 1490–95*

Marble statue

H. 7½ in. (19.1 cm)

Signed (on front of plinth): TULLIO LOMBARDO

Fletcher Fund, 1936. 36:163

**PROVENANCE:** Commissioned for the tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin (1393–1478), church of Santa Maria dei Servi, Venice, and later the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice; Vendramin-Calegri family; Palazzo Vendramin-Calegri, Venice (ca. 1819–42); the duchesse de Berry, Palazzo Vendramin-Calegri (ca. 1844–65; her sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, May 8–13, 1865, no. 2); Henri Dieudonné d’Artois, comte de Chambord, possibly Schloss Frohndorf, near Vienna (until d. 1883); Princess Beatrice de Bourbon-Massimo (1895–? after 1921); Henry Pereire, boulevard de Courcelles, Paris (until 1932); Mme Henry Pereire, Paris (1932–35; sold to Stiebel); (Stiebel, 45, avenue Montaigne, Paris, March 1935–July 1936; sold to Seligmann, Rey); (Arnold Seligmann, Rey and Company, New York, July–December 1936; sold to MMA)

**EXHIBITED:** "Masterpieces of Fifty Centuries," The Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 14, 1970–June 1, 1971; "Early Renaissance Sculpture from Northern Italy, 1440–1540," The Metropolitan Museum of Art, June 5–October 14, 1973

**TULLIO LOMBARDO WAS A MEMBER OF A FAMILY OF SCulptors** that included his father, Pietro, and brother Antonio. Through training and practice in Venice he developed a thorough understanding of classical art and created some of the first great sculptural statements of the High Renaissance. In a career spanning the years 1475 to 1532, he was known for large-scale narrative reliefs at the basilica of San Antonio in Padua, such as The Miracle of the Newborn Child (1500–1504), and sensual double portraits, such as Young Couple (ca. 1500–1510, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), but his major contributions were monumental wall tombs. Of these, the most famous is the tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin, and its most forward-looking sculpture, the Museum’s Adam, is the first lifesize nude marble statue of the Renaissance.

Grandiose tombs, such as the one carved by Antonio Rizzo for Doge Niccolò Tron, in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari (1476–79), began to fill the walls of Venetian churches in the fifteenth century. In another Venetian church, Santa Maria dei Servi, the tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin (died 1478) was probably erected in the early years of the decade 1490–1500, since an account by the chronicler Marino Sanudo mentions that it was under way in 1493.1 An engraving of the tomb there shows a classicizing triumphal arch towering over the bier of the deceased.2 Freestanding statues of page boys (damaged; Bode Museum, Berlin) stood above the upper story, which featured statues of the Annunciation separated by high reliefs of the Nativity.3 Below, the elaborate program included statues of virtues, warrior saints, and, in niches on either side, Adam and Eve. In the early nineteenth century the whole tomb was transferred to the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, where it can be seen today, with various alterations and minus the statues of the pages and the first man and woman (fig. 12). About the time of the tomb’s transfer, the statues of Adam and Eve were moved to the Palazzo Vendramin-Calegri on the Grand Canal, the home of generations of the Vendramin family. After the building was purchased in the mid-nineteenth century by the duchesse de Berry, Adam moved through a succession of illustrious collections before the Museum acquired it in 1936.

Originally, Adam occupied a prime position in the wall monument to the left of the doge’s bier, just above a viewer’s eyes. The statue was one of many elements of an elaborate tomb, yet it has extraordinary force and grace in its own right. This biblical figure stands next to an ivy-covered tree trunk, his weight shifted to his right leg. He steadies himself on a lopped-off branch of the tree with his right hand, while proffering the apple signifying the Fall of Mankind with his left. A powerful physique is implied by his chest and arm muscles. The hair is a downturned bowl of sharply rendered
locks framing a face with a serious—even drawn—expression. There is a gentle sway to the contrapposto of the body but at the same time a stiffness to the stance; the sensuous sheen of flesh is countered by hip joints and dorsal muscles rendered so perfectly that they approach abstraction. Wendy Stedman Sheard has described well this tension in Adam’s body and presence, noting particularly the contrast between his dreamy sensuality—with its roots in antiquity and its connection to the reveries imagined by Venetian painters like Giorgione—and the cool, somewhat aloof dignity. She noted the classical sources that underlie Tullio’s conception: the rigor of the Doryphoros for the pose and the barrel-chested male beauty of the Antinous. The work that Sheard thought inspired Tullio most profoundly is a Roman copy of a Greek Apollo of the fifth-century B.C. (Palazzo Ducale, Mantua). Sarah Wilk has suggested that a revival of interest among Venetian Renaissance sculptors in late classical ivory carvings contributed to Adam’s rigid posture. Though not unprecedented, the inclusion of Adam and Eve in a tomb program is unusual. Eberhard Ruhmer has even proposed that Adam belongs to a different commission and places it a decade later than the generally accepted date of about 1490–95. In her comprehensive analysis of the Vendramin tomb, however, Sheard convincingly explains their presence as an example of the “Fortunate Fall,” the idea that the Fall of Mankind generated the possibility of salvation and the triumph of Christianity, which is symbolized by the triumphal arch.
above them. The paradise in which Adam and Eve dwell, evoked by abundant floral motifs carved across the tomb’s reliefs, serves as a metaphor for the afterlife of the deceased.

On stylistic grounds, Wilk agreed that Adam and Eve were included in the Vendramin tomb and confirmed that they date in the 1490s, noting a number of connections between Adam and other works by Tullio of that period. A few scholars have doubted that Adam could have been created so early in Tullio’s career, but Wilk countered that the forward-looking nature of their sculpture explains precisely why the Lombardo family was so influential on the greatest sculptors of the next generation, Michelangelo and Andrea Sansovino.

Tragically, the pedestal supporting Adam in a Museum gallery collapsed in October 2002 and the statue fell, breaking into several pieces. A painstaking and lengthy analysis of the marble ensued, and the application of such techniques as laser scanning and finite element analysis to the fragments has yielded important new data on the physical stresses inherent in the stone, making it possible to choose the optimal methods for its repair and conservation. With the help of specially commissioned tests of adhesives and pins, the restoration of the sculpture is near completion. The scientific and conservation studies that this restoration necessitated will be published as a compendium of information for conservators. When conservation and cleaning are complete, the statue will be installed in a new gallery devoted to the Venetian Renaissance in a niche that approximates the height of the one on the Vendramin tomb.

---

3. For the pages in the attic of the tomb, see Knuth 2007.
6. Adam and Eve are part of other Venetian tomb programs of the period, such as the Arco Pisani in the Palazzo Ducale, Venice, of about 1485.
10. Saint Andrew

**ANDREA BREGNO (ITALIAN, 1418–1503)**

Rome, 1491

Marble relief

$47\frac{1}{4} \times 31\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ in. (119.7 × 80.6 × 17.1 cm)

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.1736a-c

**PROVENANCE:** Old Saint Peter’s, Rome (until 1606); Monsignor Giovanni Battista Simoncelli (by 1612), who transported it to Baucu (now Boville Ernica), where it was installed in his family chapel in the church of San Pietro Iscano; [Alfredo Barsanti, 177 via Sistina, Rome, by 1909; sold to Morgan]; J. Pierpont Morgan, New York (1909–17; his gift to MMA)

This high-relief sculpture of Saint Andrew standing in a shell-topped niche was originally on an altar in Old Saint Peter’s, Rome. Tiberio Alfarnano’s 1571 plan of the basilica indicates where it was located inside the front wall. A drawing (fig. 13) made before the altar was dismantled in 1606 shows, above the altar, three saints in niches separated by finely decorated pilasters: Saint Paul to the left, Saint Peter in the center, and Saint Andrew at the right. In the drawing, Andrew turns his head slightly toward Peter and embraces with his left arm the cross on which he was martyred. Paul also twists his head toward Peter, and he holds his sword of martyrdom with his right hand—his gestures are designed to mirror Andrew’s as the two flank the central saint. The reliefs of Peter and Paul—without the pilasters—are now in Boville Ernica, near Rome, where they were installed with Saint Andrew about 1612. Prominent on the structure that supported the saints in Old Saint Peter’s was the inscription “Guillelmus de Perrieri Auditor hoc altare deo et SS Apostolis Dedicavit, An D MCCCLXXXI.” The French prelate Guillaume de Perrier commissioned this and several other altars for Roman churches in the 1490s. Antonio Muñoz was the first to associate the Museum’s relief with the altar in Old Saint Peter’s, after it appeared on the market in 1909.

By the time Andrea Bregno carved the three reliefs he was nearing the end of an active and distinguished career. He is best known for funerary monuments of prelates, such as those in memory of Cardinal Ludovico d’Albret (died 1485) in Santa Maria in Aracoeli, Rome, and of Cardinal Cristoforo della Rovere and Cardinal Domenico della Rovere in Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome (died 1478 and 1501, respectively), as well as for altars, notably the Borgia Altar in Santa Maria del Popolo (commissioned 1473). Many of these monuments and altars feature reliefs of single saints in niches. By the 1480s, after the influential sculptors Giovanni Dalmata and Mino da Fiesole had departed from Rome, Bregno’s large workshop dominated commissions in that city.

Bregno collected antiquities, and his increasingly classicizing style reflects this interest; he was also celebrated for decorative carving on architectural ensembles, above all, the Piccolomini Altar (1485) in Siena Cathedral. The solid stance of Saint Andrew’s body in the Museum’s relief and the sharply defined pleats of his robe show how closely Bregno had looked at classical sculpture in Rome. The delicate candelabrum motifs on the pilasters flanking the saint, also culled from ancient sources, give ample evidence of his refined architectural touch. Museum curator Olga Raggio related these stylistic traits to Bregno’s earlier work on the Borghini and the Piccolomini altars and affirmed that the fineness of the carving indicates that the master

**fig. 13** Drawing of the altar commissioned by Guillaume de Perrier for Old Saint Peter’s, Rome, before 1606
himself, and not his workshop, was responsible. Her observation that Andrew’s features are similar to Andrea’s in the portrait of the artist on his tomb in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, may not be immediately apparent; however, there is little doubt the artist had a special affinity for his patron saint. Bregno and his workshop completed a number of similar marble reliefs for the various Perrier altars and for tombs; the Saint Andrew relief is particularly close to Saint James and Saint John in San Giovanni in Laterano, completed in Rome in 1492–93, just after the reliefs for Old Saint Peter’s. Often formed as triptychs of saints, reliefs by Bregno were subsequently erected in the Roman churches of San Paolo (1494), Santa Maria del Popolo (1497), and Santi XII Apostoli (undated, but evidently later in his career).

Examination of Bregno’s reliefs for Santi XII Apostoli, now in the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, reveals not only that the standard set in the Old Saint Peter’s reliefs at the beginning of the 1490s was retained at the end of the decade but also how Bregno used details to vary the basic model. Saint James and Saint Phillip fill their niches more amply and stand taller than Andrew in his, and the architectural decoration is more detailed, including beading, moldings, and scallop shells not seen in the Museum’s example. These are additions that might occur to a sculptor while working on later formulations of his original conception. It is the sensitive workmanship of the head and hands of Saint Andrew that distinguishes it as primary. The thin face with its precisely drawn brows and the meticulously veined hands with naturalistically spaced fingers are so finely rendered as to justify Olga Raggio’s ascription of the work directly to Bregno. While the sculptor refined the motif of the standing saint, a mainstay of his production over many years, he clearly took special care with this commission for the most exalted church in Christendom.

1. Affrano 1914 (ed.), p. 70.
2. Grimaldi 1971 (ed.), p. 133, fig. 47.
4. Muñoz 1912, p. 239.
5. See Leavagno 1922 and Sciolli 1976 for overviews of these works.
8. Middeldorf 1976, p. 65, Kühnenhal 2008, p. 215 and fig. 4, maintains these late reliefs are from Bregno’s workshop.
11. Horse and Rider Startled by a Snake

Northern Italy, perhaps Padua; early 16th century
Bronze statuette
9¾ x 8½ x 3¼ in. (24.3 x 21.6 x 9.5 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964. 64.101.1419

PROVENANCE: Count Donà dalle Rose, Venice (before 1933); John Simon, New York; Irwin Untermyer, New York (until 1964; his gift to MMA)


This is one of the finest small bronze horse-and-rider groups of the early Renaissance. A snake beneath the horse's raised hooves is poised to strike, and horse and rider react in unison to this common foe. Both open their mouths in alarm. The sharply defined wrinkles on the horse's neck and the taut facial muscles of the rider reveal their tension; even the angular bent of their limbs unites man and animal. The horse is neither saddled nor bridled (a protruberance in the mane suggests that the rider grasps the horse's hair, although it also functions as a strut attachment). The man wears short, classical armor with breastplate strips over the tunic and scale-patterned leggings. He rides bareback in the manner of ancient cavalry; his raised hand may have held a whip that lashed at the snake.

Like Shouting Horseman, the famous bronze by Andrea Riccio in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, our group shows a nervous, startled mount and rider shouting. The similarity of subject and expression led scholars to attribute our bronze to Riccio. But over time it has become clear that the Riccio bronze in London may well have influenced this one now in New York and that while both must have issued from northern Italy they were not modeled by the same hand. In fact, Riccio's energetic chasing of the bronze surface is quite distinct from the smooth contours and refined details of the Museum's example. Its precision of form led James Draper to wonder whether the Museum's bronze was modeled on a wood carving, perhaps by Francesco di Giacomo da Sant'Agata, who was active in Padua between 1491 and 1528. His first training was in goldsmithing, but he is known to have carved in boxwood. Subsequently, Draper has withdrawn this attribution, though he continues to believe that the sculptor of this horse and rider worked in northern Italy, perhaps in Padua, and, like Sant'Agata, was strongly influenced by Riccio's example. Undoubtedly, the work is intimately connected to an elite class of unique bronzes that includes the Frick Collection's Naked Female Figure (Diana?), a Rape of Europa in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest, and a Hecate or Prudence in the Bode Museum, Berlin.

No exact model has been identified for the composition. Draper has proposed that examples carved on ancient gems — which are clearly the kind of source that appealed to the antiquarian scholars and artists active in and around the University of Padua — inspired the bronze's subject and form. The sharply incised details of the rider's face may owe their character to the great North Italian painter Andrea Mantegna; woodcuts after an equestrian in Andrea Mantegna's Triumph of Caesar canvases at Hampton Court, near London, may have exerted some influence on this figure. Without a literary source
for this composition, the subject remains elusive. It may well be an imagined scene set in ancient times, combining an allusion to antiquity with a contemporary penchant for dramatic storytelling.

1. Planiscig 1932, p. 917.
PIER JACOPO ALARI-BONACOLSI, CALLED ANTICO

(ITALIAN, CA. 1460–1528)

Mantua, ca. 1500–1505

Bronze statuette, partially gilt and silvered
14 3/4 x 7 3/4 x 7 3/4 in. (37.1 x 18.7 x 19.7 cm)

Edith Perry Chapman Fund, 1955 55.93

PROVENANCE: [Piero Tozzi, New York, until 1955; sold to MMA]


PIER JACOPO ALARI-BONACOLSI, KNOWN AS ANTICO, WORKED primarily for the Gonzaga family, first at Bozzolo and later in Mantua. His close relationship with his patrons and the relatively small size of his oeuvre, which consists mainly of bronze statuettes or busts that are usually unique casts, prevented him from becoming widely known during his lifetime. The exquisite detail and technical perfection of his work, so appealing to members of the Gonzaga court, brought him growing appreciation by connoisseurs in the twentieth century; today, he is recognized as one of the finest Renaissance masters of the bronze medium. Several works in this Museum and in other private and public New York collections offer visitors to Manhattan a fine selection of this rare master's output.¹

Many works by Antico—whose skill in interpreting the sculpture of antiquity won him his nickname—have close prototypes in ancient Roman marbles, yet no certain source has been found for the Museum's Paris. Ancient statues of the Trojan prince are usually standing figures, and most representations of the subject carved in relief on sarcophagi are partially draped.² Nonetheless, in 1994 Ann Allison suggested that Antico's source must be a relief because the figure is best seen from the three-quarters view common in second- or third-century A.D. Roman reliefs.³ Some years later, Davide Gasparotto proposed that a relief on an ancient sarcophagus today in the Villa Doria Pamphili, Rome, which represents the seated nude hero in the act of making his famous judgment may be that very prototype.⁴

Paris is identified here by the golden apple of the Hesperides that he conferred on Venus to mark his choice of her as the most beautiful of three goddesses. Both the apple and his hair are fire-gilt. His blond tresses and silvered eyes that contrast with his deep brown skin, and the sleek surface of his body create a sensuous sculpture. The ring held in his other hand prompted Olga Raggio to suggest that the statuette was intended to be a bridal gift.⁵ Allison countered by suggesting that the ring is a symbolic remnant of the heraldman-prince's flute.⁶ It seems preferable to accept that this is meant to be a ring and alludes in some way to matrimony.

In 1981 Museum Conservator Richard E. Stone observed that the heavy flaring of the buttocks and the bottom of the right foot were undertaken to fit the seated figure into a stone base, long missing.⁷ When acquired by the Museum in 1955, the bronze was covered with a dark patination, since removed, that obscured the silver and gold and was attached to a modern bronze rocky setting. Stone's radiographs indicate that, as with other Antico bronzes, the head and arms were separately cast in wax and joined to the torso before the whole figure was cast in metal. Allison finds these limbs and the head
underscaled for the torso and believes that Antico joined them to parts of a body derived from an earlier creation. Unlike Raggio, who saw a parallel between Paris and an Apollo that dates before 1498 (Galleria Giorgio Franchetti alla Ca' d'Oro, Venice), or Manfred Leithe-Jasper, who related it to a Meleager of about 1484–90 (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), Allison believes this is a late production of Antico’s. Although the artist used fire gilding mainly in his early work, she points to a few exceptional examples to explain the use of the technique here.

Are the short arms truly indicative of the reworking of an earlier composition or does this represent an aesthetic choice? The upraised arm of Antico’s Cupid (Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence) and Meleager’s bent arm also appear underscaled. Allison notes that the figure of Paris, if standing, would be one of the largest of Antico’s statuettes and posits that its exceptional size may have altered the sculptor’s sense of proportions. To this author, it seems more likely that Paris is a work from earlier in Antico’s career. The short arms are not disconcerting in front of the powerful torso, which is what draws the viewer’s eye. There is no doubt that this is one of the sculptor’s most refined statuettes; its opulent gilding plays off the dark bronze, and its perfection of surface approaches in quality some of his great early works, such as the Venus Felix (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), or the Apollo in the Ca’ d’Oro. It fits comfortably with their style and likely dates from the same period.9

1. The other works by Antico in the Metropolitan are Satyr (acc. no. 1980.60.91) and Emperor Antoninus Pius (no. 16 in this book).
2. See the drawing of a sarcophagus in the Villa Doria Pamphili, Rome, by the artist of the Codex Escorialensis, fol. 8v (Egger 1905–6, pp. 63–64, III).
6. Allison 1994, p. 207, and for further discussion of the meaning of the ring, see pp. 204–5, no. 25.
9. This is the view advanced by Gasparotto in Bonaccolto, l’Antico 2008, p. 196.
13. Portrait of an Unknown Man

PIETRO TORRIGIANO (ITALIAN, 1472–1528)

England, 1510–15
Terracotta bust, painted
24 3/4 × 25 1/4 × 13 1/4 in. (62.6 × 64.7 × 33.4 cm)
Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1936 56.69

PROVENANCE: Holbein Gateway, Whitehall, London (possibly until 1759); unknown collector, Bolton Street, St. Giles, London (until ca. 1762–63); John Wright, Hatfield Peverel Priory, Essex (from ca. 1762–63); Peter Luard Wright (until at least 1803); his descendants (until shortly before 1928); Arthur Wilson-Filmer, Leeds Castle, Kent (until ca. 1936); Arnold Seligmann, Rey and Company, New York, until 1936, sold to MMA


LITERATURE: J. T. Smith 1807, pp. 22–23, ill. (etching by Isaac Mills after a drawing by J. T. Smith); Higgins 1894, p. 195; Harcourt-Smith 1928, pp. 190–91, ill.; Beard 1929, esp. p. 82 (as possibly by Giovanni da Maiano and as the identity of the sitter uncertain), ill. no. 1, var. Remington 1936, figs. 2, 5; Grossmann 1950, pl. 57c; Metropolitan Museum 1952, p. 238, no. 188, ill. facing p. 192; Phillips 1954, p. 148, ill. p. 167; Hernández Perea 1957, pp. 21–22, 38 (as a portrait of an unidentified ecclesiastic), pl. 25; Pope-Hennessy 1964, vol. 2, p. 200 (as the identity of the sitter uncertain); Darr 1979, p. 181, ill. no. 8; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1987b, pp. 113, pl. 88; Calvini and Lindley 1988, pp. 892–95 (this and the preceding references, except where noted, as a portrait of John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, by Pietro Torrigiano), fig. 5; Gorony–Roberts 1992 (as possibly a portrait of Desiderius Erasmus); Calvini and Lindley 1995, pp. 171–72, 183–87 (as a portrait of John Fisher (?)), pl. 100; Darr 1996, p. 189 (as a portrait of John Fisher); Hepburn 2001, p. 154 (as a portrait of an unknown ecclesiastic), fig. 2; Peta Motture in Gothic 2003, p. 151, no. 8 (as a portrait of an ecclesiastic [John Fisher(?)]), ill.

COMMANDING AND FORCEFUL, THIS PAINTED TERRACOTTA portrait bust is an important harbinger of the arrival of the Italian Renaissance style in England. Its realism and, above all, the convincing fleshiness of the subject, were new there at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and a favorable reception would have ensured its maker a successful career. An attribution to the Florentine sculptor Pietro Torrigiano during his period of activity in England has been generally accepted, but the identification of the sitter is still contested.

Torrigiano studied with Bertoldo di Giovanni and early in his career vied with Michelangelo, famously breaking his rival's nose in a fistfight. His career was truly international, taking him to Rome and Avignon, before he traveled to work in the Netherlands, England, and Spain. His most important commission was the bronze and marble tomb of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York in Westminster Abbey, London (1512–18), and it is in the context of this work that the bust must be considered. A painted terracotta bust of Henry VII by Torrigiano, of about 1509–11 (fig. 14), which has been convincingly connected with the effigy of the king on Torrigiano's Westminster Abbey monument, is clearly related to the Museum's bust in its style, dimensions, and facture; moreover, the two busts and a third, long thought to be of Henry VIII (fig. 15), were together for much of their history. All three are believed to have been in the Holbein Gateway at Whitehall, London, before its demolition in 1759, and they were certainly at Hatfield Peverel Priory, Essex, in the possession of the Wright family, from 1779 until they were sold, at some point before 1928.

When the antiquary Michael Tyson visited Essex in November 1779, he wrote to a friend that he had seen at Peverel Priory three terracotta busts from the room over the Holbein Gate in Whitehall—of Henry VII, Bishop Fisher, and Henry VIII at the age of nineteen—and that he understood them to be by Torrigiano. On this basis and on stylistic grounds, Museum curator Preston Remington decided that the three busts were conceived together—even though their original site could not have been the Holbein Gateway, which was finished in the 1530s, long after the date he believed the busts were made. He also pointed out a similarity between the face of the unknown man and a drawing of Fisher by Holbein executed a number of years after the bust. John Fisher (1469–1535), bishop of Rochester, was beheaded when he refused to recognize Henry VIII as head of the Church of England. Earlier in his life, as confessor to Margaret Beaufort, the mother of King Henry VII, Fisher was involved with the commission of Lady Margaret's tomb from Torrigiano. He was thus in a position to commission his own bust from and to act as a patron of the Italian sculptor.

fig. 15  Torrigiano, Unknown Man, ca. 1510–15. Painted terracotta. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Fletcher Fund, 1944 (44.94)
Alan Darr has speculated that the three terracotta busts were part of an effort to win the important tomb commission and dates them to 1509–11, shortly after Torrigiano’s arrival in England. At that time Fisher would have been about forty (the apparent age of the man in the Museum’s bust) and Henry VIII between eighteen and twenty-one years of age (which agrees with the statement by Tyson, above).6 Certainly the uniformity of the busts’ height and format suggests that they were designed as a contemporaneous set. It has been noted that an integral plinth of the Henry VII bust brings it almost exactly in line with the height of the others, just above 60 centimeters (24 inches).

That Fisher is the subject of the Museum’s bust has been questioned but cannot be entirely discounted. When she conducted an analysis in 1990, Ann Goronwy-Roberts concluded that the Museum’s bust was less likely to represent Fisher than it was the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus, whom she favored.7 This finding has not received subsequent support.8 Nor did scientific testing conducted in 1989 cast light on the question of the date of the bust.9 The report showed that it was 239 years old, plus or minus 57 years, putting its manufacture much too late, at about 1750. However, it is known that either the young John Flaxman or his father mended the three busts about 1767.10 As this would have involved refitting to attach broken pieces, it compromised the specific test used to determine the original firing date. All of the busts were painted over when they were repaired, and perhaps subsequently, but those later accretions have been stripped away to reveal ochre and black pigments, which probably reflect the original coloration of the garments, and pink for the face.11

The results of various scientific investigations have persuaded Carol Galvin and Phillip Lindley that the bust of Henry VII is based on a death mask, probably the one used to create the effigy of the king on his tomb in Westminster, and that a similar process, though based on life masks, was used to create the likenesses of the subject of the present bust and of “Henry VIII.”12 This would account for the somewhat rigid features of the three busts, even though the artist must have fleshed out and smoothed the model with tools before making the final mold for casting in clay.

Frederick Hepburn has recently reviewed this convoluted story. He discounts the connection between Holbein’s drawing of Fisher and our bust, seeing a deformation of the eyebrow in the drawing that is not present in the bust. More convincing is his argument that the bust is likely to be of a Florentine merchant. He notes that according to Giorgio Vasari, Florentine merchants were instrumental in bringing Torrigiano to England, that two of them were financial guarantors for the Beaufort tomb, and that recently found documents indicate the sculptor lived in the London home of the Italian merchant banker Pierfrancesco de’ Bardi for some time.13 He also makes a convincing argument for disallowing Henry VIII as subject of the third bust, finding it again likely that the subject is an Italian merchant who moved in the circle of the English court. While the circumstantial evidence that Hepburn has mustered is impressive, the identity of our figure remains uncertain. Torrigiano evidently incorporated a life mask of the sitter into his work, but then by focusing on the features of the face he was able to create a powerful image within a monumental bust that ennobles its subject.

1. For an overview of his career, see Darr 1996.
3. It was John Pope-Hennessy (ibid.) who pointed out that the Holbein Gateway was built several years after Torrigiano’s death, in 1533–34.
4. Remington 1936, p. 236 and fig. 1.
5. Scott 1915.
7. Goronwy-Roberts 1992, pp. 17–19. (She used the WIZARD Adaptive Recognition System.) An earlier scholar who doubted that Fisher is the subject of the Museum’s bust is C. R. Beard (see Beard 1929, p. 32). Pope-Hennessy (1964, vol. 2, pp. 400–401) discounted Beard’s ascription of the bust to Giovanni da Maiano, and noted that it does not “conform closely” to the Holbein drawing; however, he saw “a strong probability that this bust was executed in association with the others.”
9. A sample from the center of the back was submitted for thermoluminescence testing to Daybreak Nuclear and Medical Systems, Guilford, Connecticut. Their report of April 28, 1989, is in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
11. Pigment analysis has not been conducted on the present work, but it has been done on the bust of Henry VII, see Galvin and Lindley 1983, p. 894.
14. The Rothschild Lamp

ANDREA BRIOESCO, CALLED RICCIO (ITALIAN, 1470–1532)

Padua, ca. 1510–20

Bronze oil lamp

7¾ × 5 × 2⅛ in. (19.4 × 22.9 × 7.3 cm)

European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2009 (2009.58)

THE GREAT MASTER OF THE SMALL BRONZE IN THE EARLY Renaissance, Andrea Briosco, called Riccio, trained first as a goldsmith in the workshop of his father, Ambrogio Briosco. He owes his renown to the bronze statuettes and functional objects he cast for a small circle of clients, particularly in his native Padua. Many of them were made in homage to the art of antiquity; Riccio borrowed motifs from ancient sources and combined them in novel ways to give them fresh meaning for his humanist patrons in that university town. Although members of his workshop and his followers issued, on a level of mass production, bronze oil lamps as well as inkwells and candlesticks, Riccio himself produced only a handful of them, including some unique oil lamps, which transcend utility to become masterpieces. Long in the collection of the Rothschild family, this is one of three superlative examples of its kind; the others are the Morgan Lamp, in the Frick Collection, New York (fig. 16), and the Cadogan Lamp, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (fig. 17). The three share many motifs, but with a fertile imagination Riccio incorporated them into each lamp in such a way that they seem to be in a constant state of flux, changing their guise from one object to the other before our eyes.

While its owners may have prized it too highly to use it for lighting, this is a functioning oil lamp. The hinged lid opens by means of the handle topped with a grotesque head—its upward movement limited by the ram’s head spiraling behind—and reveals two connecting reservoirs for oil. When the lid is closed, the grotesque head appears to be blowing on a wick that rose from a tongue protruding from the opening below. Curling tendrils above and below serve to suspend the lamp from hooks or to support it as struts on a table. Overall, the lamp takes the form of a fanciful ancient ship or galley. Its prow is like a nautical battering ram; the Cadogan Lamp has a spike that refers to this function and a proper poop deck behind. By curling the spike into a continuous element with two loops, Riccio found a more elegant solution for the Museum’s lamp. The tendrils buoy up the body of the lamp, lending lightness and a sense of mobility to the otherwise dense bronze mass. Of the three superb lamps mentioned here, this is the only complete example, and it demonstrates how lid, handles, and loops were intended to work.

On the lid a pair of putti perch, embracing swanlike creatures that emerge from the swelling bronze surface and tuck their necks back into it. The Cadogan Lamp lid supports a single putto astride a dolphin that swims in the opposite direction from the boat; a hole in the poop may indicate where a second figure once stood, possibly the

PROVENANCE: Baron James Mayer de Rothschild (by 1865–d. 1868); his son Baron Gustave de Rothschild (1829–1911); his son Baron Robert de Rothschild (1880–1946); descended in the family (until 2009; sold by private agreement through Christie’s, London, to MMA)

LITERATURE: *Exposition de 1865, 1867*, pp. 114-15, no. 1230; Bode 1907-12, vol. 1, p. 25, pl. lvi; Bode 1908-12, vol. 1, p. 29, pl. lvi; Seymour de Ricci in *Exposition d'objets d'art* 1913, p. 24, no. 46; Bode 1922, pp. 48-49, pl. 60; Planiscig 1927, pp. 273, 322, 488, no. 181, fig. 313; *Exposition de l'art italien* 1935, p. 349, no. 1219; Pope-Hennessy 1970b, p. 76; Radcliffe 1972, pp. 43-45, figs. 21-23; Bode and Draper 1908-12/1980, pp. 23, 93, pl. lvi; Riccio 2008, p. 181; Under no. 13 (entry by Peta Motture), p. 182, under no. 14 (entry by Denise Allen), fig. 13.5; Draper 2010, pp. 132-33, fig. 1; James David Draper in “Recent Acquisitions” 2010, p. 21, iii.

Helmsman, as Anthony Radcliffe hypothesized. An engraving of the Morgan Lamp, made in 1652, when it was already missing its lid, shows a lyre-playing putto seated against the rear handle; the remains of a foot on the forward lip suggest that another putto stood facing the wick. Therefore, all of the lamps originally had figures of children riding on top. The Morgan Lamp is in the shape of a classical boot, not a ship. But these fantastic objects were not meant to be taken literally: they make reference to ancient prototypes of lamps, and with their riding figures they also suggest both the richly decorated floats that Renaissance artists created for triumphal processions and illustrations of such elaborate chariots in works like Francesco Colonna’s *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499).

Encrusted with shells, brucellae, harpies, garlands, and other classical decorative motifs, the body of each lamp is also decorated with friezes of putti. The Museum’s lamp displays a dozen in the relief on one side and eleven on the other. In the first, the twelve naked children dance, play with a ram, step over an ewer, and blow on a horn; in the second, some dance, one plays a pipe on the far right, and a kneeling group sit in a circle around a ram at the left. These friezes become narrower at one end, and as they taper, each child remains clearly delineated, but the poses shift from upright to crouching to seated.

The three lamps are closely related to Riccio’s most substantial work in bronze, the Paschal candlestick in the basilica of San Antonio (Il Santo) in Padua, since similar motifs are present on all. He began the colossal liturgical object in 1507, was apparently interrupted in 1509, and completed it only in 1516. Although the dating of the various parts of the candlestick is conjectural, most scholars place the three lamps within the period of its making or shortly afterward.

1. Radcliffe 1972, pp. 29-35, provides the most complete description of the Cadogan Lamp as well as the most comprehensive analysis of all the known lamps by Riccio. Peta Motture’s account in Riccio 2008, pp. 174-81, no. 13, is the most recent.
3. Licetus 1652; Radcliffe 1972, fig. 30.

---

fig. 16 Riccio, The Morgan Lamp, ca. 1510-20. Bronze. The Frick Collection, New York

15. Pan

ANDREA BRIOSCO, CALLEDRICCIO (ITALIAN, 1470–1532)
Padua, ca. 1510–20
Bronze statuette
14¼ × 6¼ × 4¼ in. (35.9 × 15.9 × 12.1 cm)
Purchase, Gifts of Irwin Untermyer, Ogden Mills
and George Blumenthal, Bequest of Julia H. Manges
and Frederick C. Hewitt Fund, by exchange;
and Rogers and Pfeiffer Funds. 1982. 1982.45

PROVENANCE: Otto Gutekunst, London (by 1912); Sir Robert
Abdy, Switzerland; Sir Valentine Abdy (sold to Humphris);
[Cyril Humphris, London]; E. V. Thaw and Company, New
York; sold to MMA

EXHIBITED: “Andrea Riccio: Renaissance Master of Bronze,”
Frick Collection, New York, October 15, 2008–January 18,
2009

LITERATURE: Bode 1907–12, vol. 3, pp. 22, 29, pl. ccxliv;
Bode 1908–12, vol. 3, pp. 22, 25, pl. ccxliii; Bode 1922,
pl. 51; Planiscig 1927, pp. 326–47, 484, no. 116, fig. 477; Bode
and Draper 1908–12/1980, pp. xiv (preface by James David
Draper), 82, 109, pl. ccxliv; Draper in Metropolitan
Museum 1982, pp. 28–29, III; Blume 1985, pp. 182–85, 459,
under no. 159, fig. 177; “Riccio: Satyr” 2006, III; Denise
Allen in Riccio 2008, pp. 144–51, no. 8, III; Stone 2008,
pp. 89–90, fig. 19 (radiograph); Penny 2009, p. 65; Draper
2010, p. 132

In the half-human, half-animal features of the mythical
race of satyrs, Andrea Briosco, called Riccio, found great expressive
potential. Furthermore, the creatures' classical associations appealed to
the sculptor's learned clientele, who purchased the bronze statu-
ettes that were his preferred medium. These diminutive objects could
also be made into useful desktop equipment for writing or lighting by
placing containers for ink, sand, or oil in the satyrs' arms. A hole in
the shell-shouldered by the Museum's figure may have held a snuffer
to tether a snuffer for candles stuck on the lamp's pricket, while the
gadrooned vase under his right arm would have contained ink.
Although it seems almost oversize for its purpose, the statuette was
nevertheless a practical object: the lamp was raised high enough to
cast a wide light, and the ink was proffered at a reasonable level to
dip in a quill. In 1985 Dieter Blume made the interesting proposal,
now generally accepted, that this figure, which had long been identi-

cified as a satyr, in fact represents Pan, the Greek deity with legs and
horns of a goat, whose power over nature could sow panic or stir
creation.1 The flaming oil and ink thus must symbolize both his sway

over the elements and the inspiration sought by any scholar who read
and wrote with their aid. While functional, it is above all a powerful
sculpture. Against the limited group of autograph works by Riccio in
this category and the extensive number of workshop productions, this
one stands out on account of its large size and forceful presence.

Its model is a well-known pair of lifesize antique marble satyr-

atlantes once in the Della Valle collection in Rome and today in the
Musei Capitolini in that city.2 Denise Allen is of the opinion that
drawings of those ancient satyrs by artists such as Bernardino da
Parenzo may have been the sculptor's actual source.3 She points out
that their upraised arms and the baskets on their heads have been
adapted to this small sculpture's pose and function but that the tensile
strength of the metal has been exploited here to widen the creature's
stance into a dynamic stride. Specific features borrowed from the
Della Valle satyrs, such as the closely spaced horns, the ram's skin
strapped over the shoulder, and the heavily muscled torso, reveal that
Riccio paid close attention to the source.

While there is no question that this is a masterful Renaissance
bronzes, its attribution to Riccio and its date have been debated. The
pioneer of Renaissance bronze studies, Wilhelm von Bode, was the
first to propose Riccio as the artist, and his opinion was enthu-

iastically seconded by the foremost expert on North Italian bronzes, Leo
Planiscig.4 Some scholars have recently returned to the question of
authorship, noting some anomalies in the statuette's physical charac-
teristics, particularly the pronounced musculature of the torso and


the relatively wide waist. For example, Denise Allen, who finds that
the closest comparison for the treatment of the torso is the nude
beggar in Riccio’s Saint Martin relief (Galleria Giorgio Franchetti alla
Ca’ d’Oro, Venice; probably after 1513), observes that the beggar’s
waist is narrower and his chest smoother than Pan’s. Its closest coun-
terpart, she notes, is the Seated Satyr with a Conch Shell in the Museo
Nazionale del Bargello, Florence, which also has an animal skin
strapped to the chest and holds similar (though not identical) objects,
which, like Pan’s shell and vase, were chosen from a stock of models
used in accepted works by Riccio. But the Seated Satyr is sometimes
attributed to a sculptor in Riccio’s workshop and dated to the 1520s,
which raises questions about the Metropolitan Museum’s bronze.

Many features do favor Riccio’s authorship. The striding pose is
also found in the artist’s Warrior and Strigil Bearer (both are in private
collections); in fact, Riccio demonstrated an interest in testing to
the limit the balance of many of his sculptures, and this example is
no exception. Richard E. Stone has identified technical qualities that
keep Pan within the boundaries of Riccio’s working manner. He
notes that the composition of the bronze used here and in the Strigil
Bearer and Shouting Horseman (Victoria and Albert Museum, London)
is characterized by a medium tin content, light leading, and the same
pattern of minor trace elements; moreover, the core pins of all three
are very thin. James Draper originally placed Pan early in Riccio’s
career, about 1507–10; however, as Allen proposes, the statuette’s
forceful stance and musculature may be better explained as the
product of his mature style. Perhaps Riccio adjusted his later style
to suit a particular client, as Nicholas Penny wondered.9

3. Denise Allen in Riccio 2008, p. 149, fig. 8.2.
   no. 116, fig. 417.
6. W. warrior is in a private collection in the United Kingdom; Strigil Bearer is in the
collection of Mr. and Mrs. J. Tomilson Hill, New York.
16. Emperor Antoninus Pius

PIER JACOPO ALARI-BONACOLSI, CALLED ANTICO
(ITALIAN, CA. 1460–1528)
Mantua, 1519–22
Bronze portrait bust, partially gilt and silvered
29¼ (with socle) × 15¼ × 14¼ in. (75.9 × 50.2 × 36.2 cm)
Gift of Edward Fowles, 1965. 65.202

PROVENANCE: Isabella d’Este, Palazzo Ducale, Mantua
(by 1522–d. 1539); Mme d’Yvon, Paris (until 1892; sale,
Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, May 30–June 4, 1892, no. 257);
[Duveen Brothers, Paris and New York, before 1964; transferred
that year to Fowles]; Edward Fowles, last surviving
partner in the firm (1964–65; his gift to MMA)

EXHIBITED: “Masterpieces of Fifty Centuries,” The
Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 14, 1970–June 1,
1971; “Early Renaissance Sculpture from Northern Italy,
1440–1540,” The Metropolitan Museum of Art,
June 5–October 14, 1973

WORKING ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE
Gonzaga family, frequently at their court in Mantua, Antico earned
his nickname by specializing in interpretations of antique Greek and
Roman sculpture. Trips to Rome on Gonzaga business afforded him
opportunities to see the latest discoveries of antiquities, which his patrons
avidly collected; helping to acquire and repair those statues and busts
gave the sculptor concrete knowledge of ancient art. His precise and
elegant style owed much to the care with which he cast and chased
his bronzes; this technical refinement of his work, as much as its
evocation of the ancient world, appealed to generations of exacting
patrons among the Gonzaga, from Gianfrancesco, to Francesco II and
his famous wife Isabella d’Este, to Federico II.

Isabella appears to have owned five busts by Antico dating
between 1519 and 1522: Cleopatra (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston),
Bacchus, Ariadne (both, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), Alexander
(Liechtenstein Museum, Vienna), and Antoninus Pius, the present
work. The subsequent Gonzaga ruler, her son Federico II (1500–1540),
owned a second, later, bust by Antico of Antoninus Pius (fig. 19) and
one of his wife, Faustina, thought to be those now in the Musée du
Louvre, Paris. Federico felt an affinity for this emperor and his wife and
apparently had images of them integrated into the decorative scheme of
the Sala di Troia in the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua.1 Renaissance
rulers frequently displayed busts of ancient leaders with whose virtues
they wished to associate themselves. Astrologer Luca Gauricus called
Federico a second Alexander and compared his master with other
notables from Roman history.2 Emperor Antoninus, whose sobriquet
“Pius” was conferred on him by the Roman Senate in recognition of
his righteousness, was known for high personal standards and was thus
an appropriate exemplar for Federico. Furthermore, “Scriptores
Historiae Augustae,” a manuscript owned by the Gonzaga, records that
the emperor was handsome and aristocratic, like Federico himself.3
Thus, the two busts of Antoninus Pius on view in Mantua by the 1520s
held slightly different connotations for their owners: for the learned
and art-loving Isabella, the bust now in New York represented an
exemplary figure from ancient history as well as a work of art of the
highest caliber, and she displayed it with some of her other large and
small bronzes on the top shelf of the grotto in her personal apartment
in the Palazzo Ducale.4 For Federico, the bust now in Paris symbolized
the virtues and qualities he held dear, and evidently he displayed it in a public salon.

In the 1990s the Museum’s bust was linked by Ann Allison to a
document of 1524 which states that the sculptor borrowed tools from
the state munitions factory to finish a bust of Emperor Antoninus.5
Fig. 18 Emperor Antoninus Pius, ca. A.D. 150. Marble, Glyptothek, Munich

Fig. 19 Antico, Emperor Antoninus Pius, 1224. Bronze, Musée du Louvre, Paris

At that time Allison thought that the Louvre bust was made in Antico’s workshop after the master’s death; however, a recent cleaning has revealed it to be of higher quality than previously thought, and Allison, having revised her opinion, now believes that the New York bust is the earlier of the two (1519–22) and that the Paris bust must be the one made in 1524. She characterizes the busts made for Isabella, including this one, as more refined than those made later for Federico. All of those in the earlier group share a scrupulous definition of the curls of hair within a flowing treatment of the whole; emphasis on the eyes through varied patinations or silvering; and strong noses and polished lips.

Comparison of the Museum’s Emperor Antoninus Pius with ancient busts, such as one in the Munich Glyptothek (fig. 18), illustrates how far the artist was willing to take his interpretation. Antico’s version shares the general features of its prototype, but the artist sharpened the detailing of the hair and intensified the subject’s expression by graving the eyebrows and hollowing the cheeks. The deep, crisply executed locks of hair create a vibrant pattern; such technical virtuosity confirms Antico’s presumed training as a goldsmith. The curls on the head join those of the beard to frame the emperor’s rather pensive face. A laurel wreath crowns the head and separates the deeply worked curls from a flatter swirl of hair above the wreath. Technical examination has revealed that the head and bust were modeled separately and joined where the long neck lifts the head majestically from the shoulders. The flowing lines of the toga encircle the torso and conceal the point of juncture. Confidently modeled, Antico’s bust rivals the great classical portrait busts; brilliantly finished, it gives a most welcome idea of how splendid ancient examples, so often battered, must once have looked.

1. Allison 2008b, p. 130.
2. See Gombrich 1950, p. 200, n. 5.
3. Lurio and Renier 1899, pp. 336–37, n. 4, notes that this manuscript was in the library of Ludovico II Gonzaga.
5. Allison 1994, p. 296, doc. no. 84.
6. Ibid., pp. 61, 260–64, no. 40. Citing a scientific study showing that the surface of the Louvre’s bust has been compromised, Bernard Jestaz attributed it to the Faustino directly to Antico, dating them later, as posthumous casts, to 1526–39 (Jestaz in Gonzaga 2002, pp. 353–54, no. 137). Marc Bormand in Bonacolsi, L’Antico 2008, pp. 266–68, nos. vii.5, 6) noted the better quality of the Louvre bust of Antoninus as revealed by conservation and its similarity to the New York bust.
8. For a full discussion of Antico’s technique, see Stone 1981.
17. Shield Bearer with the Ducal Arms of Saxony

**HANS DAUCHER (GERMAN, CA. 1485–1538)**

Augsburg, ca. 1520
Honestone (Jurassic limestone) statue, partially painted and gilt
19 3/4 x 8 1/4 x 6 3/4 in. (50.2 x 20.6 x 17.7 cm)
Purchase, Gifts of the Hearst Foundation, Alexander Smith Cochran, Mrs. Russell Sage, Mr. and Mrs. William Randolph Hearst Jr., and Bequest of Emma A. Shearer, by exchange, 1999, 1999.29

**PROVENANCE:** Ducal chapel, Meissen Cathedral, Saxony (ca. 1524—before 1919); sale, Christie’s, London, June 20, 1972, no. 116, Dr. Gustav Rau, Switzerland; sale, Sotheby’s London, July 2, 1997, no. 101; [Julius Böhlé, Munich, 1998–99, sold to MMA]


**THE ELEGANT LINES OF THIS YOUTHFUL FIGURE COMPLEMENT**

the vividly painted heraldic shield he supports. This boy wears contemporary armor fancifully embellished with turbot-shell shoulder pieces (pauldrons) and with leather straps covering the upper arms, a detail borrowed from ancient armor. He stands on a tiny hillock; his fingertips balance the top of the shield, whose base rests on the ground. Fine-grained Jurassic limestone, quarried near Sölnhofen, north of Augsburg, has been cut and polished to render the lad’s sleek limbs and finely wrought armor, but selected elements — eyes and lips, collar, skirt, and base — have been accented with color; the shield is entirely painted.

Museum curator Wolfram Koeppen has convincingly traced the origins of this sculpture, while confirming the attribution to Hans Daucher, made when it appeared on the market in 1972 and again in 1997–98.¹ Hans Daucher is documented as having designed — and with his father, Adolf Daucher, helped to execute — the portal of the ducal chapel in Meissen Cathedral. Letters between George the Bearded, last Catholic ruler of Albertine Saxony (1471–1539), and Adolf Daucher indicate that Duke George commissioned an entrance portal for his chapel about 1518–19 (see fig. 20).² The elements of the structure were delivered from Augsburg to Meissen in 1521 and installed about 1524.³ Five meters high, the portal consists of an arched limestone doorway, flanked by serpentine columns, whose double cornice supports a relief of the Lamentation framed by smaller columns and crowned by a low, shell-shaped semicircle. During renovations undertaken between 1856 and 1865, the portal was shifted to the inside wall of the chapel, but it was restored to its original position outside the entrance in 1977.⁴ The Meissen antiquarian Richard Steche wrote in 1885 that two putti holding armorial shields of Duke George and his spouse once crowned the columns of this portal, adding that they resemble those topping the high altar in the Sankt Annenkirche, Annaberg-Buchholz, completed by the Daucher atelier in 1522.⁵ These two Meissen Shield Bearers must have been removed by 1919, as there is no mention of them in a scholarly record of old buildings and monuments in Saxony published that year.⁶ There is little doubt that the Museum’s sculpture is one of the two; the location of the other is unknown.

Hans Daucher was one of a talented group of Augsburg sculptors that included his teacher Gregor Erhart. Several putti by Daucher share characteristics of the Museum’s example. In addition to the two on the high altar of the Sankt Annenkirche (1528–22) and a Young Hercules on the balustrade of the Fuggere Chapel in the same church (ca. 1530), there is a Sleeping Putto attributed to Daucher in the

---

**fig. 20** Portal of the ducal chapel, Meissen Cathedral, ca. 1528–22.
Städtische Kunstsammlungen, Maximiliansmuseum, Augsburg (ca. 1520–30). All of them bear similar facial features and, save the Sleeping Putto, wear comparable armor. The related examples are winged, but the Museum’s has filled-in holes in the back that likely once supported wings of lead or wood.

Such figures have Italian prototypes, as Koepp noted, for example, those carved by Desiderio da Settignano for the monument of Carlo Marsuppini, in the church of Santa Croce, Florence (after 1453). When placed before the ducal chapel, the Shield Bearers acted as pages, presenting the lord’s coat of arms and standing like sentinels before a sacred precinct. As Koepp has pointed out, in their original location the Shield Bearers would have marked the portal’s peak, softening its hard and somewhat ungainly form; the bearings on their shields echoed the ducal arms seen below in the Lamentation relief and over the door, leaving no doubt about the identity of those commemorated within the chapel.

2. Gess 1905, p. 231.
5. Stecher 1885, p. 55.
7. See Koepp 2002, figs. 6, 31, 32.
8. Ibid., p. 38, fig. 28.
18. Allegory of Virtues and Vices at the Court of Charles V

HANS DAUCHER (GERMAN, CA. 1485–1538)
Probably Augsburg, 1522
Honestone (Jurasic limestone) relief with traces of gilding
1 1/4 x 18 3/4 x 1 1/4 in. (28.3 x 46.8 x 4.4 cm)
Monogrammed (in cartouche on arch): HD
Inscribed: (in cartouche on arch)
VIRTVM ET VICEVM ADVVRBACIO/M.D. XXII/HD
(A Sketch of Virtues and Vices/1522/Hans Daucher);
(in wreath on arch) coat of arms of the Holy Roman Empire
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.150.745

PROVENANCE: Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II (1552–1612),
Prague; Archduke Leopold Wilhelm of Austria (1614–1662);
Debruge-Dumenil, Louis, Duke of Blacas (1815–1866);
Charles Mannheim (1835–1910), Paris; J. Pierpont Morgan,
London and New York (by 1905–d. 1913, his gift to MMA)

EXHIBITED: “Exhibition of Early German Art,” Burlington
Albertina, Vienna, September 13, 2012–January 13, 2013

LITERATURE: Van Stampaert and Prenner 1735, pl. xxvii;
Du Sommerard 1846, pp. 92ff., pl. vi; Labarte 1847, pp. 40,
444–45, no. 102; Molinier 1837, p. 201, pl. vi; Molinier
1898, p. 13, no. 31; Habich 1903, p. 59, fig. 9: Early German
Art 1906, pp. 182–83, no. 4 (case ii), pl. lvii; Giehl
1910–11, p. 58, n. 4; Halm 1920, pp. 306–11, fig. 50; Post
fig. 187; Bange 1928, pp. 18–19; Ettlinger 1956, pl. 32, a;
Bauer and Haupt 1976, p. 95, no. 1799; James David Draper
in Metropolitan Museum 1987, pp. 120–21; Eser 1991,
pp. 1771–72, fig. 4; J. C. Smith 1994a, p. 338; Eser 1996,
pp. 106–14, no. 5 (with bibliography), fig. 9; Koeppel 2002,
p. 46, figs. 11, 12; “Daucher: Allegory of Virtues and Vices”
2006, ill.

EARLY COMMENTATORS IDENTIFIED SOME OF THE WELL-KNOWN historical figures that Hans Daucher carved so precisely on this hone-
stone relief in the year 1522. Riding a horse, whose rich trappings are
emblazoned with the arms of the house of Hapsburg, Holy Roman
Emperor Charles V (1500–1558) leads his retinue across a bridge with
laurel-crowned Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519) at his side
(symbolically, since Maximilian was recently deceased). Prints and
medallions have aided in the identification of other figures. Standing
behind the two emperors is Maximilian’s court jester Kunz von der
Rosen; Count Palatine Frederick II rides the horse emerging from the
gateway of the bridge tower; and Willibald Pirkheimer, the Nuremberg
humanist and friend of artist Albrecht Dürer, strides among the
equestriennes to the right of the tower.1 In contrast with the orderly
procession on the bridge, horsemen and knights struggle to survive in
the raging currents of the river below. The rebellious Reformation
leader Franz von Sickingen is one of those who have plunged into the
river. On the hills beyond the bridge at left, bowmen emerge from a
tent to witness a jouxt, while on the right riverbank, men and women
carousel at a banquet.

Several scholars have offered historical interpretations of the
scene. Karl Giehlow suggested, for example, that the Turkish knight
emerging from a tent is a reference to the conquest of Belgrade in 1521
by Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent, who continued to threaten the
east European kingdoms in the year the relief was carved.2 Georg
Habich saw a theme of imperial triumph over insurgency in the scene,
citing the rebellion of German Imperial Knights in Augsburg in 1522,
a revolt that would be quelled, however, only in the following year
with their deaths.3 Philipp Maria Halm focused instead on the inscrip-
tion reading “A Sketch of Virtues and Vices” prominent on the tower
at the exact center of the relief.4 For him, the inscription underscored
the allegorical nature of the scene, and the date 1522 included in it
simply referred to the year the sculptor completed his task. Halm
related the relief to a woodcut by the German printmaker Georg
Penzcz, dated about 1530, and to a poem by the Meistersinger Hans
Sachs, dated exactly 1530, both of which concern the climax of the
story of King Arthur and the Adulterers’ Bridge. In this tale the
chaste king and his knights successfully cross the bridge, which lacks
a parapet, while the maritally unfaithful fall into the river.

In a 1956 article Leopold David Ettlinger reviewed these interpre-
tations and others.5 Asserting that none of the proposed historical
allusions could explain the relief in its entirety and remarking that
the story of King Arthur and the Adulterers’ Bridge could have little
bearing on the relief’s meaning because Charles V had not yet wed
in 1522, he stressed the more general allegorical significance of the scene. Daucher’s compact carving, he said, relies on medieval and Renaissance romances, such as the tale of Amadis of Gaul, in which knightly valor and virtue are tested by crossing a bridge or passing through a narrow gate. The “bridge test,” in his view, is a secular retelling of the Dialogues of Pope Gregory the Great (540–604) and especially the chapter on the Bridge of Dread, which only the virtuous can cross on their journey to the next world. According to Ettlinger, Daucher conflated these traditions in his allegory of Emperor Charles V and his retinue, most of whom, it is gracefully implied, will pass the test of virtue, though some must inevitably stumble and come to grief. The scene vividly recalls the triumphal processions beloved of Renaissance rulers, in which their glory and their exercise of dominion over towns and vassals are celebrated.

Daucher was masterly in carving fine-grained stone into detailed depictions of rulers, such as Emperor Maximilian on Horseback as Saint George (ca. 1520–25, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), and of religious subjects, such as his Mary in the Hall (1520, Städtische Kunstsammlungen, Augsburg), which capitalize on architectural motifs and clothing accessories to captivate the viewer. Into this relief’s small format he packed dozens of figures, many of whom can be identified by tiny facial features and costume details, and animated them with varied expressions and postures. It is likely that he relied on a single graphic source for the basic scheme. The four-arched bridge with its central tower and the contrasting scenes of parading and fountaining horsemen are very close to the Pencz print; perhaps both artworks depend on a single earlier design. In the desperate gestures of those lost in the river—some upended in armor, one with arms raised pleading for help, others swept under the bridge—Daucher’s keen artistic invention is most apparent. This relief was prized by no less a figure than the great patron of art Emperor Rudolf II (r. 1576–1612), who kept it in his splendid Kunstkammer in Prague.

1. Eser 1991, p. 1771, reviews these identifications made by earlier commentators.
5. Ettlinger 1996.
6. Eser 1991, p. 1773 and fig. 9, p. 1779 and fig. 2.

BACCIO BANDINELLI (ITALIAN, 1493–1560)
Florence, 1539–40
Marble portrait bust
31 3/4 (with socle) × 30 3/8 × 12 in. (80 × 78.4 × 30.5 cm)

PROVENANCE: Niccolini family, Florence (probably by 1753); Marchese Carlo Niccolini, Florence (until d. 1919); his wife, Marchesa Jennifer Cole-Brook Niccolini, Switzerland (1919–d. 1942); her descendants; [Alain Moatti, Paris, until 1987; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: Olga Raggio in Metropolitan Museum 1988, pp. 26–27, ill.; Hégener 2009, p. 76, fig. 77

In 1534, in rivalry with Michelangelo, Baccio Bandinelli carved the colossal Hercules and Cacus, a marble group that confronted the older sculptor’s famous David (finished in 1504) on the Piazza della Signoria in Florence. With their stiff postures and lapidary precision, the figures of Bandinelli’s group could not compete in grace and power with Michelangelo’s youth. Over the years, Bandinelli created a unique, even idiosyncratic, Mannerist style (the style prevalent in Italy after the 1520s) and achieved considerable success, yet constantly strove to emerge from Michelangelo’s shadow, and his competitive zeal intensified a tendency to exaggeration in his work. After the eighteen-year-old Cosimo de’ Medici became duke of Florence in 1537, the sculptor found increasing favor in his native city as well as in Rome. Through ducal patronage, he was supported in such major projects as the tombs of the Medici popes Leo X and Clement VII (1536–41, church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome) and works in the chancel of Florence Cathedral (1545–60).

His bust of Cosimo in the Metropolitan is one of the earliest sculptural portraits of the duke, probably the first done all’antica (in antique fashion). The young duke began to grow a beard in the first year of his reign, as medals by Domenico di Polo bear witness. Crisply defined in marble, the wispy strands of facial hair place the subject in the early years of adulthood. A chalk drawing by the Florentine painter Pontormo, probably made in the year of Cosimo’s accession (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) displays the strong profile and confident demeanor seen in Bandinelli’s bust. The duke’s relative youth here is apparent when the Museum’s portrait is compared with Bandinelli’s better known bust of Cosimo from about 1543–44 (Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence), in which the subject’s face has fleshed out and his manner become even more assured. Nonetheless, the artist went to great lengths in the early bust to confer authority on his subject. The sharp turn of the head, a motif found in many of Bandinelli’s works, is meant to make Cosimo appear decisive; it appropriately echoes the pose of Michelangelo’s Giuliano de’ Medici, a famous seated, lifesize sculpture of a Medici youth of an earlier generation installed in 1534 in the Medici Chapel of the church of San Lorenzo, Florence. Duke Cosimo’s antique regalia—a laced cuirass and enveloping paludamentum, or robe of rank—have ancient imperial associations. From the beginning of his reign Cosimo was particularly eager to be compared with Augustus Caesar. He owned a bust of the youthful emperor (today untraced) as well as ancient cameos of Augustus, all of which reflect his cult of the Roman ruler.

An unusual feature of the Museum’s bust, the separate carving of head and torso (which in turn is in three parts), is a known working
method of Bandinelli, one that Giorgio Vasari noted in his Lives of the Artists, observing that it was frowned on by other sculptors: “It was the custom of Baccio [Bandinelli] to add pieces of marble both small and large to the statues that he executed, feeling no annoyance in doing this, and making light of it.” In fact, carving a bust in separate pieces was an ancient Roman practice, as Bandinelli would have known from examples he could study in Florence and Rome. The odd truncation of his right arm might have necessitated — or at least been compatible with — the piecing of the marble.

Appropriately enough, Cosimo’s bust came early into the possession of staunch supporters of the Medici, the Niccolini family of Florence. It is likely that it is the first item in a list of five busts inventoried in the house of Cavaliere Lorenzo Niccolini on January 5, 1795, after his death. More than two centuries earlier, the house was in the possession of Giovanni Niccolini, and it is possible that the bust was there at that time. We know that in the eighteenth century the bust still stood on a tall, divided and tapered, walnut pedestal (gabello) a type that had frequently been used for the display of sculpture during the mid-sixteenth century. The original iron ring cemented into the unfinished back suggests that the piece was once attached to a wall. The 1795 Niccolini inventory documents that the original socle was of the same stone as the bust; the present one is a later replacement.

2. For the lost bust of Augustus, see Förster 1971, p. 88. For the cameos, see Megaw 1987, p. 166, 218, pl. 8, 6. The Metropolitan Museum collection contains a fine portrait cameo of Emperor Augustus dating between A.D. 41 and 54 (acc. no. 42.11.30).
4. For one example, an Antonine-era bust in Ostia, see Calza 1964, pp. 108–9, no. 187.
5. A copy of the inventory (from the archives of the Niccolini family) is in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
20. Virgin and Child with the Young Saint John the Baptist

Northern France (Île-de-France?), ca. 1525–50
Marble group, partially gilt
27¼ x 13¼ x 13½ in. (69.2 x 34.3 x 34.3 cm)
Purchase, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1939 59.12

PROVENANCE: Mme Léon Arnoux, Paris (until 1942; auction, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, February 6, 1942, no. 122, as school of Germain Pilon, 16th century); Reichsmarschall Hermann Göring; recovered by the French government in 1945 but not claimed for the Musées Nationaux Récupération (National Museums Recovered Art) collection; delivered to the Service des Domaines de l’État (State Property Administration) as an ownerless work;1 (Brimo de Laroussilhe, Paris, by 1955, until 1959; sold to MMA)


CARVED IN FRANCE, THIS GRACEFUL IMAGE IS ROOTED IN ITALIAN Renaissance compositions. Leonardo da Vinci’s painting known as the Virgin of the Rocks and Raphael’s La Belle Jardinière (both Musée du Louvre, Paris) were models for the integration of these three holy figures into a compact, pyramidal format. Since both paintings belonged to King Francis I (1494–1547), it is not surprising that French sculptors emulated their famed designs. The subject was more popular in Italy than in France in the sixteenth century, so few exemplars were available north of the Alps.8

Italian, Flemish, and native French artists worked at the French court and around the Île-de-France in the first half of the sixteenth century; the character of this marble sculpture reflects that international mix. If the group owes its design to Italian precedent, its sweet demeanor and elegant gestures reflect the French manner. Placing it firmly within a particular atelier, however, is problematic because the era was one in which artists moved frequently across regions and borders. Some scholars link it to work in the Loire-valley town of Tours, but there is little basis for that attribution.3 A stylistic point of departure is offered by the four virtues seated on the corners of the tomb of Louis XII (1462–1515) and Anne of Brittany in the cathedral of Saint-Denis, north of Paris.4 Carved by the Italians Jean Juret and his brothers between 1515 and 1521, these calm, contained figures covered with broad swaths of drapery represent a fundamental model for our marble. They share aspects of the style of several sculptors whose work followed the Justes’. An atelier traditionally known as that of Saint-Léger, named for a town south of Troyes in the Champagne region, took a similar approach in the relative simplicity and gravity of their figures, the precision of their details, and the broad folds of their drapery. A Virgin and Child in the Musée National de la Renaissance, Château d’Écouen, dating to about 1530, one of the finest works of the Saint-Léger atelier, is a good example of the oval facial type and contained body movements and gestures characteristic of that school of sculptors.5 By comparison with that work, the Virgin and Child with the Young Saint John the Baptist is more complex, as the bodies are positioned in depth and more emphatic in their movement.

From the evidence of this marble, the sculptor of our group had a penchant for such details as the Virgin’s topknot of hair, which is echoed by similar knots at either side of her kerchief and at her waist, the crinkled ribbon hemming her bodice, and the fur of John the Baptist’s animal-skin coat. Such love of specificity is a Flemish trait and reminiscent of a dynasty of sculptors, the Juliots, who worked at the Château de Fontainebleau in the sixteenth century and were based in and around Troyes. But their productions are even more richly
detailed in costume accessories than the Museum’s sculpture; moreover, the faces of their figures incline to caricature and the bodies have a more frenetic sense of movement. In the final analysis, this exceptionally accomplished work may be said to reflect trends in French sculpture stemming from royal ateliers and spreading to regions near the Île-de-France, but it cannot yet be firmly associated with a particular atelier.

3. Phillips 1962, p. 216, was the first to label this as “French (possibly Touraine), about 1530.” In the spring of 1986, Jean Guillaume, then professor at the Centre d’Études Supérieures de la Renaissance, Tours, examined the sculpture and doubted that it was from Tours, thinking Troyes more likely.
21. The Reign of Jupiter

Northern France, ca. 1550–70
Marble relief
14¼ × 19 × 1½ in. (37.8 × 48.3 × 3.8 cm)

This sophisticated relief, adroitly carved and freighted with meaning, reflects the French Renaissance in all its charm and mystery. Six discrete scenes fill the rectangular marble slab, three above and three below. Jupiter occupies the prime position at top center. Accompanied by his eagle, he sits on a rocky ledge, holding — unusually for this Roman god — a scepter and a book. From his blocky throne emerge three streams, which seemingly but not physically flow down into a dislikelike image of a fountain in a forest. Elaborately decorated, this watery scene features dolphins supporting a basin, from which rises an obelisk. The setting is ideal, rather than untamed nature or a garden. One spots a palm tree as well as deciduous trees. To Jupiter's right, the figure of the god Mercury with a carefully delineated caduceus flies toward the chief Olympian, seeming to engage him in speech. Below Mercury, a pair of naked children embrace. The upper right section of the relief represents an ideal city with a circular temple in front of finished and ruined buildings. Below, a bow-wielding male centaur rears toward the center.

The graphic quality of this relief raises the possibility that the sculptor followed a drawn model or models. In the French Renaissance, painters such as Francesco Primaticcio and architects such as Jean Bullant routinely furnished drawings to sculptors for tombs or building facades. The lack of fluid connection between the parts of this relief makes one wonder if the sculptor assembled drawings and prints from different sources, possibly following the verbal program of a poet or writer. The circular depiction of a fountain in the forest, for instance, could be an excerpt from an illustrated book. It is reminiscent of woodcut illustrations in the Venetian Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, published in France in 1546.¹ The ideal city recalls paintings and drawings by Jean Cousin.⁶ The prevalence of such themes in graphic and painted work of the 1540s and 1550s supports a dating about that time.

The elegance and fluid carving of the low-relief figures have led scholars to suggest that they are by one of the foremost sculptors of the period, perhaps Jean Goujon or Germain Pilon. Yet neither of those artists seems to have been responsible. Instead, it resembles most closely the work of the unidentified carver or atelier employed about 1549–52 at the chapel of the Château d'Anet, south of Paris. The elongation of the figures, the courtly gestures of the embracing putti, the swirling patterns of drapery in the air around them, and the emphasis on decorative pattern are all traits shared by the Anet chapel reliefs and this small marble. The air of courtly refinement and delight in decorative pattern bring to mind the famous Diana of Anet (ca. 1549, Musée du Louvre, Paris), a monumental fountain figure supported by a brilliantly patterned sarcophagus-shaped pedestal.
The unusual combination of figures and emblems on the relief has invited varied interpretations, of which Michael Mezzatesta’s is the most comprehensive and carefully considered. The embracing infants and the centaur are seen by Mezzatesta and others as the zodiacal signs of Gemini and Sagittarius. They may refer to the birth date of a specific person, though Mezzatesta reads them as a conjunction of constellations arranged by Jupiter to coincide with poetic inspiration, as signified by the fountain between them. Mercury is the messenger god of eloquence and the arts. Mezzatesta equated him here with Charles, cardinal of Lorraine, a statesman famous for his eloquence, and the figure of Jupiter with King Henry II. In his view, the whole relief is connected with the cardinal’s now-destroyed Grotte de Meudon outside of Paris, a site of poetic and artistic inspiration about which Pierre de Ronsard and others wrote.

In another analysis of the Museum’s marble tablet, Colin Eisler relates it to emblematic reliefs seen on contemporary heart monuments (sculptures accompanying the burial of a human heart), such as the one dedicated to Francis I at the cathedral of Saint-Denis, that emphasize the role of the arts in our creative nature. In Eisler’s view, the dimensions, quality, and iconography of the present relief all indicate that it was designed for use on a French royal heart monument. Although there is no documentary evidence to support the idea, he wonders whether it was commissioned for Charles IX (who died 1571 and for whom no such memorial is known) and suggests the possibility that Jacquot Ponce carved it. While these are tempting suggestions, there is little evidence to support this work’s connection with a heart monument. Ponce’s stuccowork—which is all that remains to testify to his relief style—shows little affinity with this marble relief. The rabbeting of three edges—the bottom edge has been recut—indicate that the relief was intended to be framed and thus was probably meant to be set into a monument or into the fabric of a wall. What can be said for sure of this exquisitely carved marble is that it must have been intended for a particular location, and surely for a noble if not a royal complex; that it followed a specific program, most likely suggested by a poet or writer; and that its motifs and style suggest a date of about 1550–70.

1. See Zerner 1996, fig. 370.
2. See, for example, Cousin’s Children Playing among Ruins (1540–70, Musée du Louvre, Paris); ibid., fig. 372.
22, 23. Saint Agnes/Saint Jerome

Spain (Aragon?), mid-16th century
Pair of alabaster tondi, painted and gilt
Saint Agnes: 20¼ x 20½ x 4¾ in. (51.4 x 52.1 x 12.4 cm)
Saint Jerome: Diam. 20⅛ in. (52.4 cm), D. 4½ in. (11.8 cm)
Purchase, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1934, 34.34 (Saint Agnes)
Fletcher Fund, 1927, 27.112 (Saint Jerome)


LITERATURE: (Saint Agnes) American Art Galleries 1927, p. 188, no. 344 (as by Damión Forment), III. Phillips 1934 (as by a sculptor of the sacristy doors of Cuenca Cathedral), III. (Saint Jerome) American Art Galleries 1927, p. 188, no. 344 (as by Damión Forment), III.; Rorimer 1928, fig. 1 (as by Forment); Phillips 1934 (as by a sculptor of the sacristy doors of Cuenca Cathedral).

These roundels from the Conde de las Almenas collection in Madrid were separated after auction in New York in 1927 but reunited in the Museum a few years later. They may have been part of a larger series, since there is no reason—biblical or historical—to show Saint Agnes and Saint Jerome together (the pairing may reflect the patrons’ given names, however). Both Agnes and Jerome were popular subjects in the religious art of Spain. Jerome is shown, pen in hand, writing a book, presumably his Latin translation of the Bible, known as the Vulgate. His robe has the ermine-fringed collar of a cardinal and his hat hangs on the wall behind him; the head and a paw of the lion he befriended after extracting a thorn peek out beneath his arm. The virgin martyr Agnes holds her attribute, a lamb. Jerome is often depicted alone, but since he was one of the Four Fathers, or Doctors, of the Church, he may originally have been joined by three male saints and four female saints, to make a series of eight. Whether as a pair or as many as eight, the roundels could have been decorations for one of the large retables, or altar shelves, that filled churches during this period, but their sumptuous nature would also have suited a palace. The richly carved and painted garlands of fruit and flowers, a type of ornament popularized in glazed terracotta work by the Della Robbia in Italy and widely imitated in Europe, would have brought the saints into harmony with a secular interior.

As a medium for sculpture, alabaster was often used in northeastern Spain, where it was quarried.1 Even such a costly material as alabaster was frequently painted in the Renaissance. While the natural beauty of the stone is left undamaged in the carefully chiseled striations of Jerome’s sleeves, the fur of his cloak, or the billows of Agnes’s dress, most of the reliefs’ surfaces have been defined by color. Dark green leaves contrast with white and red fruit and flowers in the garlands; carnation hues blush on Agnes’s cheeks and gold highlights her tresses, while tones of black emphasize Jerome’s gnarled beard; and gilding picks out the hems and ermine tails of their robes. Without pigment, the windmill and low-relief landscape behind Agnes would lack visual clarity. Spanish wood sculpture was routinely painted, and the roles of entallador (carver) or escultor (sculptor) were clearly separated from that of the encarnador (painter of flesh tones) or estofador (painter of draperies). While wooden sculpture was completely covered with paint and required the hand of several specialists, alabaster was more selectively painted, and possibly a single artist—quite likely not the carver—was responsible for the coloring here. Diego de Siloé’s Virgin and Child (ca. 1519–28, Victoria and Albert Museum, London) is another example of the partial painting of alabaster: only hair, drapery, and facial features received coats of pigment.
The carving of these roundels is most attractive, and the coloration complements rather than detracts from the sculptor's skill. Jerome’s bony fingers and gaunt cheekbones deliberately contrast with the voluptuous smoothness of Agnes’s flesh. The textures of their hair and the swelling forms of the fruit were brilliantly rendered by chisel first, and only then enhanced by the painter’s finesse. Both sculptor and painter must have delighted in the trompe l’œil fly that has just landed on Jerome’s book. Jerome’s torso, bursting from the garland’s confines, reflects trends of Mannerist art in Spain in the middle of the sixteenth century. Stylistic traits and material clues (such as the use of alabaster) suggest that the roundels were made in the region of Aragon. James Rorimer thought that Damián Forment, a famous Spanish sixteenth-century artist active in Poblet, Huesca, and Saragossa might have executed them. Other scholars have offered attributions to sculptors less well known than Forment. John Goldsmith Phillips found similarities between them and sculptural work on the sacristy doors of Cuenca Cathedral, which Manuel Gómez-Moreno thought were possibly by Diego de Tiedra. Although none of these attributions has been agreed upon, recent scholars have continued to locate the roundels’ place of origin in Aragon rather than Castile.

2. Rorimer 1928.
3. Phillips 1934, p. 68; Gómez-Moreno 1931, pp. 56-57, pl. 49.
4. Marjorie Trusted, oral communication and letter of 2010 in the curatorial files of the Department of Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum. Manuel Arias, deputy director of the Museo Nacional de Escultura, Colegio de San Gregorio, Valladolid, kindly confirmed that in his opinion the reliefs date from 1500 to 1550 and are likely to have been made in Aragon (communication of summer 2010).
24. Charity

CIRCLE OF JACQUES DU BROEUCQ
Northern France or Flanders, mid-16th century
Alabaster statue with traces of gilding
54.4 x 11.5 x 12.4 in. (138.1 x 44.5 x 31.4 cm)
Purchase, Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation Inc.
and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation Inc.
Gifts, 1965 65.110

PROVENANCE: Alexandre Lenoir, Paris (until 1837; his sale,
Paris, December 11, 1837, no. 15); [E. Lowengard, London, (in
1903); Heugel, Paris; Wildenstein and Company, New York,
1965; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: "Marble Statue by Germain Pilon" 1903, p. 95,
III. p. 94; Vollmer 1923, fig. 19; "Pilon" 1933, p. 45 (this and
the preceding references as by Germain Pilon); Phillips 1965,
pp. 76–77, 79 (as attributed to Pilon), III. (front cover and
inside front cover); Christie’s 1982, p. 60, under no. 149;
James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1987c, p. 66
(as by a Franco-Flemish sculptor of the second half of
the sixteenth century), pl. 40, III. p. 67; "Charity" 2006, III.

This allegorical figure of Charity nurtures three
children. One clammers up her blouse to reach her left breast; one
she pins with one arm to her left hip; the eldest stands at her feet, twisting
to look up at his brother. Standing calmly amid her wriggling brood,
the woman looks down with a trace of a smile. She wears a laurel
wreath on her long hair. Lifting her robe, which is trimmed at the hem
with a rinceau border, she reveals sandals decorated with seraphim
heads. In its iconography, this Charity is related to the type of statue
that stood in the loft or gallery atop the screen that separated the altar
of a church from the congregation and also supported a crucifix, or
rood. The Charity carved in 1550–52 by Domenico del Barbiere for the
stone rood screen that once stood in the church of Saint-Étienne (now
Saint-Pantaléon), Troyes, has three children tucked into the folds of her
voluminous robe.1 Another example, carved by the Flemish sculptor
and architect Jacques Du Broeucq between 1535 and 1548 and still in
the collegiate church of Sainte-Waudru, Mons (fig. 21), is accompanied
by two children, one nestled in her arms, one standing at her feet.2

It seems probable that, like the two works just described, the
Museum’s statue was once part of an architectural structure inside a
church. The sculptural programs of rood screens varied in complexity.
At Troyes, Charity and Faith flanked the crucifix (in addition to the
Virgin and Saint John Evangelist); at Mons, the group around the crucifix
included the theological and the temporal virtues. Called jubés in
France, these stone or wood screens figured frequently in European
churches early in the sixteenth century, but after the Council of Trent
(1545–63) they were often torn down as obstacles to the newly desirable
proximity between laity and clergy. This Charity’s fine alabaster
with traces of gilding and its good condition suggest that the sculpture
originally stood indoors and continued to be protected from the
weather.

Since this type of architectural statue is predominantly found in
northern France and the Low Countries, the sculptor has been sought
in that region. Not unreasonably, the French artist Germain Pilon
(ca. 1525–1590) was first considered its creator.3 To those scholars who
attributed it to Pilon, the Charity seemed to have the courtly grace
and mannered line associated with art at the court of Fontainebleau in
the middle of the sixteenth century. Comparisons have been made
with the sculpture of Du Broeucq (ca. 1505–1584), who often worked
in alabaster, a material abundant in Flanders. The stately virtues he
carved for Sainte-Waudru in Mons have many points of comparison
with the Museum’s Charity. Their straightforward poses are enlivened
by drapery that clings to the torso in many fine pleats but sweeps
around the legs in broader swaths. The Museum’s Charity does not
have the broad, sharp eyebrows characteristic of the Mons statues, and her children have lumpier muscles and more awkward poses than the graceful wards of the Sainte-Waudru Charity. But its refined carving and keen formal sense suggest the hand of an accomplished artist familiar with Du Broeucq’s style.

A third sculptor, the German Conrad Meit (1480s–1550/51), has been mentioned in connection with this Charity.¹ Meit worked in the same region as Du Broeucq, particularly at the church of Brou, near Bourg-en-Bresse, where his Sybil, or Virtue, of 1532 decorates the tomb of Margaret of Austria. Its sweet demeanor is reminiscent of our Charity. The precision and geometric patterns in Meit’s carving of pleats, however, do not seem quite matched in the more relaxed flow of this Charity’s drapery.

Recently, Lens Burk proposed a fourth candidate, Claudius Floris (died after 1548).² Dean of the guild of Saint Luke (a professional organization of painters, sculptors, and other artists) in Antwerp, he was responsible for the sculptural images at the top of the sacramental tower in the abbey church of Tongerlo in Flanders. This fifty-foot-high structure executed between 1536 and 1547/48 supported some five hundred statues and statuettes until it was destroyed in 1797. No images of the original monument are known, and only a few of its sculptural decorations, including some of Meit’s work, survive. Fredericus van Hoult, prior of the Norbertine abbey of Tongerlo, in 1779 described three fairly tall alabaster statues of Faith, Love, and Hope standing on a level above Meit’s statues. Furthermore, a 1798 inventory of works in the Carmelite convent at Antwerp noted an alabaster statue of “Love with three children” (“Love” is the literal translation of Caritas, the Latin word for charity), a hint that it may have escaped the demolition the previous year. Although there are no certain extant works by Claudius Floris, Burk’s research establishes circumstantial evidence that he may have been the sculptor responsible for the Museum’s Charity. Further research may yield proof of this hypothesis.

Although the question of attribution remains open, it seems correct to say that this probably mid-sixteenth-century statue once stood on an architectural screen or tower at a church in northern France or southern Flanders. Whoever was the artist responsible, the sculpture, at once graceful and compelling, is perhaps the finest and most imposing alabaster carving of this period in an American museum.

---

3. “Marble Statue by Germain Pilon” 1903, p. 95; Vollmer 1923, fig. 19; “Pilon” 1933, p. 45; Phillips 1965, pp. 76–77, 73.
25. Saint Sebastian

ALESSANDRO VITTORIA (ITALIAN, 1525–1608)
Venice, 1566
Bronze statuette
21¾ × 6¼ × 6¼ in. (54.3 × 17 × 16 cm)
Signed (on socle): ALEXANDER VICTOR[IA], T[IDENTINUS], F[ECIT]
Samuel D. Lee Fund, 1920. 20.24

PROVENANCE: Federico Mylius, Genoa (until 1875; sale, Villa Mylius, November 11, 1879, no. 181); English private collector; [Goldschmidt, sold to Bayer]; Mr. and Mrs. Edwin S. Bayer, New York (by 1927, until his death in 1928); Mrs. Edwin S. Bayer; later Laura, comtesse Sala (1928–33; her sale, Galerie Charpentier, Paris, May 19, 1933, no. 49); Cleden In J. Ryan (after 1938–40; sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, January 20, 1940, no. 274, to MMA)


THE PREEMINENT VENETIAN SCULPTOR OF THE LATE SIXTEENTH century, Alessandro Vittoria was highly productive in diverse media and types of work. He is most closely identified with portrait busts, which collectively create a sober image of Veneto society, but he also produced excellent stucco decorations for palaces and stone statues for churches. In addition, he issued a distinguished series of bronze statuettes—including thirteen known signed examples—about half of which have religious subjects, such as Saint John Baptist (formerly in the Venetian church of San Francesco della Vigna), and half mythological ones, such as Mercury (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles).1

Saint Sebastian is among the most successful of these bronze statuettes and was a favorite of the artist, who kept it and a variant in his house and proudly mentioned it in various wills. The composition depends on a lifesize work in Istrian stone of 1563–64 commissioned from Vittoria by the Montefeltro family for the altar in San Francesco della Vigna.2 The dynamic, twisting composition is indebted to various works Vittoria admired, including Michelangelo’s Dying Slave (Musée du Louvre, Paris) for the overall pose and such Hellenistic sculptures as the Dying Alexander (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) for the emotive face and flowing hair.3 Venetian painters from Carpaccio to Vittoria’s contemporary Tintoretto Inflected the style of the saint’s elongated figure.4 In the Metropolitan’s bronze, Vittoria accentuated the length of the body and exaggerated its torsion. As the viewer moves around the sculpture, the smooth surfaces of the metal catch the light, emphasizing the fluid modeling of the male body and the precision of such details as locks of hair and tree bark.5

Three extant bronze variants of Saint Sebastian—this one, another, unfinished, in a private collection; and a third, draped and unsigned, in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art—have proved difficult to disentangle historically, despite the existence of some documentation. Vittoria’s fifth will, dated May 1584, mentions two castings of Saint Sebastian, one signed and one unsigned.6 We know that Vittoria paid Andrea d’Alessandr (Andrea Bresciano) for having cast a Saint Sebastian on December 14, 1566, and that on May 16, 1575, he paid Orazio, a son-in-law of the late Andrea d’Alessandr, for casting another figure of the saint.7 Before the appearance in 1928 of the bronze now in a private collection, it was generally assumed that the Metropolitan’s and the Los Angeles version were the two cited in Vittoria’s 1584 testament.8 Recently, however, scholars have agreed that the slack modeling and thin cast of the Los Angeles version indicate that it is a later cast.9 The Vittoria specialist Manfred Leitie-Jasper has proposed that the Metropolitan’s version is the first cast and that the second cast is, in fact, the unfinished version in a
private collection, since X-ray examination has shown them to be nearly identical technically. Leithe-Jasper further noted that the crisply engraved signature on the Metropolitan’s bronze — “Alexander. Victor.T.F.” — reflects the artist’s early practice, continued into the 1560s, of using the letter T to refer to his birthplace, the city of Trent (ancient Tridentum). The signature “Alexander.Victoria.F.” on the bronze now in a private collection is consistent with the artist’s later practice; moreover, the lettering is more casually engraved, suggesting that the work was not signed at the time of casting (and thus was described as unsigned in Vittoria’s will) but added later.

There are no arrows to identify the protomartyr Sebastian either in the stone version at San Francesco della Vigna or in the bronze versions; only the figure’s troubled expression and contorted limbs reveal his torment. Clear signs of torture being absent, it is the beautiful body that is the artist’s focus. Indeed, the artist himself seems to have ambivalent about the subject: in one of his wills Vittoria states that the bronze statuette of Sebastian could also be interpreted as a Marsyas. The importance of the statuette to Vittoria and the resounding success of his brilliant Mannerist figura serpentinata are suggested in
a number of paintings. Paolo Veronese’s *Alessandro Vittoria* (fig. 22) shows the sculptor leaning against a carpeted table and cradling what is probably a plaster of one of the prototypes of Saint Sebastian. Across the table lies a fragmentary ancient marble torso. Its rippling muscles are an obvious source for Vittoria’s work, but the artist seems confident that the Renaissance sculpture will surpass its classical model in the complexity of its pose. Plaster casts taken from preparatory models or finished bronzes surely circulated among artists and collectors. They appear in paintings as disparate as Bergamesque painter Evaristo Baschenis’s *Musical Instruments and a Statuette* (Galleria dell’Accademia Carrara, Bergamo) and the Dutchman Jan Steen’s *The Drawing Lesson* (J. Paul Getty Museum), testifying to the esteem in which seventeenth-century artists continued to hold this marvelous composition.13

1. For the thirteen signed bronzes, see Leithe-Jasper 1999, p. 325.
2. For the history of this commission and its publication, see W. Avery 2004.
3. Many scholars, from Wilhelm K. Valentiner (1942) to Manfred Leithe-Jasper (in “La bellissima maniera” 1999, p. 342) have noted that the Dying Slave and the Dying Alexander served as models for Saint Sebastian.
4. Leithe-Jasper (in Genius of Venice 1983, p. 388, no. 137) is one of the scholars who have mentioned the influence of these painters on the present work.
5. Stone 2010, p. 109, emphasizes how successfully the North Italian type of black patina enhances the statuette’s lustrous skin.
7. The documents of 1566 and 1575 were first cited in Predelli 1988, pp. 132, 155–56. Victoria J. Avery (1999, p. 54, doc. no. 91, p. 85, doc. no. 91) has reviewed both of these documents thoroughly.
9. Already in 1987, before the bronze in a private collection was discovered, Scott Schaefer and Peter Fusco doubted that the Los Angeles County Museum’s bronze (M.51.12; H. 21¼ in. [55.2 cm]) was a contemporary cast, citing it as possibly eighteenth century; see Schaefer and Fusco 1987, p. 170.
11. This observation is in the third will, dated November 7, 1570: “Statua di bronzo, quale può servire raccordando, ove san Sebastian, ove Marsia, facendola finta la testa sinistra o nel mezzo della testa” (bronze statuette which can be turned into a Saint Sebastian or a Marsyas by adding a wound below the left breast or in the center of it); Gerola 1924–25, pp. 348–49.
12. The most recent discussion of Veronese’s portrait of Vittoria is in Koering 2009, pp. 181, 186, and pp. 183–85, no. 16.
26. The Holy Family with Saints Anne and Joachim

**Diego de Pesquera (Spanish, ca. 1540—after 1581)**

Granada, 1567–68

Wood relief, painted and gilt

62 ¼ x 41 ¼ x 4 in. (158.4 x 106.4 x 10.2 cm)

Bequest of Helen Hay Whitney, 1944. 45.128.5

Collaboration between sculptors and painters produced a distinctive tradition of polychromed wood sculpture that is a highlight of Spanish Renaissance and Baroque art. In The Holy Family with Saints Anne and Joachim the figures’ different ages and sex give full scope to expressive carving as well as to the coloring of flesh tones and patterning of drapery. The relief shows two couples, the men standing behind their seated wives—Mary and Joseph to the left and Mary’s parents, Anne and Joachim, to the right. Their glances and gestures join at the Christ Child, sprawled across Mary’s lap. The circle of hands—from Joachim’s to Christ’s to Mary’s, and back to Anne’s—connect these figures while focusing the viewer’s attention on the Child. Fingers touch and eyes glance with the ease and intimacy of a family gathering. In contrast to the adults, whose stances are stable, the large Christ Child wriggles. Off-balance, he causes the adults to react; they lean in to support him with their legs and hands. Only Joseph stands back, pensively looking down on the Child and his mother. The miracle of the Immaculate Conception, a particularly important tenet of the Catholic Church at that moment in Spain, is underscored by Mary’s parents, whose presence reminds us that Mary’s own birth was normal and that Christ’s was not.¹

While the sculptor has created a striking composition, he left ample opportunity for painters to embellish his work. Typically, specialists in rendering flesh (encarnadores) and in patterning drapery (estofadores) would divide this labor.² Mary’s face is rendered with pale, smooth skin and a blush on the cheeks, while Anne’s has sunken cheeks and swarthier skin tones. The Virgin’s headdress reveals her golden tresses, while Anne’s hair is fully covered. If the encarnador has given character to the figures, the estofador has tied the whole relief together with sumptuous color and pattern. Once the carver relinquished his panel to the painters, layers of gesso were applied, and then a bole—clay mixed with animal glue—was added as a matrix for sheets of gold leaf, brushed and burnished on the surface. Pigments were daubed over the gold leaf and then designs were scratched into the paint layers to create patterns, revealing the brilliant gold beneath. The relatively flat passages of carved drapery made the painters’ job easier, while occasional pleats and wrinkles added verismimitude as well as liveliness. For variety, some portions of the cloth were left simply gilded with embossed and scratched patterns. Even the background of the relief is patterned, as if the family is grouped before a rich canopy. Were the figures not so plastic and powerful, their outlines would fade or disappear before the brilliant effects of the fictive cloth.
PROVENANCE: Parish church of Los Ojijares, near Granada (until 1881); Helen Hay Whitney (until d. 1944; her bequest to MMA).

LITERATURE: Phillips 1946, p. 81 (as by Diego de Siloé), ill. p. 80; Phillips 1954, p. 146 (as by Siloé), ill. p. 162; Gómez-Moreno 1955, pp. 293–95, pl. 11, fig. 2; Azcárate 1958, p. 332; Camón Aznar 1961, pp. 271–72, fig. 267; Raggio 1975, p. 154. “Pesquera: Holy Family” 2006, ill.

When the sculpture was first acquired by the Museum, it was attributed to one of the best-known masters of the Renaissance, Diego de Siloé. A decade later, the art historian Manuel Gómez-Moreno was able to identify it as the work of another accomplished master, Diego de Pesquera, who divided his career between Granada (from 1563 to 1572) and Seville. On April 27, 1567, before he left Granada, he was commissioned to make a retablo—an altarpiece decorated with reliefs, of which this is one—for a parish church in nearby Los Ojijares. Payments suggest that the relief was finished by December 24 of the following year. A related relief of nearly identical dimensions by the same artist, Joachim and Anna before the Golden Gate, remains in situ in a three-level retablo; its structure is supported by fluted columns that create lateral panels for paintings by Juan de la Palenque and Miguel Leonardo. The names of the persons who painted the Museum’s relief are not known, but they are unlikely to be the same as those of the artists who executed the panel paintings, which would have been produced by members of a different guild. The relief now in the Museum was sold by the church in 1881.

2. An excellent recent discussion of these techniques is Barbour and Ozone 2009.
5. The relief and its retablo are illustrated in ibid., respectively, pl. 1 fig. 3, pl 1 fig. 1.
A seventeenth-century retablo is illustrated here (fig. 32).
6. Ibid., p. 234.
27. Alpheus and Arethusa

BATTISTA DI DOMENICO LORENZI (ITALIAN, CA. 1527/28–1594)
Florence, 1568–70
Marble group
58 3/4 × 32 3/4 × 23 3/8 in. (148.9 × 82.9 × 59.7 cm)
Fletcher Fund, 1940. 40.33

PROVENANCE: Designed for a grotto in the garden of Alamanno Bandini in his Villa II Paradiso, Plan de Ripoli, near Florence; by marriage or inheritance to the Niccolini family, first at Plan de Ripoli, later Florence, later Carmignano (1653 or 1685–1740; sold by Marchese Paolo Niccolini to MMA)


BATTISTA LORENZI WAS A FLORENTINE SCULPTOR WHO APPRENTICED with Baccio Bandinelli (see entry no. 19) and collaborated in Rome with Vincenzo de’ Rossi on a monumental statue of Pope Paul IV (destroyed by a mob in 1559). After his return to his native city (by 1565), he found success with wealthy clients, producing statues and fountains for their estates in and around Florence. Early works of this nature include a cycle of statues of the four seasons for Giovambattista Guadagni (sent to that abbot’s French residence and now lost); a Triton with Dolphins for Cosimo I de’ Medici (Galleria Regionale, Palermo); and an attributed figure of Ganymede (Boboli Gardens, Florence).

We know from Raffaello Borghini’s famed account of art in Florence, Il Riposo (1584), that this marble group, which he describes as one of the most accomplished of Lorenzi’s garden sculptures, was commissioned by Alamanno Bandini for a grotto in the garden of his Villa Il Paradiso. The structure in which the sculpture stood still exists, although it was modified in the eighteenth century and later. Behind a triple arcade open to the elements, a wide room encloses a pool, sheltered by a roof and the building’s three walls. The rear wall is covered with rocaille and stucco figures centering on a pedestal flanked by columns. On this pedestal the sculpture originally stood, its white marble gleaming in the darkened space, its smooth surface contrasted with the pebbly background, and its meaning completed by the pool below.

Drawn from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, the subject may have been suggested by Borghini himself. The goddess Diana’s nymph Arethusa, tired from hunting, bathed in a river. The river god Alpheus became enamored of her and gave chase; as she was about to be caught, she implored Diana to save her. The goddess rescued Arethusa by transforming her into an underground stream, whose spring is in Sicily. The sculptor seized on the climactic moment in the story when the nymph is captured, just before her metamorphosis. Ovid’s
text clearly inspired the sculpture and its grotto setting. His verse, "Once, I remember, in the summer's heat/Tir'd with the chase, I sought a cool retreat," suggests the respite a visitor to Bandini's garden might have found in the grotto. Within, one statue above the pool reflected the watery source of the river god and the other the spring which the nymph will become. As Ovid tells us, Arethusa was changed to water by means of a cloud: "My strength distill'd in drops, my hair in dew." One can imagine water dripping on the sculpture from the damp grotto ceiling, recalling this passage of the Metamorphoses.3

Intertwined, the nude figures are in poses of arrested motion. Alpheus flings his left arm around Arethusa, while she reaches back to remove it. In her left hand she trails her garment, which, according to Ovid, she had taken off to bathe; in his right hand Alpheus holds an up-ended vase, the conventional emblem of a river god, from which water once flowed into the basin below. As the subject was relatively rare in sixteenth-century art, Lorenzi appears to have turned for compositional inspiration to a print by Agostino Veneziano of Daphne, another nymph saved from a god's pursuit by last-minute transformation. Bertha Wiles, who proposed this artistic borrowing, also noted the influence of Lorenzo's sculpture on the most famous depiction of that myth, Gianlorenzo Bernini's marble Apollo and Daphne in the Galleria Borghese in Rome (1624).4 If it were to be set beside Bernini's active group, Lorenzi's couple might well appear static, yet it is a successful early step toward the goal of Renaissance sculptors to depict figures in struggle and in movement. Another, slightly later response to that compositional challenge, Giambologna's Rape of a Sabine (installed 1582, Loggia dei Lanzi, Piazza della Signoria, Florence), is far more complex; by contrast, there is an appealing simplicity to Alpheus and Arethusa.5

Both of Lorenzi's figures stride forward, the river god straight ahead, the nymph angling to the side. Lorenzi composed his group as a series of checks and balances. Alpheus's chest is frontal and his head in profile; the nymph's body forms a diagonal, its weight restrained only by his embrace. Her head, turned back toward her pursuer, faces the viewer. The planes of their bodies swivel. Together, they define the edges of an imaginary block containing them and are earthbound when compared to Bernini's seemingly weightless figures; but Lorenzi's remain convincing in their quieter balance of forms.

Lorenzi's training with Bandinelli is apparent in the clarity of his outlines, but his sculptures are more naturalistic than the older master's. His experience as a restorer of antiquities is revealed in Alpheus's body and pose, which are close to those of the Hellenistic statue called the Gladiator. The motif of the frontal upper body and bent right arm is repeated in the Ganymede attributed to Lorenzi (ca. 1565–75) and may have been invented by Niccolò Tribolo for his River God, now in the Villa Corsini, Castello.6 Arethusa's physiognomy—an extended oval face, sharp nose, slightly open mouth, and protruding chin—is found in other works by Lorenzi, notably the Allegory of Painting that he carved for the tomb of Michelangelo about 1570–74.7 On the basis of style, Hildegard Utz dates Alpheus and Arethusa slightly earlier than that, to 1568, the time of Alamanno Bandini's first fountain commissions for the Villa Il Paradiso.

2. Borghini 1584, p. 598.
3. The story of Arethusa is found in Metamorphoses 5.572–641. The quotations from Ovid's poem in this paragraph are from Ovid 1717 (ec). On Borghini's possible contribution of the idea for the project, see Utz 1973.
5. Utz 1973, p. 60, suggests a progression in Renaissance multigual groups—from Francesco Mosca, called Il Moschino, to Vincenzo de' Rossi, to Battista Lorenzi—that led to even more dramatic interactions in Giambologna's figural groups.
28. Siren

Rome, ca. 1571–90
Bronze statue
32 ⅞ x 44 ⅞ x 13 ⅞ in. (83.6 x 113.7 x 34 cm)
Rogers and Edith Perry Chapman Funds, 2000: 2000.69

PROVENANCE: Possibly commissioned by the Colonna family, Rome; Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte, via di Ripetta, Rome (by 1627); Cardinal Antonio Barberini, Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane (by 1644); and later Palazzo Barberini ai Giubbonari (by 1671); his nephew Maffeo Barberini, Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane (by ca. 1680); probably descended in the Barberini family (until at least 1720); Rothschild family, Pregny, Switzerland; [Alain Moatti, Paris, until 2000; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: Olga Raggio in “Recent Acquisitions” 2000, p. 24, ill.

DIRECT AND DRAMATIC, THIS BRONZE HALF-LENGTH STATUE represents a nude woman, aquatic from the waist down, who holds a scaly tail in each hand. Her long hair trails behind her to a set of fish gills that fan out from all sides of her body. She wears a pointed crown, which is clearly a later addition, though her roughened pate and open cranium indicate the presence of a previous crown. She would have been placed high so that the viewer could not see the top of her head. There is no physical evidence that this bronze was part of a fountain; rather, it appears to be an emblematic decoration.

The statue reflects traditional types of mermaid figures and in particular the mythic Greek sirens. The sculptured figure of a woman holding her own fish tails can be found on Romanesque capitals, and in the sixteenth century the image became a decorative motif for tapestries and small bronze candelabra. The crown, however, indicates that this statue is a specific dynastic symbol. A great Roman family, the Colonna—and especially the princely Paliano branch—adopted this image as an emblem. As such, it appeared on their tombs in Rome, at San Giovanni in Laterano, and in the town of Paliano, as well as on furniture and in ceiling decorations. A volume of personal and family devices (imprese) collected by Paolo Giovio illustrates and describes the emblem of Stefano Colonna and quotes his motto, “Contemnit tuta procellas” (She defies the tempests). The most illustrious member of the family, Marcanonio Colonna (1535–1584), was celebrated for defeating the Turks at the battle of Lepanto in 1571. A siren appears on his armor in a painting and tops two rostral columns on a stone relief memorializing the victory at Lepanto (fig. 23). It would be particularly appropriate if, as in the stone memorial, the bronze Siren had originally been displayed on top of a column, since a cylindrical shaft was also a family emblem (colonna is Italian for column). Her gills would have spread down around it. The brusque chafing of her hair and some other features would be explained if the figure was meant to be seen from a distance—for example, from a perch atop a column.

A 1644 inventory mentions “a siren of bronze, with a crown on her head” standing in a small room in the Palazzo Barberini apartments of Cardinal Antonio Barberini. Antonio’s brother Taddeo was the husband of Princess Anna Colonna, and until recently it seemed to be a foregone conclusion that Antonio had received the Siren from Taddeo. Archival research, however, has turned up an inventory of April 1627 that documents the sculpture as in the palace of the recently deceased Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte on the via di Ripetta. Peter Bell has pointed out that it could have been purchased by Antonio Barberini directly from Del Monte’s heirs. Thus, there is
no proof that the Siren was owned by the Colonna family. Nonetheless its iconography points to them as the family most likely to have commissioned the Museum’s imposing and doubtless expensive bronze. Moreover, it is not out of line to guess that it was one of many works created to celebrate the great victory of Marcantonio Colonna in 1571 and that it remained among the family’s possessions for some time.

It is difficult to attribute the Siren directly to any artist, but its style is close to Roman bronze work of the period 1570–90. Museum curator Olga Raggio noted that Taddeo Landini’s bronze youths of 1581–84 on the Fontana delle Tartarughe in Rome, for example, have similar rhythmic poses and wet-looking, tousled hair. Another comparison, one that James Draper has informally proposed, is with the bronze lions supporting the Vatican obelisk that Lodovico del Duca cast in 1586, after models by Prospero Antichi and Francesco da Pietrasanta (Saint Peter’s Square, Rome). The vigorous modeling of the lions’ manes was meant to be seen from afar, as was the Siren’s hair, and the statues have similar iconic roles as bronze decorations. Like the Vatican lions, the Siren was likely a collaboration between sculptor and bronze founder, who created a brilliant—essentially Roman—emblem.

1. A technical examination by Richard E. Stone on December 10, 1999 (report in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum) showed that it has no residual deposit of slip or unfired clay that would point to its use as a fountain; the crown has an artificial patina and is clumsily worked, unlike the body of the figure.

2. A twelfth-century capital at the church of Saint-Maurice, Saint-Dié (Vosges), and a capital from the end of the twelfth century at the cathedral of Notre-Dame, Le Puy (Haute-Loire), are illustrated in Lederer-Max 1997, p. 135, III, no. 72, p. 147, III, no. 87. There are two bronze Mermaids in the Museum’s collection (Padua, first half of the sixteenth century, H. 5 in. [12.7 cm], acc. nos. 32.400.134 and 32.400.135).


4. Grevio 1576, p. 149.

5. The triumphal procession in Rome given in his honor after the victory by Pope Pius V and statues erected to him are described in E. Rossi 1928, pp. 19–20.


9. Peter Bell was the first to identify the Del Monte–Barberini bronze as the New York Siren; see Bell forthcoming.

29. Temperance

GIOVANNI CACCINI (ITALIAN, 1556–1613)
Florence, 1583–84
Marble statue
69½ in. (to upper surface of integral plinth) × 25¾ × 30¾ in.
(176.8 × 64.5 × 78.4 cm)
Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1967 67.208

PROVENANCE: Garden of the palace of Giovanni Battista Milanesi, bishop of Marsi (d. 1577), via Larga, Florence; descended in the Covoni Milanesi family, in the same location (until at least 1674); [Ugo Bardini (1892–1965), Florence, until at least 1963]; [Luca Fortini Gobbo, Florence, until 1967, sold to MMA]

EXHIBITED: “Masterpieces of Fifty Centuries,” The Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 14, 1970–June 1, 1971


This Temperance is identified by the items she holds: a bridle in one hand and dividers and ruler in the other. Clutching the bit with its bold bosses and its strap wrapped around her forearm like a defensive weapon, she admonishes us with pointed finger to follow her lead. The two mathematical instruments stand for the restraint of reason, which shapes a life measured by intellect, in contrast to the bridle, which signifies control over physical urges. Befitting her character, Temperance is poised and contained, her body tightly wrapped in thick drapery, her hair carefully braided. Her look is stern, and her gesture suitably simple and direct.

From the seventeenth-century art historian Filippo Baldinucci, we know that the statue was placed “at the head of the alley in the small garden” of the Florentine house belonging originally to Giovanni Battista Milanesi, the bishop of Marsi (called the bishop of Marsi). There it stood alone, not accompanied by statues of the three other cardinal virtues, prudence, fortitude, and justice, a group of four often seen together on tombs. It is also noteworthy that the sculpture was a central feature of a garden, a place often filled with licentious and playful statues that encourage relaxation rather than promote virtuous behavior.
The religious aspect of the virtue of temperance is underscored by the model on which this marble sculpture is closely based: Giambologna’s lifesize bronze Temperance (fig. 24), made for the chapel of Luca Grimaldi in the church of San Francesco in Genoa. 4 The relationship of the marble statue to the style of Giambologna was so manifest in the seventeenth century that Baldinucci ascribed it to that sculptor, only correcting himself in a footnote to say that it was actually by Giovanni Caccini. The mistake is not surprising, as Caccini was one of Giambologna’s closest followers. 5 Caccini’s career as sculptor and architect included many commissions for churches in Florence: among his greatest works were statues for the high altar of Santo Spirito (1599–1613), and he was one of the distinguished sculptors working under Giambologna on the great bronze doors of Pisa Cathedral (1588–96). Temperance is one of his early sculptures. Art historian Raffaello Borghini’s reference to it as under way in 1583 lends precision to its dating. 6 Furthermore, its solid stance and gentle forward motion reflect Caccini’s experience between 1583 and 1590 restoring classical sculptures for the Medici.

As an early work by the sculptor, it is not surprising that Temperance betrays the close attention he paid to the oeuvre of Giambologna. This is the sole statue by Caccini that is directly based on a piece by the principal sculptor of the day, and it is full of motifs from other works by that master. Since Giambologna’s bronze was placed in the Grimaldi Chapel in Genoa in 1584, Caccini must have studied the lifesize plaster model for it in Giambologna’s Florentine studio. As Olga Raggio observed, the marble borrows the bronze’s stance, its crisisscross of tight triangles of drapery, and its attributes but is more sober than its source. 7 The organization of the drapery is followed nearly verbatim: bunched over the chest, sweeping across the torso to the Virtue’s right hip, and falling straight down between the legs. Small changes, however, transform the character of the figure. The left foot of Caccini’s Virtue rests on the ground and is not raised, so the sway of the body is not as pronounced as in the other statue. Her arm extends forward, not to the side, so there is a reduced sense of motion, and she stares ahead, rather than focusing on the upheld bridge. Thus, Caccini’s Temperance appears to address the viewer, unlike Giambologna’s. While both works clearly come from the same model, the bronze presents a more mannered figure and active surface and the marble has a quieter effect, which Caccini achieved by flattening and simplifying the pleats of drapery across the chest. By switching the attributes from one hand to the other he privileged the bridle, so the restraint of the body more than that of the intellect is emphasized, perhaps reflecting the client’s wishes. The head of the Caccini piece bears no relation to the Grimaldi bronze version with its garland and headdress, but the braids tied behind and into a bow at the top are motifs borrowed from Giambologna’s Bathing Venus, known in bronzes based on a model of about 1583, 8 and from the marble Venus of the Grotticella in the Boboli Gardens in Florence of 1572–73.

Temperance is also related closely to Caccini’s own marble statues of the period. It has the straight-on pose and thick falls of drapery of Saint Bartholomew (ca. 1580–85) in the Carnevasc Chapel of the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, Florence. Some of the artist’s later work, such as the Angels or Saint Anne for the high altar of Santo Spirito, exhibit a dynamic movement and expressive detail that anticipate the Baroque. 9 By comparison, Temperance is conservative, merging aspects of Giambologna’s style with lessons from ancient statuary.

2. In traditional iconography, dividers signify prudence; in this instance, Caccini used them to characterize temperance, along with the Virtue’s usual symbol, a ruler. For the iconography of dividers in particular, see Menaker 1962, p. 85.
4. Holderbaum 1983, p. 324, n. 12, and pl. XXIII, fig. 182) notes that “[Giambologna’s] figure is specified as Status Prudentiae in the original contract, but as Temperantia in unpublished casting records made in Florence.”
7. Olga Raggio was the first to note the statue’s relationship to Giambologna’s Temperance and point to the elements in it of Caccini’s own style; Raggio 1968, pp. 45–47.
8. For example, Bathing Venus (Metropolitan Museum, acc. no. 24.212.16).
9. Catalano 1585, fig. 13 (Saint Anne).
30. Francesco I de’ Medici (1541–1587), Grand Duke of Tuscany

**After a Model by Giovanni Bologna, called Giambologna (Flemish, Active in Italy, 1529–1608)**

*Probably cast by Pietro Tacca (Italian, 1577–1640)*

Florence; modeled 1585–87, cast ca. 1611

Bronze portrait bust

30 1/4" (with socle) × 24 3/4" × 13 1/4" in. (77.2 × 62.2 × 34.7 cm)


Purchase, Gift of Irwin Untermyer and Bequest of Ella Morris de Peyster, by exchange; Edith Perry Chapman Bequest; Robert Lehman Foundation Inc. Gift; Edward J. Gallagher Jr. Bequest, in memory of his father, Edward Joseph Gallagher, his mother, Ann Hay Gallagher, and his son, Edward Joseph Gallagher III; and Harris Brisbane Dick, Rogers, Pfeiffer, Louis V. Bell and Dodge Funds, 1983.1983.450

**Provenance:** Probably Queen Marie de Médicis, Paris (from 1611); [Alain Moatti, Paris, until 1983; sold to MMA]


**This imposing portrait of Grand Duke Francesco I de’ Medici dates between 1585, when he received the Order of the Golden Fleece (the badge dangles prominently from a chain around his neck) and 1587, when he died. The model for the bronze clearly owes its character to the premier sculptor of the Medici family, Giambologna. Yet its facture is consistent with sculptures that Giambologna produced later in his career, specifically the work characteristic of his principal studio assistant, Pietro Tacca. Documents bear out the supposition that this sculpture is a later interpretation by Tacca of the older master’s concept.**

Giambologna’s most famous Medici portrait—an equestrian monument to Francesco’s father, Cosimo I, initiated in 1577 and installed in the Piazza della Signoria, Florence, in 1587—became the iconic image of the Florentine rulers and set standards across Europe.1 When Queen Marie de Médicis (née Marie de’ Medici) decided to commission an equestrian monument to her husband, King Henry IV of France, she relied on her family back in Italy to press the busy Giambologna to execute that monument.2 Following the sculptor’s death in 1608, the commission passed to Pietro Tacca. The bronze horse and rider were shipped from Florence to Paris in 1611, together with a bust. On October 7, 1614, Matteo Bartolini, the Tuscan emissary in Paris, wrote to his masters that the queen was sending 300 scudi to Tacca in recompense for the bust in bronze of her father, Francesco I.3 When the Museum’s bust appeared on the market in 1983, it was recognized as the long-lost possession of Marie de Médicis.

Its debt to models by Giambologna and its execution by Tacca are evident. What may be Giambologna’s earliest bronze bust of Cosimo I (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) is the direct prototype for Francesco I.4 The image of the son follows that of the father: identical Renaissance armor—with scalloped pauldrons and a rope motif centered across the breastplate—is in both cases crossed by a sword sash over the right shoulder, topped by the ceremonial chain. The date of the bust of Cosimo is uncertain. It was probably cast after 1553, when the artist moved to Florence. Another scholar suggests, however, that it was made at the time of Cosimo’s death, in 1574, and if so, the sculptor may have deliberately paired the busts of Cosimo and Francesco.5 The parentage of the New York bust is clear, and there are also echoes in it of other Giambologna busts of Francesco, notably an example in marble over the door of the former Teatro Mediceo in Florence.6 Similarly clad in contemporary armor, though wearing a sash over the left shoulder, that one lacks the badge of the Golden Fleece and thus predates the Museum’s bronze; however, the fairly fleshy face and full
beard indicate that the two are not far apart in date. Both busts accord with painted portraits, such as that by an anonymous artist in the circle of Scipione Pulzone in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence. Early canvases, such as Tommaso d’Antonio Manzuoli’s portrait of 1560 (Museo Civico, Prato), and marbles, such as Giovanni Bandini’s Francesco I (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence), with thinner face and beard, show how the duke’s physiognomy changed over time; the full sequence of images indicates that the Museum’s bronze bust represents the duke toward the end of his life.⁸

Crisp chiseling of the surface, sharp folds in the drapery, and a translucent reddish lacquer patina are characteristic of bronzes from Giambologna and his workshop later in the sculptor’s career.⁹ It seems likely that Tacca, a considerable artist in his own right, interpreted Giambologna’s model and produced a meticulously clean bronze for his exalted and demanding patron, the queen of France.¹⁰ The idealized, somewhat abstract portrait of Francesco accords with the imperious image the Medici sought for themselves. Created posthumously, the bronze captures the likeness but preserves the dignity of the sitter as an iconic image of a ruler. This was a man more at home in his studio, poring over natural specimens or fostering such inventions as Medici porcelain, than with ruling the state from the great hall (today the Salone dei Cinquecento) of the Palazzo Vecchio. Francesco’s somewhat vacant stare manages to appear commanding while divulging no secrets of the inner man’s true personality.

2. See Geneviève Breis-Bauchey in Cast in Bronze 2005, pp. 164–69, nos. 40, 41, for a recent account of the commission.
5. C. Avery 1987, pp. 167, 256, no. 32, pl. 172.
6. Ibid., pp. 169, 254, no. 15, pl. 175.
7. Les Trésors des Médicis 1993, p. 95, no. 35.
9. Richard E. Stone (2010, p. 100) has analyzed its “magnificent organic patina of a striking color like that of a very old burgundy wine” (but he was unable to identify the resin that gives it its distinctive hue).
31. Mother Ape

Camillo Mariani (Italian, 1567–1611)

Pesaro, 1595–96
Bronze statue
23 ⅓ x 17 x 20 ⅞ in. (63.8 x 33 x 52.4 cm)
European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2006. 2006.35

Provenance: Duke Francesco Maria II della Rovere, Villa Miralillo, Pesaro (d. 1633); private collection, Belgium; art market, Geneva; [Daniel Katz Ltd., London, until 2006; sold to MMA]


Literature: European Sculpture 2002, pp. 66–77, no. 11 (with archival research by Eike Schmidt and Clara Tarca), ill.; James David Draper in “Recent Acquisitions” 2006, p. 34, ill.

A tailless Barbary ape performs a mother’s balancing act. With her long arms she originally clutched two baby apes to her shoulder. The arm and leg of one of them can still be seen dangling along her left side, and its head originally lolled back against hers. The remains of four digits and of a footpad, as well as various surface gouges in the bronze, permitted Richard E. Stone to reconstruct the position of the missing second baby: it climbed up along the mother’s right side, resting its right paw on her knee and reaching its arm around her to grab the arms of the first baby. One of the mother’s legs extends downward, as if to test water in a pool beneath; she has bent the other up against her body to steady herself. While the babies cavort, she carefully controls her charges, as her concentrated expression makes clear. The texture of the fur, the detail of the clenched paws, and the postures of the apes all make this one of the most vivacious and naturalistic of Renaissance animal statues. A wide hole in the mother’s left shoulder provided an opening for a fountain to spout upward. Calcium deposits attest that water coursed over the sculpture’s surface for long periods of time.

Until documents linked this statue unexpectedly to the Venetian sculptor Camillo Mariani, it was thought to be a Florentine production by Giambologna, as it is clearly related to three bronze apes on a fountain in the Boboli Gardens, Florence, that had already been attributed to that Flemish-born master. The documents — published by Eike Schmidt and Clara Tarca in 2002 — instead linked the Museum’s bronze and the three Boboli Gardens apes to a 1596 commission for the Villa Miralillo in Pesaro. The history of the bronze group has been pieced together as follows. After an active career in his native city of Vicenza and in the Veneto, Camillo Mariani spent two years in Pesaro before moving permanently to Rome. On May 13, 1595, the architect Vincenzo Scamozzi, who also hailed from Vicenza, recommended Mariani to Francesco Maria II della Rovere (1549–1631), duke of Urbino, and the following month a ducal commission was given to the "new Venetian sculptor" for a wax corpus of Christ. Then in November 1596 "the Venetian sculptor" was paid for "the apes of the fountain of Miralillo 240 scudi, and for copper and other things to make the aforesaid apes 182 scudi." The evidence suggests that Mariani was the Venetian sculptor who executed the two commissions. He was born and trained in the Veneto and had been introduced to Della Rovere’s court at Urbino just one month before the first commission. While he is not known as a bronze specialist, being instead celebrated for his work as a stuccatore, he was much influenced by Alessandro Vittoria, a Venetian sculptor noted for his bronzes (see entry no. 25).
Basing his position on research by Tarca, Schmidt has proposed that the marble fountain at Miralfoire, for which the bronze apes were commissioned, dates from the previous decade and that it was designed by Giulio da Thiene and carved by Giovanni Bandini's assistant Piermario. Francesco Mingucci painted a tempera rendering of the finished fountain in 1626 (fig. 26). The duke's hunting lodge and guesthouse are still extant, as are the gardens of which the fountain was the principal feature. Mingucci's image shows four apes on the quadrilobate basin facing a less distinct central element spouting water. It is likely that the Museum's ape was in the middle, as it is a complex group, rather than a single figure, and because it must once have incorporated plumbing for a fountain. By 1655, at least three single apes had been removed to the Medici villa at Poggio Imperiale, near Florence, after the duke's granddaughter, Vittoria della Rovere, who had inherited his art collection, married Ferdinando II de' Medici. The bronze apes were likely transferred to the Boboli Gardens about 1830, when various other statues were also moved from the Medici villa (fig. 25).

Menageries of domestic and exotic animals were often kept at Renaissance courts, and one in or near Urbino may have provided inspiration for this subject as well as models for the artist. Apes are often depicted in art as comic correlates of men and women, but in this case they seem to signify a balance between human creations and nature's beauty. To his court in Urbino and palace at Pesaro, Francesco Maria II della Rovere brought important painters, and he also sponsored workshops for various types of craftsmen. The pious
duke often employed these artists to create religious works, but for his fountain at the Villa Miralfiore, which served as a retreat from his official life, he commissioned statues of creatures that connote freedom and natural behavior.10

Identifying the Museum’s statue and the Boboli Gardens’ apes with the Della Rovere commission and with Mariani was an important achievement. At one stroke Schmidt and Tarca resurrected an important Renaissance sculptural entity and extended our knowledge of the sculptor’s range. Mariani’s stucco saints for the church of San Bernardo alle Terme, created in Rome shortly after he left Pesaro, testify to his powerful sense of form and ability to imbue his figures with dynamic movement and their features with animated expressions. All of these capabilities are seen in the apes, but in the absence of other animal sculptures from Mariani’s hand, it would not have been possible to attribute these scattered fountain figures to him without documentation.

1. Stone’s diagram is in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
7. In a survey of the grounds at Miralfoire dated November 22, 1777, Antonio Bamborzo and Domenico Massi described the fountain as “a curved small, ribbed . . . basin of stone with its fountain in the middle, which falls into a small . . . bowl of bronze, which is held up by four young little monkeys likewise of bronze.” Archivio di Stato, Rome, Camerale III, busta 2443. (Translated in European Sculpture 2002, p. 72, n. 10.)
8. The following entry in the Medici register of ducal furnishings (Archivio di Stato, Florence, Guardaroba Medicea 657, fol. 158) may describe Mariani’s simian group as it was displayed at Poggio Imperiale: “Two monkeys, in fact three, of cast metal in various poses taken by her Serene Highness.” Translated in European Sculpture 2002, p. 73, n. 11.
32. Apollo

ADRIAEN DE VRIES (DUTCH, 1556–1626)
Probably Augsburg, ca. 1594–98
Bronze statuette
1 3/4 × 1 1/4 × 3 1/2 in. (4.7 × 3.2 × 9.1 cm)
Bequest of George Blumenthal, 1941. 41.190.534

PROVENANCE: George and Florence Blumenthal, New York (by 1926, until her death in 1930); George Blumenthal (until d. 1941; his bequest to MMA with life interest to his widow, Ann Payne Blumenthal, later Mrs. Ralph K. Robertson, terminated in 1966)


The critical fortunes of this bronze reflect scholarly advances in the field of Mannerist sculpture since the 1920s. While in the Blumenthal collection, it was attributed to the most famous maker of bronze statuettes during the second half of the sixteenth century, Giambologna (see entry no. 30); however, it formally entered the Museum in 1966 as a work by the latter’s rival Benvenuto Cellini. After exhibitions on Giambologna and publications on Cellini helped to clarify their oeuvres, Olga Raggio proposed ascribing the piece to Adriaen de Vries, basing her attribution on an inscription at the bottom of an engraving of our Apollo by Jan Muller (fig. 28), which identified De Vries as the design’s inventor. In 1998–2000, the first major exhibition ever devoted to De Vries confirmed his authorship of the Museum’s Apollo.

This sculptor, born in The Hague, was international in his formation and practice. While his apprenticeship in Holland is uncertain, documents confirm that he worked from 1581 to 1586 with Giambologna in Florence, where a number of Netherlandish sculptors had already joined the great master from Douai. Subsequently De Vries worked with others or as his own man first in Milan, and then in Turin, Augsburg, and Prague. Both the source and the style of Apollo reflect his Italian experiences. Inevitably the most famous antique representation of the god, the Apollo Belvedere—which was accessible for study when De Vries visited Rome in 1595—resonates in the frontal view of our Apollo as he strides forward on his right foot, the other trailing behind, and twists his head sharply to his left. But the spiraling composition, resolved into clearly defined views from sides and back, moves well beyond its ancient inspiration to the multiple viewpoints favored by the front-runner of Mannerist style, Giambologna. Apollo’s left arm is extended forcefully forward; only a fragment of the bow he holds remains to suggest his activity. Unlike the ancient Apollo, he does not gaze where his weapon points. Interestingly, Jan Muller provided an explanation for this: in his engraving, the god’s glance is directed at a python on cliffs above; he seems to have just sighted his prey and will immediately turn to shoot.

But creating an elegant pose concerned De Vries more than depicting realistic action. The back view of Apollo reflects the care with which the sculptor worked out the contrapposto. There are similarities with his statuette of a faun (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden) in the curvature of the spine and twists of the body, though the Apollo moves less gracefully than the Faun. Both of these bronzes were likely made in the 1590s, either in Augsburg or in Prague. On the evidence of Muller’s print, datable to about 1598, and because we know that the sculptor and the engraver collaborated, probably
between 1594 and 1598, it is probably correct to say that the Apollo was executed in Augsburg during those years. A drawing of Apollo in Gdansk (fig. 27) has been identified as preparatory to the statuette. The drawn figure's more pronounced sway and stocky body, as well as the positioning of the right arm and pentimenti in the penciled right leg under the penned one, suggest that this is an initial concept rather than a copy after the statuette.

In addition to large fountain groups in Augsburg—Mercury (1599) and Hercules (1597–1602)—and busts executed in Prague of his principal patrons, including Rudolf II (1603, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), De Vries made several small bronzes of classical subjects during his early period. Few survive—the Faun and a Nymph (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Grünes Gewölbe, Dresden) are thought to be after his model rather than directly finished by him—so the Apollo is a rare example of this artist's production of statuettes on this scale before 1600.

4. See De Vries 1998, pp. 115–17, no. 5 (entry by Frits Scholten); pp. 248–49, no. 45 (entry by Thomas Dacosta Kaufmann).
33. Orpheus

**Cristoforo Stati, also called Cristofano da Bracciano**

*Italian, 1556–1619*

Florence, 1600–1601

Marble statue

77 ⅞ × 38 × 23 ⅜ in. (195.9 × 96.5 × 60.6 cm)

Gift of George Blumenthal, 1941 41.100.242

When this sculpture was given to the museum in 1941, it was identified as an Apollo made by Pietro Francavilla (1548–1615) for the palace of Averardo Salvati in Florence; however, the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore possessed a marble Apollo that was considered to be the one carved for Salvati. The discrepancy was resolved when Filippo Rossi, director of the galleries and museums in Florence, identified the Metropolitan’s statue as the *Orpheus* by Cristoforo Stati described as in the Palazzo Corsi by Giovanni Cinelli in the 1677 edition of Francesco Bocchi’s * Beauties of the City of Florence.*

Recent research by Donatella Pegazzano ties the *Orpheus* securely to Jacopo di Giovanni Corsi, who died in 1602. This renowned composer and patron of music was director of Euridice, an opera with music by Jacopo Peri and libretto by Ottavio Rinuccini. Its most famous production took place on October 6, 1600, at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, on the occasion of the wedding of Maria de’ Medici to King Henry IV of France. Pegazzano’s discovery of a payment on February 23, 1601, by Corsi to Cristoforo Stati for statues of a Triton (now lost) and an *Orpheus* securely identifies Corsi as Stati’s patron and dates the statue of Orpheus. She also makes the interesting proposal that the statue is Corsi’s enduring monument to the ephemeral production of the opera, of which Orpheus is the principal protagonist. Jacopo purchased a house on the via del Parione in 1593. Here an early recital of Euridice took place, and it is the likely site for which Orpheus was originally commissioned. Pegazzano also advances the hypothesis that a never-completed fountain for which Stati made a model was intended as a base for the *Orpheus*, but the evidence is not conclusive. Following Jacopo Corsi’s death, his brother moved works of art from via del Parione to the new family palace on via Tornabuoni, and the statue is described as standing there not only by Cinelli but also in documents of 1679, 1685, 1747, and 1824.

Given Stati’s relative obscurity, the misidentification of the statue as by Francavilla is not surprising. Recent studies and the rediscovery of several more of the artist’s statues now make it possible to place the *Orpheus* in a firmer stylistic context. Stati was born near Rome, at Bracciano, but he is likely to have trained in Florence, possibly under Valerio Cioli, who is best known as a carver of garden statuary for the Medici. Stati’s debt to Giambologna and his Florentine followers is undeniable. As the sculptor of the Museum’s *Orpheus*, he must have known Francavilla’s lifesize marble *Orpheus and Cerberus*, dated 1598 (fig. 29). While the pose of the legs is reversed in the two statues, the stance is the same, and the positioning of the musician’s hands on his instrument (a lira da braccio) as well as the angle of the upturned heads are nearly identical. Stati chose a tree stump rather than a
PROVENANCE: Commissioned by Jacopo di Giovanni Corsi, via del Parione, Florence (1601- d. 1602); his brother Bardo di Giovanni Corsi, Palazzo Corsi, via Tornabuoni, Florence (1602- d. 1625); descended in the family, in the same location, until ca. 1824; Joseph Sporidon, France; (Jacques Seligmann and Company, New York); George and Florence Blumenthal, New York (by 1926, until her death in 1930); George Blumenthal (until d. 1941; his gift to MMA).


LITERATURE: Bocchi and Cinelli 1677, p. 576; Fournier-Sarlovézé 1902, p. 52 (this and the following two references as representing Apollo by Pietro Francavilla), ill. p. 50; Rubinstein-Bloc 1926-30, vol. 2, pl. xix; Collection of George Blumenthal 1943, ill. no. 14; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1987b, p. 158, pl. 122; Susanna Zanuso in Bacchi 1996, p. 845; Ferrari and Papaldo 1999, p. xxxvii, n. 10; Wardropper 1999, pp. 34-37, fig. 10; C. Avery 2001, pp. 323-24, fig. 20; Pegazzano 2009, figs. 1, 2; Pegazzano 2010, pp. 13-26, fig. 1.

figure of Cerberus as support between Orpheus’s legs. Francavilla’s statue has an angularity and tension that refer back to Giambologna’s brand of Mannerism, but Statti’s sways smoothly in a continuous upward motion. Not fleshy and muscular like Francavilla’s Orpheus, Statti’s is sleek, with lean proportions and clear outlines. The pronounced tilt of the body echoes the Antinous Belvedere, and this reference to a canonical antique work reflects the sculptor’s activity as a restorer of ancient marbles. The slim, nearly adolescent body type anticipates that of Adonis in Statti’s Venus and Adonis (ca. 1605–15, Palazzo Communale, Bracciano). The markedly tilted hips relate the musician’s pose to Statti’s recently discovered marble Cleopatra (1607, Dexia Crediop, Rome) and to Samson in his Samson and the Lion (1604–7, Art Institute of Chicago). The fairly small, circular base emphasizes Orpheus’s song, which seems to flow out far beyond its narrow confines. Statti chose similar bases for Cleopatra and for Friendship, a marble figure of a nude woman in the Louvre. The regular scoring of the tree trunk and base, similar to that on Samson and the Lion and Cleopatra, reflects the precision with which Statti approached the task of carving.
In his appendix to Bocchi’s guidebook, Cinelli described Stati’s Orpheus as singing before Pluto, but there is no evidence for this in the statue. Francavilla’s version clearly situates the hero at the mouth of Hades, which the three-headed dog Cerberus is known to guard, and thus implies that with his music Orpheus is persuading the lord of the underworld to free his wife, Eurydice. Known from many ancient sources, this famous myth was a subject often explored in art, music, and literature during the early seventeenth century. Orpheus frequently is depicted in the company of animals that are tamed by the beauty of his song. Here, he is alone, projecting his voice toward an unseen audience. Crowned with a wreath of laurel, this Orpheus embodies the perfection of music, and as its commission suggests, it memorializes a remarkable early operatic performance.

1. References for the statue in the Walkers Art Gallery (now Museum) include Baldinucci 1681–1728/1845–47, vol. 3, p. 54; Serie degli uomini più illustri 1774, p. 22; Dussieux 1875, pp. 418–39.
2. Rossi to John Goldsmith Phillips, July 28, 1928, letter in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum. Cinelli’s description of Stati’s statue (Bocchi and Cinelli 1877, p. 576) is quoted here: “nel Palazzo chi è oggi del Marchese Corsi un Orfeo di marmo in atto di sonare avanti Pluto bellissimo, di Cristofano da Bracciano” (in the palace that today is owned by the Marquis Corsi, there is a beautiful marble Orpheus playing before Pluto by Cristofano da Bracciano).
5. Ibid., p. 323. Francavilla’s composition influenced other sculptors, too: Hendrik de Keyser’s bronze Orpheus with Cerberus of about 1610, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, is one example. Schoffen 1955, p. 841, states that it is “well-nigh certain that de Keyser would also have known Francavilla’s Orpheus at first hand” from a study trip to Paris of about 1610.
6. Haskell and Penny 1981, pp. 141–43, no. 4, fig. 73.
7. Martinelli 1957.
8. Wardropper 1999; C. Avery 2001, p. 324, fig. 11.
11. An example in this Museum is the depiction in pietre dure (hardstone mosaic) at the center of a cabinet made for the Barberini family in Florence between 1606 and 1623 (acc. no. 1988.29); see Wolfram Koeppe in Kisluk-Grosheide, Koeppe, and Krieder 2006, pp. 28–30, no. 9.
34. Tarquinius and Lucretia

AFTER A MODEL ATTRIBUTED TO HUBERT GERHARD (GERMAN, CA. 1540/50–BEFORE 1621)

1605-10
Bronze group
19 11/16 x 15 x 13 3/4 in. (50.3 x 38.1 x 39.1 cm)
Edith Perry Chapman Fund, 1930. 50.201

PROVENANCE: Baron Heinrich Thyssen-Bornemisza, Schloss Rohonc, Hungary/Austria, then Villa Favorita, Lugano, Switzerland (until d. 1929); his son, Baron Hans Heinrich Thyssen-Bornemisza, Villa Favorita (until 1950); [Adolph Loewi, Los Angeles, 1930; sold to MMA]


LITERATURE: Schloss Rohonczi 1930, p. 14, no. 34, pl. 16 (as by Adriaen de Vries); Berliner 1931, pp. 27–28, fig. 24/1 (as a variant cast, as Netherlandish); Feulner 1941, p. 40, no. 80 (as by Hubert Gerhard); Olga Raggio in Italian Heritage 1967, n.p., no. 53 (as by Gerhard), ill.; Weihrauch 1967, p. 331 (as by Gerhard); William D. Wixom in Renaissance Bronzes 1975, n.p., under no. 213 (as by Gerhard); Frits Scholten in De Vries 1958, pp. 134–36, under no. 11 (as by De Vries); Scholten 1958, fig. 12 (as by De Vries); Dorothea Diemer in De Vries 2000, pp. 331–33, no. 45 (as by De Vries or Gerhard), ill.; Diemer 2001, pp. 199–200 (as by Gerhard or De Vries); Diemer 2004, vol. 1, pp. 405–11, fig. 266, vol. 2, pp. 178–79, no. 112 (as not by Gerhard)

IN THE LATE SIXTEENTH CENTURY THE INNOVATIVE STYLE AND phenomenal success of the sculptor Giambologna (see entry no. 30) attracted many artists to Florence to join his large workshop. Two sculptors born, as was that master, in the Low Countries — Hubert Gerhard, from Zutphen, and Adriaen de Vries, from The Hague — absorbed his manner but transformed it into distinctive idioms that they carried back to northern Europe. De Vries (see entry no. 32) was peripatetic, occupied by commissions in Milan, Turin, Augsburg, and Prague; Gerhard worked mainly in the South German cities of Augsburg, Innsbruck, and Munich. Both mastered the medium of bronze, working often at a large or lifesize scale but also producing statuettes. This Tarquinius and Lucretia, of which a number of versions exist, interacts with aspects of each sculptor's style, and over the years its attribution has shifted back and forth between them.1

In the Museum's bronze group the struggling figures' tightly interwoven limbs express the tension and violence of the historical subject, the rape of a Roman matron, which prompted her suicide (see entry no. 50). Hubert Gerhard's large-scale sculpture Mars, Venus, and Cupid (ca. 1585–90, Schloss Kirchheim, near Augsburg), and a smaller, variant bronze of the subject he produced some two decades later (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) are closely related to the present work in their composition, especially in the way the man's leg is slung over the woman's.2 On this basis, the scholarly world concurred that Gerhard must have devised the Tarquinius and Lucretia. Recent reappraisals not only of Gerhard's work but also of De Vries's have put the authorship of this bronze group at issue. In 1958 Frits Scholten found the movement of the figures coordinated in one direction to be unlike the complex, back-and-forth poses of Gerhard's groups, particularly the Mars, Venus, and Cupid.3 He also singled out two De Vries compositions, the Gladiator (ca. 1602–11, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and the lost statue of Cleopatra, known through prints, as sources for the two figures. In 2000 the foremost expert on Gerhard, Dorothea Diemer, thought that the Tarquinius and Lucretia could be by either Gerhard or De Vries, but in her latest publication, which is the definitive study of Gerhard to date, she relegates it to a "rejected attributions" category.4 Yet the movements of Tarquinius and Lucretia seem more tightly structured than De Vries's loose-limbed, off-kilter poses and generally more in line with Gerhard's disciplined compositions; thus, we maintain the attribution to Gerhard here, while acknowledging Diemer's opinion to the contrary.

Unusual for either artist is the large number of casts that exist of this group. At least ten are known, including one of lesser quality in the Jack and Belle Linsky collection in this Museum.5 Significant

108 |
differences distinguish them. For example, in the present version, there is no drapery over or under Tarquiniius’s slung leg but some falls over Lucretia’s left leg; a version in Cleveland shows cloth draped over the left thighs of both protagonists; and in yet another version, in a private collection in England, Lucretia has no drapery over her left thigh but a passage of fabric separates her thighs from his. In each work cloth threads through the limbs in different rhythms; for this author, the direct contact of flesh on flesh in the Museum’s version offers the most forceful representation of sexual predation. William Wixom has argued that the Cleveland version was the first one because it lacks a base and has the subtlest modeling. Scholten, on the other hand, believed that either the version in an English collection or the one in the Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, is likely to be the original because of their square bases (a preference of De Vries’s) and because the figures lack a cache-sexe. There is a considerable range in the quality of the casting among the ten versions, and some have faults in their metal; this and the substantial differences among the models make it likely that the ten were produced over a significant period of time, probably with the intervention of other artists. The Museum’s work was only minimally chased after casting; it has a skillful join below the elbow of Tarquiniius’s right arm and a repair of screwed-in plugs below Lucretia’s left knee.

2. For the Mars, Venus, and Cupid at Schloss Kirchheim, see ibid., vol. 1, fig. 154, vol. 2, pp. 147–49, no. 67, pls. 22–25, 1280–31, and for the variant at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, ibid., vol. 2, no. 116, pp. 158–59, pls. 37, 22, 73.
5. William D. Wixom in Renaissance Bronzes 1975, n.p., no. 213, provides a list of the variants, to which should be added the version in an English private collection (Scholten in De Vries 1998, pp. 134–36, no. 11). The version in the Linsky collection is acc. no. 5982.60.122.
PIETRO BERNNINI (ITALIAN, 1562–1629),
ASSISTED BY GIANLORENZO BERNNINI (ITALIAN, 1598–1680)

Rome, 1616–17
Pair of marble terracotta figures
Autumn: 89 1/4 x 30 3/4 x 27 1/4 in. (227.6 x 77.8 x 70.2 cm)
Spring: 89 1/4 x 34 3/4 x 27 1/2 in. (226.4 x 87.3 x 69.9 cm)
Inscribed (probably later, on side of block below Autumn's right arm): 68

PROVENANCE: Delivered to Cardinal Scipione Borghese for his gardens at the Villa Borghese, Rome (1617–d. 1633); subsequent gardens of the villa (until 1891); presumably bought in Rome by Luther Kountze for his estate in Morristown, New Jersey (probably 1891–d. 1918); his son William de Lancey Kountze and Martha Kountze, estate at Morristown (until his death in 1925); Order of Saint Benedict of New Jersey, Saint Mary's Abbey–Delbarton School, Morristown (1925–90; sold to MMA)

This pair of playful garden statues—a type known as terracotta figures—was commissioned by Cardinal Scipione Borghese (see no. 40) for his villa in Rome in 1616. They were completed in 1617 and transported to the site from the sculptor Pietro Bernini’s house near the church of Santa Maria Maggiore. Set up just inside the garden gates, at either end of a hemispherical topiary, these terracotta framed a visitor’s first glimpse of the gardens. An engraving by Matteo (Matthäus) Greuter of about 1623 (fig. 30) shows their relation to the gates and the topiary court called a “theatre.” They were erected on pedestals carved with emblems of the Borghese eagle, as a later lithograph bears witness. Two years later, six additional terracotta, more conventional and severely classicizing, were completed at the Bernini workshop and joined the first two in the Borghese gardens. In 1650 Jacomo Manilli, who had been Cardinal Borghese’s household manager, published an account of the villa in which he described the Museum’s pair as representing the “God of the orchards, the other one Pomona, standing on travertine pedestals carved with the Borghese arms, as if kindly to invite the guests to enjoy the delights of the gardens. They are modern works by Pietro Bernini assisted by his son, the Cavaliere Lorenzo, when he was still a young man.”

Their location was carefully considered: both statues lean slightly back and gaze toward a point that must have been in the center of the gates. Each carries a basket—the man’s overflowing with autumnal fruit and vegetables, the woman’s with flowers—and each wears a headdress to match. Commentators have taken Manilli’s phrase “god of the orchards” to mean Priapus, the Roman god of fertility, here representing the season of autumn. Manilli called his companion Pomona, goddess of fruit, which she is usually shown carrying. Since here the female figure bears only flowers, she is believed—despite Manilli’s characterization—to be Flora and to represent spring. With a broad nose and squinting eyes, Priapus’s face is twisted into a mischievous leer; Flora’s conventionally pretty countenance forms a smile. Appropriate to their rustic character, the pair wear animal skins slung over one shoulder. Each skin flaps forward into a triangle below the waist. Its taper echoes that of the shield-shaped architectural element covering the rectangular base that composes the lower half of the body. Feet emerge beneath a molding at the bottom.

Terms are ancient architectural forms, half-human, half-pillar, that were set up to mark boundaries, as these two did in Cardinal Borghese’s garden. While there must have been examples from classical antiquity for the sculptor to emulate—and we know that they were originally paired with ancient terms, now lost—their broad


Humor and forms flow from the early Baroque sensibility and reflect a number of other sculptures by Pietro Bernini. After this pair was rediscovered on a Morristown, New Jersey, estate in the 1970s, a group of related statues with affinities to the Museum’s terms has been identified. Chief among them is a series of the four seasons executed by Pietro Bernini and his workshop about 1616–18 (Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati). Like the Museum’s terms, they are comically leering men or quietly smiling women bearing clusters of fruit or flowers. Pietro Bernini’s penchant for deeply undercutting forms to achieve a pictorial character through light and shade and for twisting his figures in Mannerist style comes through even more forcefully in the Aldobrandini Four Seasons.

Much debate has centered on the relative roles of Pietro and Gianlorenzo Bernini in the carving of these figures. Already a brilliant sculptor with solo works to his credit, Gianlorenzo was still in his teens when he apprenticed in his father’s studio, so Pietro received payment for all commissions executed in the shop during this period and his son’s contribution is not recorded. Valentino Martinelli (who was the first to identify them, in 1962, without knowing their exact location) attributed Autumn to Gianlorenzo and Spring to Pietro, while arguing that Gianlorenzo conceived them both. In 1966, eminent scholar of the Italian Baroque Rudolf Wittkower gave them firmly to Pietro.6 Catherine Sloane, who rediscovered them in Morristown, New Jersey, and published them in 1974, regarded them both as by Gianlorenzo.7 More recently, scholars have favored the primacy of Pietro.8 In the end, as Irving Lavin recently remarked, it is difficult to ignore Manilli’s contemporary statement that Pietro was responsible for the conception and overall execution of the pair and Gianlorenzo for the fruit and vegetables, playing a minor role.9 Fascinating as it is to tease out the earliest efforts of the greatest Baroque sculptor, it is more useful to recognize Pietro’s imaginative and entrepreneurial role in conceiving this relaxed and amusing race of garden statues. Intimately involved in the series, Gianlorenzo contributed to the process but, more importantly, absorbed attitudes of theatricality and caricature that helped to define his mature style.

6. For example, Alessandro Angelini (2004, p. 18) and Hans-Ulrich Kessler (2005, pp. 78–79) consider these works entirely by Pietro Bernini.
GIANLORENZO BERNINI (ITALIAN, 1598–1680)
AND PIETRO BERNINI (ITALIAN, 1562–1629)

Rome, ca. 1616–17
Marble group
52 3/4 × 29 × 18 3/4 in. (134 × 73.7 × 47.9 cm)


Crackling with energy, this complex sculptural group makes an immediate impression. A faun clammers up a fig tree to pick fruit, acrobatically straddling the trunk while grabbing a high branch. His act is so forceful that the limb snaps. In the tree, two children razz the faun; one pulls his hair, the other sticks out a tongue, and they link arms to obstruct him from reaching his goal. Subsidary incidents further animate the scene. On the ground a lioness rises, like the faun, to reach some dangling grapes, and in her movement a third child is bucked off. Grapevines cling to the fig tree, making it doubly tempting to the hungry creatures seeking its bounty. Before ascending, the climber must have paused to drape his lion’s-skin cloak on a low branch, and it hangs there in an uncanny juxtaposition to the live lioness on the other side of the tree. Among the roots a lizard scurries to observe the lioness.

Only a carver of great virtuosity could realize such an inventive and complex sculpture. The long and narrow shape of the block of raw material available for this subject constrained the composition, which is best viewed from the front but also rewards observation at the back (see page 115). The narrow ends of the block are less interesting because details are compressed; however, the children’s faces can only be appreciated from a side view. The sculptor pierced openings through the stone so that light would fall on human limbs and tree branches to make dynamic linear patterns. Textures color the sculpture. The faun’s smooth skin stands out against the tree bark, roughened by concentric chisel marks. Whorls of hair, drooping leaves, and bunches of fruit create pockets of shadow across the surface of the marble. Repeated drill marks roughen the lioness’s fur between paw and ground; holes bored between vine and trunk and in many other passages of the sculpture seem to have been left simply for their pleasing patterns.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Italian patrons admired bacchic subjects in art, and collectors sought out ancient Roman statuary with such themes. Annibale Carracci’s Triumph of Bacchus and Ariadne fresco on one of the Palazzo Farnese ceilings elicited admiration from all; scenes of Bacchus’s return from India with a retinue of revelers and wild beasts decorated ancient sarcophagi in Roman collections.4 Licentious, amusing depictions of ancient deities and woodland spirits were considered appropriate decorations for the gardens that wealthy Romans such as Cardinal Scipione Borghese were creating to surround their villas. For patrons who enjoyed such bacchic subjects, Pietro Bernini, assisted by his son Gianlorenzo, carved several sculptures in the decade 1610–20. The Museum owns one pair, Autumn and Spring (nos. 35, 36). Another set, a Four Seasons,
is in the collection of the Villa Aldobrandini at Frascati, and a third, now-lost group once graced the Palazzo Altemps, Rome.3 Some of the statues share the motif of fauns (or satyrs) holding bunches of grapes aloft, occasionally accompanied by animals. Of the surviving statues on this theme, the Museum’s Bacchanal is the most complex and refined.

Uncontestably the work of a master, it nevertheless poses a problem of authorship. There is no doubt that it comes from the workshop of Pietro Bernini in the period when Gianlorenzo assisted his father, and it was documented in the house of Gianlorenzo in the inventory taken after his death.4 But we do not know whether it is primarily the work of Pietro or of Gianlorenzo or a collaborative effort; nor can scholars agree whether it is even possible to distinguish the hand of the father from that of the son during this period.5 Gianlorenzo worked for his father and collaborated on sculptures for which Pietro, as head of the workshop, received sole payment. There are works made between 1610 and 1620 that are by Pietro alone, such as the relief in the Cappella Paolina in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome. The prodigy Gianlorenzo produced works during that decade that scholars accept to be uniquely his, such as Putto with a Dolphin (1617, Bode Museum, Berlin) and Saint Sebastian (1617, Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection, Lugano). The linear energy of Bacchanal looks back to Mannerism in such a striking fashion that the group was attributed to the preeminent sculptor of that period, Giambologna, when it appeared at auction in 1973.6 There is a notably Mannerist aspect to Pietro’s aesthetic; the muscular torso of the faun, however, relates most closely to Gianlorenzo’s canon, in works such as the Saint Sebastian, with its solidity and precise definition. The smiling faces of the two children are a motif invented by Pietro for the Cappella Paolina relief, but here they reflect Gianlorenzo’s sharper, more parodic version in the Putto with a Dolphin. The emergence of Gianlorenzo’s style from his father’s is what makes this moment in his career — and this sculpture — so intriguing and so problematic. The daring and ambition of the composition and the virtuoso showmanship of its carving, to this author, signal the spirit of the young Gianlorenzo. This attribution follows Olga Raggio, whose greatest acquisition this was and who made a carefully reasoned argument for Gianlorenzo, while observing that the basic composition and spirit owed much to Pietro.7

2. See, for example, a Roman sarcophagus of the second century A.D. in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. For Carracci’s fresco, see Posner 1971, vol. 1, pp. 104–10, vol. 2, pl. 111x.
3. J. Lavin 2004, pp. 49–50. Lavin (ibid., pp. 49–52) dates another sculpture in this group, the Fountain with Satyr and Pantherea (Bode Museum, Berlin), to 1594–95, earlier than most scholars do, for this reason, it needs to be considered apart from the others.
6. For the auction, see the Provenance, above.
38. Saint John the Baptist

JUAN MARTÍNEZ MONTAÑÉS (SPANISH, 1568–1649)
Seville, ca. 1620–30
Wood statue, painted
60¼ × 29¼ × 27¼ in. (154 × 75.2 × 70.2 cm)
Purchase, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1963  63.40

PROVENANCE: Convento de la Nuestra Señora de la Concepción, Seville (monastery suppressed in 1837); Henry Symons (until 1923; his sale, Anderson Galleries, New York, January 21–February 3, 1923, no. 1023); [Mildred Centers, Jacksonville, Florida, until 1963; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: González de León 1844, vol. 1, pp. 228–29;

JUAN MARTÍNEZ MONTAÑÉS WAS ONE OF THE GREATEST SPANISH sculptors of the first half of the seventeenth century. Based in Seville, he carved numerous wooden statues and reliefs that were painted and integrated into large altar screens called retablos (English: retablos) for churches in his native region or to be shipped to the New World. His forte as an artist was the single figure, standing or seated, usually robust, naturally posed, and richly robed. Somewhat defensively, he gave his reason for this: “As for the appearance of the statues when they are seen away from their settings by those who do not understand or maliciously criticize them, we say that once they are in their places they will be very effective, and if they did not have so much drapery they would look very insignificant when they were put in compartments at a distance.”

To modern eyes, his works even when removed from their original contexts have a powerfully sculptural form; but it is important to remember how critical the original church setting was in the artist’s conception. The Museum’s statue of Saint John the Baptist, a rare work by the master in a collection outside Spain or South America, illustrates these points. A mature man with a powerful physique, he wears a short brown tunic cinched with a rope around the waist. A crimson robe patterned with foliage and cherub heads is draped over his shoulder and partially covers the rock formation on which he stands and leans. His left hand rests on the rock while his right reaches across his body to point. This gesture was certainly toward a missing Lamb of God on an altar in the monastery church for which Saint John was made or toward the top of a banderole with the message “Behold the Lamb of God” stuck in the ground by the saint’s left foot (where a hole exists) and rising to his left shoulder. The altar of Saint John the Baptist (1635–37) in the Convento de Santa Paula, Seville (fig. 31), gives an idea of how this might have appeared. His strong, defined carved features include a thin, split goatee—the rest of his light beard and mustache are painted—a knot of hair over the forehead and long tousled locks, a creased forehead, and straight, subtly carved eyebrows. Made of Spanish cedar, the statue has held up relatively well over the centuries, although some fingers of the right hand have been recarved and the right arm rejoined.

As a physical type, John the Baptist is like other statues of the saint carved by the artist. The one he made for the retablo of San Isidoro del Campo at Santiponce (after 1609) is generally similar in pose, though the raised foot of the Museum’s figure makes the saint’s gesture more emphatic, and its face is smoother and not quite as eloquent as here. Closer to this one in its powerful presence and expressive face is the Saint John the Baptist in high relief on the retablo

fig. 31 Juan Martínez Montañés, retablo of Saint John the Baptist, 1635–37. Painted wood. Convento de Santa Paula, Seville
of the Convento de San Leandro, Seville (1622–23). A dating of the Museum’s statue during the artist’s mature years seems to be borne out by these comparisons. Beatrice Prosko assigned it to the 1620s or early 1630s. José Hernández Díaz preferred to date the figure to the first decade of the century, before the retablo of San Isidoro at Santiponce.

He viewed the Museum’s Saint John as a striking and characteristic work entirely by Martínez Montañés, but Prosko thought she detected the intervention of another artist in the sculptor’s workshop and described it as in the style of Montañés.

Documents connect the statue to the Sevillian Convent de la Nuestra Señora de la Concepción, which was suppressed in 1837. In a notice published in 1844 that inventoried the contents of the monastery church, Félix González de León described one of its retablos:

Under a big molded arch with pilasters supporting a cornice, on a high pedestal placed over the base of the retable itself stood the most beautiful figure of Saint John the Baptist ever made by the celebrated Martínez Montañés. One can hardly explain the beauties of the design and the treatment of draperies and body of this famous image, the honor of its author and its country.

He further noted niches on either side of the statue decorated with pediments and angels and filled with paintings of stories about the saint. Relatively modest by the standards of the time, the retablo must have been somewhat like those in the Convento de Santa Paula, centered on the statue of the saint. Martínez Montañés’s resolutely straightforward image with pleasing partial side views would have been well suited to such a frame. The emphatic gesture was designed to be read from a distance, and as the sculptor himself explained, the voluminous drapery would give the figure weight and solidity in the midst of such splendid decorations. The sculptor’s father was an embroiderer in the city of Alcalá la Real, and the son’s taste for richly decorated textiles must have developed early in life. Traditionally, Spanish sculpture of this period was painted by specialists other than the carver. This figure’s relatively simple painted patterns and colors only enhance the power of the carving.

---

3. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Madison, Wisconsin, letter of April 25, 1966, in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum. The statue was cleaned by Christine Faltermeier and the right arm reset by Rudolph Colman in the summer of 1975.
4. Prosko 1967, pp. 61–69, figs. 73, 76.
5. Ibid., pp. 93–95, figs. 108, 109, 131.
39. The Youthful Saint John the Baptist

DOMENICO PIERATTI (ITALIAN, 1600–1656)
Florence, ca. 1625–30
Marble statuette
28 × 17 3/4 × 13 3/4 in. (71.1 × 44.5 × 35.7 cm)
European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2006.2006.70

PROVENANCE: Marchese Tempi, Casa de’ Tempi, Florence (by 1677); Bargagli family, Palazzo Bargagli, Florence; [art market, Florence]; [Thomas Howard-Sneyd, London, by 1882]; sale, Sotheby’s London, December 9, 2005, no. 114, not sold; sold in early 2006 by private arrangement through Sotheby’s to MMA


As the center of gravity in Italian art shifted to Rome in the seventeenth century, the powerful and dramatic style of Gianlorenzo Bernini increasingly dominated the field of sculpture. In Florence, the heirs of the workshop of Giambologna and the masters in his train, such as the Taccas and the Susinis, continued to produce bronze statuettes, though in a more suave and pictorial manner than was seen in Rome. Marble carvers also developed a style that was quieter and more courtly than Bernini’s Baroque manner. The generation of artists who followed the leading sculptor, Giovanni Caccini—including Domenico Pieratti, his brother Giovanni Battista, and Antonio Novelli—obtained commissions for the city’s churches and palaces and the Boboli Gardens.

Pieratti’s Youthful Saint John the Baptist is entirely characteristic of seventeenth-century sculpture in Florence. A favorite Florentine subject, the city’s patron saint is seen seated on an ivy-clad rock formation. A lamb stands near him at the base of a shepherd’s staff, which now lacks the crook that originally grazed the Baptist’s left shoulder. A banderole snakes around the staff— the missing section was no doubt inscribed “Ecce Agnus Dei” (Behold the Lamb of God), a reference to the saint’s cousin, Christ, often made in such representations. John holds a honeycomb in his right hand, a biblical attribute that alludes to his mission in the wilderness, where he survived on locusts and honey. The saint is shown as an adolescent nude, his angled limbs setting off soft muscles and mossy locks of hair. The pose and attributes reflect iconographic traditions seen in other Florentine sculpture of the period. As James Draper has observed, the seated pose with crooked arm and the shadowed composition recall famed paintings of Saint John the Baptist by Caravaggio, such as those in the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City (1604–5) or the Galleria Borghese, Rome (after 1605). The sweeter, more languorous style is even closer to the work of Pieratti’s contemporaries in painting, such as Francesco Furini. Such analogies underlie the intensely pictorial approach of the carver; textures of honeycomb and rock striations detail the setting and act as foil to the nude youth.

The attribution to Pieratti is based on a late seventeenth-century sighting of the statue in Florence, as well as comparisons with other documented work. In 1677 Giovanni Cinelli noted two statuettes by the sculptor, a “Saint John the Baptist in the Wilderness” and a “Hercules and Iole” in the Casa de’ Tempi in Florence (the Hercules and Iole [1652] is now in the Palazzo Galli Tassi). Certainly this Saint John recalls Pieratti’s lanky youths with swinging poses, Cupid with the Key and Cupid with a Hammer, from the Boboli Gardens, created about 1618–23. His seated pose is more contained than the livelier, open attitudes of the Boboli youths, yet it is more relaxed than Pieratti’s
other statue of Saint John, an early standing marble figure now in the Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence, which has tightly contained limbs and a rigid pose. Claudio Pizzorusso dates the seated Saint John considerably later than those two works, to the 1640s, on the basis of the similarity of the hair to the thick, ruffled locks of Pieratti’s statue of a child supporting a holy-water stoup in the church of San Gaetano, Florence, and to a Gladiator by him in the Villa Medici at Castello. But there is a stiffening of pose in many of Pieratti’s later works, such as the Moorish Hunter (Boboli Gardens, Florence) or the Hercules and Iole that is entirely absent here. On balance, it would be appropriate to date it to an earlier stage, about 1625–30.

Statues of the Baptist, usually smaller and erect, often stood atop baptismal fonts in churches. The contemplative nature of this marble statue, however, seems better suited to a gallery or domestic setting, and, in fact, Cinelli described it as standing in a salotto, or drawing room, in the Casa de’ Tempi. While the back view is pleasing, it is mainly taken up by the rock formation, so the work may have been intended for placement against a wall rather than to be seen in the round. Its abraded surface is evidence that it was outdoors for a period in its history, but the weathered condition and a few losses—the toes of the left foot, parts of the staff and banner, and the now restored flank of the lamb—do not detract from the delicacy of Pieratti’s conception or the virtuoso undercutting of its details.

1. See, for example, the representation in the entry by Bruce Boucher in Earth and Fire 2001, pp. 154–55, no. 23. There, however, John wears an animal-skin tunic, as is often the case.
2. Notes by Draper in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum. For the paintings, see Kitson 1969, p. 98, no. 53, p. 100, no. 61.
3. See Pizzorusso 1989, pp. 94–95, fig. 87.
4. “Di cui passando in un salotto, si veggono due gruppi di piccole statue furo è un’Ercule, che piglia la conchiglia da Iole, ed Amore da parte: figure, e marmo Greco, l’altro un S. Gio. Battista nel deserto di mano del Pieratti rappresenta” (From here, passing into a drawing room, one sees two small sculpture groups, one a Hercules, who makes the acquaintance of Iole, with Cupid at the side, carved of Greek marble; the other a Saint John the Baptist in the Wilderness, from the hand of Pieratti); Becchi and Cinelli 1877, p. 281.
40. Cardinal Scipione Borghese (1576–1633)

GIULIANO FINELLI (ITALIAN, 1601–1653)

Rome, 1631–32
Marble portrait bust
38 7/8 (with socle) x 37 7/8 x 16 in. (98.8 x 97.4 x 40.6 cm)
Purchase, Louisa Eldridge McBurney Gift, 1955 55.201

PROVENANCE: The sitter (1632–d. 1633); Prince Paolo Borghese, Rome (until 1892; his sale, Rome, March 28–April 9, 1892, no. 340, to Manskopf); Gustav D. Manskopf, Frankfurt (until d. 1900); [Raoul Helbronner, Berlin, until d. 1941]; his daughter; [French and Company, New York, until 1955; sold to MMA]


Nephew of Pope Paul V, Cardinal Scipione Borghese (1576–1633) was one of the wealthiest and most powerful men in Rome during the first third of the seventeenth century. An astute art collector, he commissioned sculptures that would come to define the Baroque movement. His splendid gardens were entered through a gate flanked by term figures carved by Pietro and Gianlorenzo Bernini (nos. 35, 36), and his villa just north of the Pincian Gate displayed early masterpieces by Gianlorenzo, such as Apollo and Daphne (1622–24, Galleria Borghese, Rome). Despite the cardinal’s early patronage of Bernini, Pope Urban VIII’s conditions of employment made it difficult for anyone else to procure the sculptor’s services, and when Scipione sought to have a portrait made in the early 1630s he had to turn to another man, Giuliano Finelli. Scipione persevered and eventually obtained what he wanted from Bernini—a work that became one of the most famous of all Baroque portrait busts (fig. 32). Meanwhile, the
cardinal sat for Finelli, whose talents he had come to appreciate at first hand: as an assistant to Bernini, Finelli had carved with astonishing virtuosity the leaves, tendrils, and bark of Daphne's metamorphosis in the cardinal's own marble group *Apollo and Daphne*. Born in Carrara, where his father was a marble merchant, he had trained in Naples with his uncle Vitale Finelli and the better-known Michelangelo Naccherino, before moving to Rome in 1622.¹ There he joined the teams of sculptors working under Bernini, until he broke with the master in 1629, after being passed over for an important commission. For a brief period until 1634–35, when he returned to Naples, Finelli set up as an independent artist. During this time he carved some exceptional portrait busts, based on precedents in Bernini's work but with innovations all his own.

Although *Cardinal Scipione Borghese* is one of the most remarkable of his Roman-period portraits, Finelli's authorship of the bust has only recently been recognized. When it was sold by Prince Paolo Borghese in 1892, it was credited to Alessandro Algardi, an attribution that was accepted by the Museum at the time of its acquisition.² Certainly it shares the serious tone — in both its delicate carving and its psychological nuance — of works by Algardi such as Monsignor Antonio Cerri (ca. 1640, City Art Gallery, Manchester).³ However, in 1977 Jennifer Montagu published a document in the Borghese archives that mentions a payment to Finelli on June 7, 1632, for a bust of the cardinal.⁴ Furthermore, a letter from Tommaso Salviati to Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger (grandnephew of the Renaissance artist) of October 18, 1631, mentions that Finelli was then in the midst of carving the bust: "The sculptor Signor Giuliano ... has made [his bust of] Signor Bracciolini very well, and is making ... [one of] Signor Cardinal Borghese, which will be a very beautiful thing."⁵ Francesco Bracciolini (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), which Salviati indicates had just been finished, shares with *Cardinal Scipione Borghese* Finelli's virtuoso drizzling of the short beard and of the lace that appears beneath the collar, as well as the relaxed facial muscles and lightly ruffled hair.⁶ Such naturalistic details are hallmarks of Finelli's style. Irregularly unbuttoned holes along the mozzetta, and the cord (partially damaged) dangling from the vestment under the cape add an informal note, undercutting the formality of the cardinal's costume. Philipp Zitzlsperger notes the authority that the biretta confers on the cardinal, in contrast to busts that show prelates bareheaded,⁷ but Finelli's portrayal, down to the locks of hair poking out under the cap, emphasizes the character of the man rather than the prestige of the office.

The feature that most animates the bust is the slightly open mouth, lips pursed as if the cardinal were about to speak. While this innovation is usually credited to the more famous image of Scipione by Bernini, Andrea Bacchi notes that payment for Bernini's bust (two versions were carved) came early in 1633, seven months later, so Finelli's sculpture may have been finished before Bernini's was begun. Bacchi adds that this motif had already been introduced in Finelli's *Bust of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger* (Casa Buonarroti, Florence) of 1630.⁸ By comparison with Bernini's bust, Finelli's portrayal emphasizes the cardinal's calm demeanor and introspective character. Finelli's less pronounced carving of the pupils makes the expression more inward, while the straightforward angle of the head makes the sitter appear restrained. The vivacious, robust cardinal Bernini portrays, with sparkling eyes and twisted head, is in marked contrast. Given a contemporary biographer's description of the cardinal — "though of amiable character and of pleasant appearance, he was timid by nature"⁹ — one wonders whether Finelli's interpretation of Scipione Borghese as quiet and brooding, only one year before his death, was closer to the mark.

---

4. Montagu 1977, p. 323, n. 71. See also Montagu 1985, vol. 2, p. 473, under no. 236, in which is quoted an additional request in the *Registo dei Mandati* in the Vatican (A.S.V., C.B. 6093, p. 223, no. 233), dated June 25, 1632, to pay 90 scudi in reimbursement to "Giuliano Finelli Scultore per intero pagamento d’un ritratto fatto in marmo nella Villa fuori Porta Pinciana per servizio nostra." In the margin are the words "Ritratto di Sua Em." (Portrait of His Eminence).
5. Archivio Buonarroti, Florence, 53, XIII, 1637, quoted in Dombrowski 1997, p. 473, doc. no. 81. Written in Rome, the letter reads: "Signor Giuliano scultore ... Ha fatto il Signor Bracciolini benissimo et fa ... Signor Cardinale Borghese, che sera cosa bellissima."
Virgin and Child

CIRCLE OF PIERRE BIARDEAU
Northwestern France, ca. 1640–50
Terracotta statue, partially painted and gilt
63/4 × 263/4 × 223/4 in. (161.3 × 67.6 × 56.2 cm)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of
Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929; 29.100.145

PROVENANCE: Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (until
d. 1929; her bequest to MMA)

EXHIBITED: “Splendid Legacy: The Havemeyer Collection,”
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, March 27–June 20, 1993

LITERATURE: Breck 1930, p. 64 (as by an unidentified French
sculptor of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century),
III. p. 65; Draper 1991–92, p. 4, III.; S. A. Stein 1993, p. 254;
Bardelot 1994, pp. 26, 30, n. 11; Geneviève Brecc-Bautier and
François Le Boeuf in Belles et Inconnues 2002, pp. 22, 63;
105, fig. 44; Elisabeth Guillaneuf in Terre et ciel 2003, p. 175,
no. 62, ill.

FROM ABOUT 1580 THROUGH THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY, THE
adjacent provinces of Maine and Anjou in northwestern France
developed a notable sculptural tradition in terracotta. A school of
sculptors in and around Angers — including Gervais Delabarre (active
1593–1642), Charles Hoyau (died 1644), and members of the Biardeau
family — specialized in small-to-life-size statuary in fired clay often,
but not always, painted and gilded. These were predominantly reli-
gious works, single statues of the Virgin or saints placed in church
niches or incorporated into altarpieces, as well as ensembles of
statues representing, for example, the Entombment of Christ or the
Dormition of the Virgin.

The Museum’s standing statue of the Virgin and Child is a particu-
larly fine and characteristic work from this area, called the Angevin
region. She turns regally to her right, her hand gently touching her
scarf; the Christ Child tugs at its other end, supported by her left
arm, and shifts down and away from her, seemingly focused on the
pear held in his other hand. Their contrasting poses energize the
composition, and the Child’s squirming posture lends a human note
to this otherwise ethereal image. Broad planes of drapery envelop
the mother, swelling capaciously when viewed from the side. By contrast,
the features of the pair are incised precisely, with tight slits for eyes
and carefully combed hair. Painted surfaces, largely original, clarify
the forms of the drapery, particularly the white mantle, which is lined
with ermine indicated by black tails and has a gilded hem. Exceptionally
large terracotta statues were often fired in sections, and two five-inch
holes in the back indicate that this was the case here. One of the reasons for painting such statues was to disguise the joins between the sections of the fine-grained, yellowish clay from Anjou.

The sculpture was first attributed to Pierre Biaudeau (1608–1671) by Preston Remington in departmental notes of 1935, on the basis of analogies to the sculptor’s style outlined in a then-recent article.1 Subsequently, the author of a study of Angevin terracotta sculpture, P. M. Aldis, identified it with an anonymous master in his so-called Group B whose work seemed in his view to depart from the styles of Biaudeau and Hoyau.6 More recently, Philippe Bardelot as well as Geneviève Bresc-Bautier and François Le Boeuf followed Aldis in cautioning against an explicit attribution to Biaudeau.3 The latest scholar to take up the question, Élisabeth Guillaneuf, emphasizes the close relation of this and other works in Aldis’s Group B to Biaudeau’s style.4 Included in this subset are statues of Saint Paul and Saint Julitte (fig. 33) and the Notre-Dame-de-Bon-Encontre (church of Saint-Vénérand, Laval).5 For Guillaneuf, these statues all share the round face, distinct features, and thick draperies of works of 1659–64 documented as by Biaudeau in the Chapelle de La Barre, Angers, though she posits that they date from his less well known early period, about 1640. Guillaneuf also proposes that the Museum’s statue, the Saint Paul, and the Saint Julitte were once together in the chapel of the manor of La Roche-Chardonnet at Neuillé (Maine-et-Loire). In the 1870s, Célestin Port described a Virgin of “Flemish type” in the center of the chapel’s altarpiece; however, there are discrepancies between Port’s written account and the sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum.6 While sufficient evidence is lacking to locate this sculpture originally in Neuillé, its style closely adheres to the overall group and is barely, if at all, removed from the refined and elegant manner of Pierre Biaudeau.

---

1. The article was Brillant 1921. Remington’s comments are recorded in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
2. Aldis 1939.
4. Élisabeth Guillaneuf in Terre et ciel 2003, p. 175, no. 62.
5. See Belles et Inconnues 2002, p. 130, nos. 33, 34, figs. 53, 100, and p. 126, no. 7, fig. 45.
6. Port 1874–78, vol. 3, p. 278. Port describes the Virgin as holding a lock of hair against her breast with her left hand, instead of her scarf with her right hand.
42. Pope Alexander VII (1599–1667)

MELCHIORRE CAFÀ (MALTESE, 1638–1667)

Rome, 1667
Bronze portrait bust
33 1/2 (with socle) × 34 1/4 × 16 1/2 in. (89.7 × 87.4 × 41.9 cm)
Signed and dated (on back of cape): MELCHIOR. CAFÀ/
MELITENSIS/FAC. AN DOM./MDCLXVII
Edith Perry Chapman Fund, 1957 57.20

PROVENANCE: The sitter (d. 1666); Baron Gustave de Rothschild (1829–1915), Paris; by descent to Baroness Lambert, Paris. [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, until 1957; sold to MMA]


BY A TWIST OF FATE, BOTH THE SCULPTOR AND THE SUBJECT OF Melchiorre Cafà’s Pope Alexander VII died in Rome the year the work was finished, 1667. Fabio Chigi, born in Siena in 1599, was elected pope in 1655 and took the name Alexander VII; his stole is ornamented with the family coat of arms — stars, oak branches, and mountains — and the biretta is a sign of papal authority. Ill health undermined his constitution in his late years, as the portrait’s gaunt face and hollowed cheeks testify. Cafà was born on the island of Malta in 1638. A workshop accident ended an active career that many thought held great promise. An exuberant proponent of the Baroque style, Cafà lent an impression of vitality to Alexander VII, though naturalistic details of wrinkles and drooping eyelids reveal the pope’s true physical condition.

The boldly incised signature “Melchior Cafe Melitensis,” respectfully hidden behind the back, underscores the sculptor’s pride in his one known portrait bust. It also bears witness to his nationality (“Melitensis” means from Malta) and to the spelling of his surname, Italianized from “Cafà,” upon his arrival in Rome, possibly in 1662.1 There Cafà joined the workshop of Ercole Ferrata, an artist more comfortable with the quietly refined classicism of his master, Alessandro Algardi, than with the extroverted, dramatic style of Gianlorenzo Bernini. Yet by the end of his brief career, Cafà’s work exhibited pronounced tendencies toward Bernini’s manner: the swirling draperies and fevered emotional state of his Glory of Saint Catherine of Siena (1667, church of Santa Caterina a Monte Magnanapoli, Rome) or Santa Rosa of Lima (finished ca. 1668, church of Santo Domingo, Lima) demonstrate how fully he absorbed the lessons of Bernini’s Ecstasy of Saint Teresa (1647–52, Cornaro Chapel, church of Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome).2 Cafà’s increasing affinity with Bernini is evident in this bust, too. Rudolf Wittkower wrote that it “should be called the most Berninesque papal portrait bust of the second half of the seventeenth century.”3 Indeed, it exaggerates some features developed by Bernini for his portraits. The pope’s right arm, which seems to lift forward, crinkling the drapery in deep crevices, is a motif perhaps borrowed from Bernini’s own marble Portrait of Pope Alexander VII (1657, private collection); yet, if so, Cafà’s conception is far more energetic than its model.4

According to the pope’s diary for December 19, 1666, he sat that day both for Cafà and the painter Giovanni Battista Gaulli.5 The clay model begun then is now in the Palazzo Chigi, Ariccia.6 A partially gilded bronze taken from the terracotta model, cast by the founder Giovanni Artusi and now in Siena Cathedral, was delivered to Cardinal Flavio Chigi, the pope’s nephew, following a payment of August 8, 1667.7 Apart from the partial gilding, the Siena and New York casts
are very close, with identical signatures, and appear to come from the same mold, with only slight differences in the finishing of the wax models and facture of the bronze cast. Because of a repaired break visible at the back of the Museum's cast, Wittkower proposed that it came first and that the wholly successful and subsequently gilded version in Siena came second. 8 More recently, scholars have maintained that the New York bust is the second cast, commissioned for another member of the Chigi family. 9

Richard E. Stone's technical examination of 2011 clarified that the break was the result of a failure of the lower section of the casting. Another cast of the cape from a piece-mold was made, fitted, and joined with plates and plugs behind, to the successfully completed head and shoulders of the bust. For Stone, this is a proof that ours is the second version. 10 A third version, formerly in the collection of W. von Dirksen, appears to be a late cast after Cafà. 11 Since the New York bust came from a Rothschild collection that included busts by other artists of popes Innocent X, Clement IX, and Clement X, there have been suggestions that this group constituted a series, once displayed in the church of Santa Maria in Montesanto, Rome; but it has been demonstrated that the busts cannot have composed an interrelated series and that only the Clement IX bust can have come from that church. 12

1. For the spelling of his name and full account of his career, see Sciberras 2006.
2. See Di Gioia 2006, pp. 52–53.
43. Hercules and Achelous

ATTRIBUTED TO THE MASTER OF THE MARTYRDOM OF SAINT SEBASTIAN

Probably Austria, mid-17th century
Ivory statuette
11 × 6⅜ × 4⅜ in. (27.9 × 15.9 × 11.1 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.139

PROVENANCE: Anselm Salomon von Rothschild, Vienna (by 1866); Jack and Belle Linsky, New York (until 1982; their gift to MMA)

LITERATURE: Schestag 1866, p. 16, no. 104; James David Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1983b, pp. 175–76, no. 93, ill.; Johanna Hecht in Liechtenstein 1985, pp. 68, 100, under no. 66; Hecht 1987, p. 188, n. 25; Haag 1991, p. 136, fig. 117; Theuerkauff 2003, pp. 18, 23, no. 14, fig. 13 (archival photograph showing the sculpture on its original pedestal); Moonan 2009, ill.

AMONG THE MOST IMPORTANT SCULPTURES TO ENTER THE MUSEUM with the gift of Jack and Belle Linsky's collection, this statuette remains one of our most prominent Baroque ivories. Recent studies of the Master of the Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, to whom it is attributed, and of the collection of Anselm Salomon von Rothschild, to whom it once belonged, have yielded fresh insights into its stylistic background and iconographic meaning. The studies also provided information that led to the acquisition and reassembly of the veneered ivory pedestal with its relief-carved ivory plaque that once supported the statuette but became separated from it at some point in the past (figs. 34, 35).

A lion's skin cloak and muscular body identify the wrestler on the right as Hercules. Renaissance and Baroque statues frequently represent the Greek hero in combat with Antaeus, an earth god whom he defeated by lifting him off the ground. Given the poses of the two figures, it is hardly surprising that the statuette was called Hercules and Antaeus when in the Rothschild collection in Vienna during the nineteenth century. According to Franz Schestag's 1866 catalogue of that collection, the statuette was mounted on a pedestal decorated with a relief of Apollo and Marsyas.1 The association of those two stories makes no particular sense, however, and many years later, when Christian Theuerkauff discovered an old photograph of the ensemble, he decided that the plaque on the pedestal illustrated, more appropriately, a different story of Hercules, his encounter with the Cretan Bull. Another puzzling feature of the statuette was the depiction in low relief of the skin and horns of a bull beneath the feet of the two combatants.2

Theuerkauff published the archival photograph in an art magazine in 2003. An art dealer saw it and recognized and eventually purchased the missing plaque and later the pedestal when they were sold from different American collections. The Museum acquired them from him and has been able to reconstruct the whole ensemble.3

Close examination of the ivory plaque, which was probably carved by the artist responsible for the statuette, reveals that Hercules is snapping off one of the bull's horns. This proved to be the clue to the subject of the entire work of art: it must be Hercules' contest with the river god Achelous. The two rivals fought for the hand of the beautiful Deianira, daughter of the king of Calydon, and after Hercules' triumph she became his second wife. According to Ovid's Metamorphoses and other classical sources, Achelous shifted his shape twice during the battle, from a man to a snake to a bull, but Hercules bested even the bull and tore off one of his horns.4 The bull skin carved in relief at the wrestlers' feet in the statuette anticipates
the river god's assuming bull form; the plaque shows the final round of the match.

The relative rarity of this subject in seventeenth-century art suggests that the plaque may have been created and attached to the pedestal to help identify the subject of the statuette. Small reliefs are often seen on cabinets of the period, forming part of a concerted program, and are sometimes also found on the socles of statuettes, though most often ones with a Christian subject. A rare secular example, also with a classical theme, is a South German mid-seventeenth-century ivory depicting Pan chasing the nymph Syrinx, which has a small ivory relief of Pan spying on the sleeping nymph set into its rectangular wooden socle. Our pedestal's strikingly architectural form, with horizontal moldings accenting its curves, is a seventeenth-century type most commonly associated with crucifixes or statues with religious subjects, often in silver. Thus, the pedestal of the Museum's ivory is of the correct period, but it may have been reused to mount the statuette, as the top of the base does not match the bottom of the group. On either side, hidden in the foliate scrolls—which are not uncommon on socles of the period—are carvings of a quill (on the right) and of the handle of a scourge with what looks like a corded rope (on the left). It has even been suggested that they make reference to what was kept in a drawer concealed by the plaque.

The statuette's vibrant carving and plethora of graphic details emphasize the epic nature of the struggle between the two powerful contestants. Hercules has intertwined his fingers in order to lock Acheulon in a hold so tight that the river god's chest ripples in bunched flesh and his back muscles are compressed. The hero plants his weight on his extended right leg to pull and twist Acheulon, whose toes barely touch the ground as he loses control of the fight. Hercules frowns in concentration while Acheulon's eyes roll upward, as if he is losing consciousness, and his mouth gapes in a scream of pain. His distress is further signaled by the splintered club held limply in his left hand and by his taut, helpless right hand.

Several ivory carvers reached this level of virtuosity in mid-seventeenth-century Vienna, including Johann Caspar Schenk, Adam Lenchhardt, and Matthias Rauchmiller. The artist whose style is closest to this work is the as-yet unidentified Master of the Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, whose artistic personality was first recognized by Christian Theuerkauff; he is named after two ivory reliefs in Vienna and Linz, dated 1655 and 1657, respectively. The exaggerated musculature, distended poses, twisted toes, and riven facial features of our contestants are seen on many of the figures in the Vienna ivory relief. Acheulon's bulging chest and musclebound
right arm are identical to the chest and arm of a figure from the Linz relief that has been recently acquired by the Museum. While the master's identity remains conjectural and while there may have been more than one artist involved in carving the Saint Sebastian reliefs, it is clear that the sculptor who created the intense portrayals of powerful physiques in the reliefs was also responsible for the Museum's statuette. A boxwood version of this statuette exists in the British Museum, and a partial one in ivory was on the Paris art market in the mid-1970s—evidence that this composition was admired and replicated. The Museum's version, large for a carving from a single ivory tusk, was expanded by adding a piece to Achelous' left heel and another, now missing, to the back of Hercules' right shoulder.

1. Schesstag 1866, p. 16, no. 104.
5. Disseminated by prints such as Giovanni Jacopo Caraglio's engraving of the subject after Rosso Fiorentino and Cornelis Cort's after Frans Floris. Images of Hercules and Achelous circulated through Europe. The myth was depicted in a number of paintings at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, including Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem’s Hercules and Achelous (1540–50 sale, Christie’s, New York, April 13, 2008, no. 29) and Domenichino’s Landscape with Hercules Fighting Achelous Changed into a Bull (1623, Musée du Louvre, Paris, inv. 794). For prints and other iconography, see Van de Velde 1965, pp. 134ff.
7. See, for example, the Madonna Standing on a Crescent Moon (Mondscheimadonna) by Christoph Lencker, of 1608 (Geistliche Schatzkammer, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna); see Paulus Reiner, in Kunsthistorisches Museum 2007, pp. 72–73, no. 25. The socle, also dated 1608, was made by Augsburg silversmith Jeremias Wildt.
8. See, for example, the 1650–70 ivory Mother and Child with socle carved in Passau by Johann Setz (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna); Weltliche und Geistliche Schatzkammer 1987, p. 250, no. 114.
9. Theuerkauff 1973. See also Haag 1992, for the most extensive recent discussion of this artist.
FRANÇOIS GIRARDON (FRENCH, 1628–1715)
Probably Paris, 1672–75
Marble relief
57 1/2 x 23 1/2 x 10 3/8 in. (146.1 x 64.8 x 26.7 cm), without frame
Fletcher Fund, 1939. 39.62

PROVENANCE: Church of Saint-André-des-Arts, Paris (ca. 1675–1793); Musée des Monuments Français, Paris (1793–1807); Joséphine de Beauharnais, Château de Malmaison (1807–d. 1814); her son, Prince Eugène de Beauharnais (from 1814; sold with the château, where it remained in the park until ca. 1877); bought back by Emperor Napoléon III (1861–70); confiscated by the state (in 1870; sold ca. 1877); a succession of private owners, who left the relief on deposit at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris; exhibited at the Palais de l’Industrie, Paris, 1884–90; Parent family, Varengeville-sur-Mer, Normandy (1890–ca. 1909; Georges Bernard, Paris (ca. 1909–37); Balay et Carré, Paris, until 1939; sold to MMA


FRANÇOIS GIRARDON WAS THE DOMINANT SCULPTOR IN FRANCE during the reign of Louis XIV, known particularly for his statuary and interior decor crucial to the formation of the Château de Versailles and its gardens. His decorous classicism is best seen in one of his most famous works, the lifesize marble group Apollo and the Nymphs of Thetis (1666–75, Versailles), but his style also admitted more Baroque tendencies, displayed in works such as The Rape of Persephone (1677–99), another marble group in the Versailles gardens. His successful career allowed him to amass an enormous collection of some eight hundred sculptures. They were engraved about 1709 and published as La Galerie de Girardon, a series that documents the sculptor’s own compositions as well as works of ancient art, the sculpture of Giambologna, and seventeenth-century Italian art that influenced his style.

In the field of funerary art Girardon’s most famous work is the tomb of Cardinal Richelieu (1675–77, chapel of the Sorbonne, Paris), a solemn and harmonious marble group showing the deceased cardinal supported and mourned by draped female allegories of piety and the Christian doctrine. Sharing the elegiac mood of the Richelieu tomb was Girardon’s slightly earlier funerary monument to Anne-Marie de Bourbon, princesse de Conti (died 1672). Originally in the church of Saint-André-des-Arts, Paris, it was dismantled during the Revolution and is now, in a reduced and modified state, in the Museum’s collection.

Given the princess’s rank and wealth, an elaborate monument along the lines of the Richelieu tomb might have been expected. Instead, her sons erected in honor of this austere Jansenist a simple wall relief. An engraving by René Charpentier (fig. 36) permits a reconstruction of the monument’s original appearance, which centered on an allegorical figure holding aloft a flaming heart in one hand and steadying an anchor with the other. Identified by Alexandre Lenoir in 1798, these attributes have been confirmed by Dean Walker as the heart signifying charity, the anchor hope, and the foundation block faith. Thus the figure personified all three theological virtues. Surmounted by a coat of arms and smoking urns and supported by a plinth that carried her epitaph, she was flanked by reliefs of cypress branches (now École des Beaux-Arts, Paris).

Both a preservationist movement following the Revolution and the Romantic historicism of the Empire affected the later history of the relief. Alexandre Lenoir was responsible for saving it and exhibiting it in the Musée des Monuments Français, still framed by reliefs of cypresses, as we know from his description of 1798. Three years later it was authorized for transfer to the Château de Malmaison, near
Paris (it actually arrived in 1807). By then it was titled Melancholy; the anchor was removed and the heart recarved as a poppy (see above, right), a symbol of the eternal sleep associated with death. These changes transformed it into a “monument tumulaire,” one of several sepulchral sculptures that Lenoir, now “honorary curator” of the Empress Joséphine’s collections, arranged as decorations for the château’s English-style gardens. In 1881 Gérard Hubert identified an arched stele, still in the park, that he believed was its site of emplacement until it was sold to a private owner and deposited at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, in 1877. Most of Girardon’s large-scale sculpture is part of the fabric of French royal palaces or gardens, but this example survived a checkered history and became the only marble relief by the artist in an American collection.

Facing forward, the allegorical figure seems to gather her voluminous drapery across her lap with the hand that once held an anchor. She raises an attribute, once a heart but now a poppy, with the other. In high relief, the deep pleats of her robes suggest bodily depth, while the mass of her headdress shadows a face mournfully averted from our gaze. Essentially, Girardon translated this high-relief figure into sculpture in the round when, a few years later, he carved the three female figures for the Richelieu tomb. The soft forms, graceful movement, and flowing lines of all four sculptures embody the style sought at the highest levels of patronage of the times.

1. See Barthélémy 1875.
45. Hercules Delivering the Erymanthean Boar to Eurystheus

FRANÇOIS LESPINGOLA (FRENCH, 1644–1705)
Probably Paris, last quarter of the 17th century
Bronze group
16¼ x 14 x 11½ in. (41.6 x 35.6 x 28.6 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964. 64.101.1486

PROVENANCE: [French and Company, New York]; Mr. and Mrs. Francis Kleinberger, New York (their sale, American Art Association—Anderson Galleries, New York, November 19, 1932, no. 57, as by Coysevox); Cortlandt F. Bishop, New York (his sale, American Art Association—Anderson Galleries, New York, November 21–23, 1933, no. 587); [French and Company, New York, in 1960]; Irwin Untermyer, New York (until 1964; his gift to MMA)


FRANÇOIS LESPINGOLA WAS BORN IN THE FRENCH PROVINCE of Champagne but trained at the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, between 1672 and 1675. When his series of small bronzes in the years 1693–99, when commissions stalled at the Bâtiments du Roi, the department of the king’s household responsible for royal gardens.1 Years of study in Italy influenced his style and informed his bronze technique.2 The figure of Hercules in the present bronze, for example, has Gianlorenzo Bernini’s David (1623–24, Galleria Borghese, Rome) as a point of departure; however, as James Draper points out, the pose has been shifted to illustrate a different action — from casting a stone to dragging a boar.3 Lespingola must also have known well the bronzes of Giovanni Battista Poggini and Massimiliano Soldani Benzi (see no. 54), two younger Florentine artists who developed complex pictorial means of grouping multiple figures. The French sculptor adapted the techniques that the Florentines used to achieve their effects: casting elements separately and assembling them with bolts beneath the base or soldered joints. In this case, four parts make up the whole: the base, including casket, boar’s tail, and the block beneath it; the body of the boar; Hercules; and Eurystheus.

The subject is Hercules’ Fourth Labor — he had been assigned twelve in all as punishment by the gods, and for this one he was ordered by the ruler Eurystheus to bring back alive a fearsome wild boar that was rampaging through the region of Erymanthus, in Arcadia. Lespingola shows the outcome of the story. The hero holds the boar pinned between his legs before the man who ordered its capture, who nevertheless recoils in fright. Carefully chosen props convey the story and form the composition. The ruler’s elaborate military costume with decorated armor and sword and plumed helmet underscores his cowardice when contrasted with Hercules’ unprotected nudity. The king’s dais decorated with garlands suspended from ram’s heads, a common motif on antique sarcophagi and grave stele, sets the stage in ancient times while elevating one of the protagonists. Most effective in characterizing the scene’s action is the contrast of poses. Hercules sweeps forward with one continuous diagonal movement, while Eurystheus’s limbs fly in all directions as he gestures violently, losing his balance on the stool. Varied textures—the boar’s spiky fur, the smoothly curling plume, and the punched surfaces of the armor—add to the pictorial quality of this sculpture.

Only one cast is known of this subject and of another Lespingola in the Museum’s collection, a depiction of Hercules skinning the Nemean Lion.4 The head of that beast, whose pelt became the hero’s
standard garb, is seen here tossed on the ground beside the boar. Lespingola completed five other sculptures of episodes from stories of Hercules, and they exist in single or multiple casts: *The Infant Hercules Strangling the Serpents Sent by Juno*, *Hercules Exhibiting Cerberus to Eurystheus*, *Hercules Slaying the Hydra of Lerna*, *Hercules Feeding Diomedes to One of His Own Mares*, and *Hercules Rescuing Prometheus*. Related in scale and compositional format, the seven bronzes likely reflect the artist’s intention, possibly resulting from a commission, to create a set of the twelve canonical Labors of Hercules, evidently adding other exploits. Hercules was particularly admired in France. Drawings for a projected series of paintings by Nicolas Poussin in the Grande Galerie of the Louvre (1640–42) and a completed decor of the Galerie d’Hercule in the Hôtel Lambert, Paris, begun by Charles Le Brun and Gerard van Opstal in 1649, offered inspiration to the sculptor when he took up the subject later in the century.

4. The accession number of that cast is 64.101.1485. Like the present bronze, it was the gift of Irwin Untermyer.
46. 47. Cosimo III de’ Medici (1642–1723), Grand Duke of Tuscany / Ferdinando de’ Medici (1663–1713), Grand Prince of Tuscany

GIOVANNI BATTISTA FOGGINI (ITALIAN, 1652–1725)
Florence, ca. 1680–82
Pair of marble busts
Cosimo: 39¼ (with socle) × 31 × 16¾ in. (99.4 × 78.7 × 42.9 cm)
Ferdinando: 38¼ (with socle) × 28¼ × 14 in. (97.3 × 73.3 × 35.6 cm)

PROVENANCE: Possibly Prince Francesco Maria de’ Medici for Villa Låppeggi at Bagno a Ripoli; possibly Palazzo Covoni, via Cavour, Florence; [Stefano Bardini, on loan to Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, until 1895]; Prince Karl Egon IV zu Fürstenberg, Donaueschingen, Germany (1895–d. 1896); descended in the family (until 1993); [Alain Moatti, Paris, 1993; sold to MMA]


These two splendid portraits by Giovanni Battista Foggini represent the last flowering of the Florentine Baroque bust. Court sculptor to the Medici, Foggini had trained in Rome from 1673 to 1676, and there he absorbed the vigor and drama of Gianlorenzo Bernini’s style. Bernini had applied his keen intelligence to reanimating the portrait bust in all aspects. Two of his images of rulers became immediately famous for their success in capturing the grandeur of the sitters, Francesco d’Este (1650–51, Galleria e Museo Estense, Modena) and Louis XIV (1665; Versailles). To great effect, draperies swirl around the torso; their sweep and dynamism convey active leadership and power. For Cosimo III, the head of the Florentine family, Foggini borrowed Bernini’s motif of drapery that wraps around the chest to end with a flourish at one side. For Cosimo’s son Ferdinando, the sculptor devised lively passages across the whole surface: the prince’s long tresses flow between the ribbon and the pleated ruffle, or jabot, at his throat and across the many tucks and folds of the robe covering his cuirass.

Father and son are presented as complementary, their heads turned toward one another. Cosimo’s broadly shaped drapery and the sharp edges of his armor set off his serious demeanor, while Ferdinando’s rippling drapery, which softens the bust’s truncation at the waist by covering the armor, reflects the vibrancy, and perhaps inconstancy, of youth. Both images feature jabots in large-scale raised needle lace, called Venetian gros point (punto Venezia a relievio). These were the height of fashion, but including them also created an opportunity to showcase the sculptor’s virtuosity with drill and chisel. Cosimo’s jabot is played down, partially tucked under the robe, while more is made of Ferdinando’s, adding to the overall charming exuberance of his costume. The small cross of the military order of Santo Stefano protruding under Cosimo’s robe above a belt cinching the armor is a reminder of his status and of his tight control over the people of Florence; they render Ferdinando’s lack of insignia and unruly hair all the more striking. Foggini’s large workshop produced much of the statuary that bears his name, particularly the larger marbles, because cramping ailments restricted some of his manual activity. The exceptional quality of this pair, however, has led most scholars to accept them as from his own hand.

Clearly intended as pendants, down to identical socles and cartouches (the latter are replacements), the two busts remained together throughout their descent in the Medici family and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the princely Fürstenberg family of Baden-Württemberg. Klaus Lankheit thought they belonged to a series of busts of members of the house of Medici, possibly made

for Vittoria della Rovere’s Medici villa at Poggio Imperiale, near Florence. Karla Langedijk and other scholars have noted that these are the only ones in such a series that could have been done from life and doubt that they are part of a larger set. In 1998, Eike Schmidt published a document authorizing payment by an agent of Vittoria’s son Prince Francesco Maria de’ Medici to Foggini’s assistant for busts of Cosimo III and Ferdinando de’ Medici. The document was issued on July 26, 1682, indicating an earlier dating for the pair than had been thought probable — distancing them further from other Medici busts by Foggini — and opening the possibility that they were commissioned by Francesco Maria, for the Tuscan villa of Lappeghi at Agno a Ripoli, rather than by Vittoria, for Poggio Imperiale.

2. Wittkower 1965, p. 333, n. 30a, described them as the finest of Foggini’s portrait busts.
48. Marsyas

BALTHasar PERMOSER (GERMAN, 1651–1732)

Rome or Florence, ca. 1680–85

Marble bust on a black marble socle inlaid with marble
27 (with socle) × 17 ¼ × 11 ¼ in. (68.6 × 44.1 × 28.3 cm)
Rogers Fund and Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 2002.2002.468

Born in Bavaria, Balthasar Permoser became one of the most celebrated of German Baroque sculptors. Beginning in 1712, in collaboration with the architect Matthäus Daniel Pöppelmann, he designed and in some cases carved the exuberant exterior sculpture of the Zwinger Palace in Dresden. In addition to those architectural ornaments—which are among the highlights of central European art of their period—he served the Saxon court with equal success in a variety of media, ranging from small-scale carved-ivory cutlery handles to lifesize stone allegorical figures.

After his apprenticeship in Salzburg and Vienna, Permoser traveled to Rome in 1674–75 and a couple of years later began working for the ducal court of the Medici in Florence, in the atelier of Giovanni Battista Foggini (see nos. 46, 47). The length of this formative period in his career—he returned to Germany only in 1690—allowed him to absorb fully the spirit of Italian Baroque art, and he was instrumental in transporting that style north of the Alps, where it flourished well into the eighteenth century.

Carved during Permoser’s Italian period, our bust of Marsyas embodies the lessons the artist learned in Rome and Florence, while revealing his own distinctive artistic character. The satyr twists violently to one side. Screaming, he opens his mouth wide while squinting his eyes half shut, and every muscle of his face tightens with the effort. His upper body, too, betrays the strain, with tendons throbbing from clavicle to neck and one shoulder pulled in sharply. The torso is framed by folds of what at first appears to be a robe curling over at left into the semblance of a grotesque head that mimics the satyr’s. Horrifically, one suddenly understands that what looks like decoratively draped cloth recalls or may even be the satyr’s own skin. Marsyas’s torture was to be flayed alive, and the sculptor marshals every detail, such as the bitten-off tongue, to portray his agony. Even the hair, which streams upward in flamelike locks, suggests the heat of the moment.

It is clear that the sculptor closely studied a famous work, Damned Soul (fig. 37), by the greatest exponent of Italian Baroque sculpture, Gianlorenzo Bernini. That bust similarly shows a man screaming, face muscles taut and hair coursing wildly. While Permoser took inspiration from it, he carried aspects of his bust further, unafraid to exaggerate features to the point of deformity. While Bernini’s figure reacts violently to the fires of hell, his eyes are still open, his humanity still recognizable. The eyes of Permoser’s satyr are so narrowed that he looks more animalistic than human, his face so distorted that from some angles it is difficult to perceive his features. In Bernini’s Damned Soul, the surface is finished with great care, each lock of hair perfectly
chiseled. By contrast, Permoser has deliberately left much of the hair unfinished, lending his sculpture a rough urgency.

The subject is taken from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, the story of a satyr who unwisely boasted of his musical prowess. Apollo challenged Marsyas to a musical contest, the god playing a lyre, the satyr his flute; the winner was permitted to inflict any penalty he chose on the loser. The gruesome torture Marsyas suffered as a result of losing was frequently depicted in Renaissance and Baroque art, often focusing on the protagonists at the moment of Marsyas’s torture, as in Jusepe de Ribera’s painting of 1637 (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels). The ancient subject was read as a warning against hubris, and its parallelism with the martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew gave it Christian resonance.

Bernini’s Damned Soul is paired with his Blessed Soul, pendant busts turning toward one another, formally complementary though symbolically opposite. Marsyas is sometimes shown alone—often in sculpture—hanging from a tree, prepared to be skinned alive. In the fifteenth century a pair of well-known antique sculptures of Marsyas framed the entrance to the Medici garden in Florence and served as models for later work, such as François Girardon’s bronze interpretation (private collection, New York State). A single bust of Marsyas is rare, so one wonders whether a bust of Apollo was once meant to accompany this one. Filippo Parodi’s Virtue and Vice, carved in Genoa about 1684–94 (Liechtenstein Museum, Vienna), closely follow Bernini’s conceit of matched busts as well as his composition. Parodi’s Vice, framed by chains, has the same attributes of screaming mouth, clenched muscles, and streaming hair. It signals renewed appreciation for this work by Bernini about the time that Permoser turned to it as a model. Permoser’s bust seems to have been designed for a niche: the carving of fine detail stops abruptly at the front edges of the sculpture; the back, including the hair, is left unfinished, and a square hole suggests that a bracket once held the bust to the wall. The weathered surface indicates that it was outdoors for part of its history and may have occupied an exterior niche on a palace facade, possibly high on a building, since the exaggerated features would read well from a distance. If this was the case, the requisite architectural symmetry would call for a second niche with a pendant bust, most likely of Apollo; however, there is no record of such a sculpture. (The profile of Marsyas’s socle and its marble inlay are consistent with seventeenth- or eighteenth-century work, but it seems unlikely that such a socle would have been chosen if the bust had been intended for an outdoor niche.)

Marsyas accords with other sculpture by Permoser. While relatively little work is known from his Italian period, his figure of
Hope, of about 1685, on the portal of the church of Santi Michele e Gaetano, Florence, resembles this bust of Marsyas in its exaggerated torsion. Identical in subject is a small ivory relief by the artist datable to about 1675–80 (Herzog-Anton-Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig). Though perfectly finished and decorously composed, it shows the satyr with grotesquely distorted features that Permoser took even further in the Museum's bust. Toward the end of his career, about 1725, Permoser essayed a bust of a Damned Soul (fig. 38). Still in thrall to Bernini's image, he engulfed the countenance—mouth wide open—in flames. As attractive as that later image is, with its beautiful stone and carefully finished carving, it lacks the urgency of the earlier Marsyas, whose intensity still conveys the shock of Permoser's first confrontation with Bernini's masterpiece and bears witness to its potent effect on the northern sculptor's style.

2. Wittkower 1961, p. 177, no. 7, pl. 6, 7.
5. The inventory number of the ivory in Braunschweig is Elf 235. See Jörg Rasmussen in Barockplastik in Norddeutschland 1977, pp. 488–89, no. 183.
49. Andromeda and the Sea Monster

DOMENICO GUIDI (ITALIAN, 1625–1701)

Rome, 1694
Marble group
64 1/4 x 46 1/4 x 34 3/4 in. (163.5 x 117.8 x 87.9 cm)
Purchase, Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation Inc. and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation Inc. Gifts, 1967 67.34

PROVENANCE: John Cecil, fifth Earl of Exeter, Burghley House, Stamford, England (1699/1700–d. August 1700); his descendants, in the same location (until about 1958); [Wildenstein and Company, New York, until 1967; sold to MMA]


THE SUBJECT OF THIS DRAMATIC MARBLE GROUP IS ANDROMEDA. Daughter of the Ethiopian queen Cassiopeia, she was chained to a rock and left to be devoured by a sea monster in atonement for her mother’s insult to the sea nymphs called Nereids. Fortunately, the Greek hero Perseus, flying by, spied her and slew the monster, thereby winning her hand in marriage. Depicted is the moment when the maiden first sights her savior in the air and trains her eyes on him, her open palm expressing surprise. Her fluttering hair may reflect the sculptor’s reading of a popular source of this myth, Ovid’s Metamorphoses: “save that her hair gently stirred in the breeze, and the warm tears were trickling down her cheeks—he [Perseus] would have thought her a marble statue.”1 While this literary passage has inspired sculptors, it has most frequently been represented by painters, including Titian (1533–57, Wallace Collection, London) and Annibale Carracci (1600–1604, Palazzo Farnese, Rome). Carracci’s famous fresco of Andromeda splayed across the rock with both wrists chained, one palm open and glancing upward, clearly guided Domenico Guidi, the sculptor of the Museum’s group. Indeed, its pictorial quality is evident in the landscape setting—divided between verdant cliff and streaming water—and in its “coloration,” achieved by creating different textures in the marble, from the princess’s highly polished skin, to the monster’s matte scales, to the roughened rock.

The opportunity to display a nearly naked damsel in distress pinning for rescue was irresistible to many artists and patrons in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The first collector to whom this sculpture appealed was John Cecil, fifth Earl of Exeter, who evidently bought it on a trip to Rome. Cecil was one of the first Englishmen of his generation to collect Italian art on a grand scale. He acquired paintings by Luca Giordano and Carlo Maratta, commissioned Antonio Verrio and Louis Laguerre to paint frescoes at Burghley House, his manor in Stamford, and bought antiquities and contemporary sculpture.4 Although the earl died on his way home to England in 1700, the sculpture safely completed the journey to Burghley House, where it was admired in various rooms, including the Gothic (or Great) Hall, until its removal sometime between 1657 and probably 1958.3 While the identity of the patron is known, that of the sculptor was long mistaken. In the eighteenth century it was attributed to one of John Cecil’s favorite artists, Pierre-Étienne Monnot (1657–1733). That French sculptor, active in Rome and Kassel, met Cecil in 1699. The earl commissioned Monnot to carve his and his wife’s tomb, in the church of Saint Martin’s, Stamford (dated 1704), and acquired or commanded from him other works still at Burghley House.4
The attribution to Domenico Guidi, now generally accepted, was made only recently, by Andrea Bacchi. The argument begins with a reminder of the first account of the Burghley House marble, based on a visit in 1727 by the antiquarian and engraver George Vertue, which includes the observation, "a fine Marble Statue. Andromeda & Monster. Italian. carv'd by Dominico Guidi. cost 4000 crowns. at 5' 6". It was an antiquary from Stamford, Francis Peck, who in 1732 made the first written attribution of the Andromeda to Pierre-Étienne Monnot—probably because Monnot was the sculptor most firmly connected with Lord Exeter—and the error was perpetuated by subsequent authors.

Bacchi also mentions the fact that Guidi had carved a marble Andromeda for Francesco II d’Este, Duke of Modena. In an exchange of letters in 1695 between Guidi and Rinaldo d’Este, Francesco’s successor, the sculptor stated that he had been commissioned to carve “in white marble the statue of an Andromeda tied to a rock in the act of being devourd by the monster” and requested payment for the finished work; but the new duke maintained that he could find no record of the commission. Despite indications that Guidi was not paid, scholars assumed that the work mentioned in the Guidi-d’Este correspondence ended up in Modena because a marble Andromeda was recorded in the ducal palace there until 1771. Olga Raggio even proposed that Guidi’s presumed-lost work influenced the Metropolitan’s marble, which she, too, took to be by Monnot. Bacchi also notes that Francesco II acquired a marble Andromeda carved by Orazio Marinali of Venice and proposes that this, rather than Guidi’s, was most probably the one that was in the palace at Modena. The likely scenario, then, is that John Cecil, visiting ateliers in Rome in 1699-1700, saw the unsold Andromeda in the workshop of Domenico Guidi and bought it. It may also be noted that Guidi likely made a modello, a smaller model in terracotta, for the marble, since there exists a bronze version in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nancy, and a lead version at Osterley Park, London, that must have been taken from it.
Cecil would naturally have visited Guidi, who was the leading sculptor in Rome following the death of Gianlorenzo Bernini. One of the most important works Guidi produced in the last decade of the seventeenth century was *The Dream of Saint Joseph* (fig. 39), a marble group on the altar of the Capocaccia Chapel in the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. The striking drapery patterns, the naturalistic carving of the rock base, and the angel’s stout limbs and classical features all bear a close relationship to those aspects of *Andromeda and the Sea Monster*, carved the year after *The Dream of Saint Joseph* was begun.

Guidi influenced a generation of French artists practicing in Rome, especially Monnot, who worked alongside him in the Capocaccia Chapel executing reliefs of the Adoration of the Shepherds and Flight into Egypt that flanked Guidi’s *Saint Joseph* group. A comparison of Monnot’s reliefs—with their nervous line, minute drapery pleats, and sweet expressions—and Guidi’s group—with its more solid figures and broader treatment of cloth—clarifies the differences between the sculptors’ styles and places the *Andromeda* within the Italian master’s oeuvre.

1. Domenico Guidi’s library contained a copy of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. It was inventoried there on April 16, 1701, after the artist’s death; see Archivio di Stato, Rome, Notario del Tribunale dell’Auditor Camerale, Notario Marcus Josephus Pelusius, vol. 1556, 1701, fol. 152r-154v (see Bershacid 1970, p. 239). The story of Perseus and Andromeda is found in *Metamorphoses* 4.465-485. The quotation in this paragraph is taken from Ovid 1996 (ed.), vol. 1, p. 227.
3. Horn 1977, pp. 182, 183. It was at Burghley House in July 1957 (records of the Photographic Survey, Courtauld Institute of Art, London), but Hugh Honour mentioned that he did not see it there in 1958.
6. Vetere 1725-31/1931-37, p. 34.
10. The bronze version measures 31½ by 27½ by 23¼ inches (80 x 70 x 60 cm). On that version and the one at Osterley Park, see Sophie Harent in “Acquisitions” 2005, p. 84, no. 6 (Inv. 2003.14.1) and documents in the curatorial files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
50. Lucretia

**Philippe Bertrand (French, 1663–1724)**

Probably Paris, 1704 or earlier
Marble statue
27½ × 43¼ × 20¼ in. (69.9 × 109.9 × 52.7 cm)
Purchase, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, Joseph M. Cohen Gift, and Fletcher Fund, by exchange, 2003; 2003.256

**Provenance:** [Chelminski Gallery, London, until 2003; sold to MMA]

**Exhibited:** Salon of 1704, Paris

**Literature:** Salon of 1704, p. 14; Lami 1906, p. 43; Wardroper 2007, figs. 1, 2, 6

A woman collapses across a block suggesting marble steps, blood trickling from a self-inflicted stab wound. Her face expresses resolve and pain. Her gown and sandals indicate that this takes place in ancient times. All these details accord with the representation of Lucretia, who committed suicide out of shame after her rape by Sextus Tarquinius, son of the Etruscan king of Rome. Her brave action roused the Roman citizenry to rebel against the dictatorial regime and establish the Roman Republic. The architectural setting of this sculptural representation of the tale alludes to Lucretia's public death and the display of her body before the Roman Senate. Engravings published in Paris in 1647 illustrating Pierre Le Moyne’s *Galerie des femmes fortes* inspired depictions in other media of biblical heroines such as Esther, Cleo, and Judith, and ancient historical or mythological ones such as Lucretia, Cleopatra, and Dido, who had demonstrated exceptional fortitude and virtue. Women of character were frequent subjects in paintings and the decorative arts of the period but rarer in large-scale sculpture, though notable examples were to be seen in gardens at the courts of Dresden, Delft, and La Granja. This Lucretia was exhibited at the Salon of 1704 in Paris and described in the checklist thus: "In front of the pier, a figure in the round of a Lucretia on its pedestal by Monsieur Bertrand, Academician." One of a talented generation of French sculptors who included Guillaume Coustou (see no. 55) and Robert Le Lorrain, Philippe Bertrand was active in commissions for the court in Paris and Versailles. He is better known for work in bronze, but he did produce marbles, and Lucretia is a fine example of his carving style. His reliefs *Secrecy and Patience* (1707–8), part of a large series of allegories decorating the walls of the chapel at Versailles, are also draped in robes with flickering, sharp pleats, and their faces are similarly broad, with expressive eyelids. His marble *Air* (1706–9) for the gardens of the Château de Marly exhibits the same thin, linear folds and softly carved locks of hair. Even at a smaller scale, Bertrand’s bronze statuettes reflect his penchant for operatic expression. For example, *Prometheus* (1703, Royal Collection, Windsor Castle), which was also exhibited at the Salon of 1704, sprawls in a diagonal pose that gives maximum exposure to the figure of the Greek supporter of humankind, whose stiff-armed gesture conveys the pathos of his suffering. Like many artists of his generation, Bertrand blended Baroque dramatics with classical refinement.

An interesting feature of Lucretia is its scale; at forty-three inches wide, it represents the figure at more than half lifesize. Its dimensions recall *morceaux de réception*, works required of sculptors who wished to gain admittance to the prestigious Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, from its establishment in the mid-seventeenth century.

![Fig. 40: François Barois, Cleopatra Dying, 1700. Marble. Musée du Louvre, Paris](image-url)
to its dissolution in 1793. The subjects and criteria for judging these tests of skill were strictly regulated by the academy. At the beginning of the eighteenth century they were generally under lifesize, their subjects drawn from classical texts, and highly dramatic. Morceaux de réception such as François Barois’s Cleopatra Dying (fig. 40), of 1700, or René Charpentier’s Meleager, of 1713 (Musée du Louvre, Paris) display dying ancient or legendary figures at approximately half lifesize.\(^8\)

Exceptionally, Bertrand’s academy reception piece, The Rape of Helen (1701, Château de Fontainebleau), was not a marble but a bronze, indicating that it was his ambition to be considered preeminent in that medium.\(^9\) The marble Lucretia, akin in its pose to Barois’s Cleopatra Dying, and often linked with the Egyptian queen thematically, may reflect Bertrand’s wish to demonstrate that his talents were not limited to bronze and that his carving skills were fully equal to those of his colleagues in the academy.

---

1. See Donaldson 1982, particularly for the literary tradition and representations in painting.
2. See Die Galerie der starken Frauen 1995.
3. For examples, see Wardropper 2007, p. 135.
7. Jonathan Marsden in Cast in Bronze 2009, pp. 392–93, no. 194. See also Marsden 2009b, for an account of Bertrand’s life.
8. See Wardropper 2007, pp. 146–47. The dimensions of Meleager are 18½ by 9½ by 16¾ inches (47 × 97 × 43 cm).
51. Alexander Danilovich Menshikov (1673–1729)

**SWISS, AUSTRIAN, OR GERMAN ARTIST ACTIVE IN RUSSIA CA. 1703–4**

Saint Petersburg, probably shortly before 1704

Portrait bust in red pine (pinus sylvestris), with wrought-iron clips

31 (with socle) × 19 ¼ × 12 ⅞ in. (79.7 × 49.2 × 31.8 cm)

Wrightson Fund, 1996.1996.7

**PROVENANCE:** Baronne Cassel van Doorn (until 1956; sale, Galerie Charpentier, Paris, May 30, 1956, no. 71, to Blumka); Blumka family, New York (1956-96; sale, Sotheby’s New York, January 9, 1996, no. 103, to MMA)


The identity of this exceptional bust’s subject and of its maker puzzled scholars until research by Wolfram Koepp and Marina Nudel resolved some of its mysteries. The medium, which at first appeared to be boxwood, is in fact red pine stained to look like boxwood. Sections of the bust were assembled with metal clips (see fig. 41), a technique used by craftsmen accustomed to working with dense materials like boxwood or ivory that were only available in small pieces. While red pine is native to northern Europe, the Baltic region, and Russia, this method of construction is most often associated with wood-working in southern Germany and Austria. An explanation for this discrepancy is found in the biography of the man Koepp and Nudel identified as the subject of the bust: a Russian known to have employed German and Austrian artists, Alexander Danilovich Menshikov. Of modest background and beginnings, Menshikov caught the eye of Czar Peter the Great when he was about twenty. He rose quickly through the ranks to become Commanding General Field Marshal of the Russian armies and was eventually appointed governor of Saint Petersburg. His military prowess distinguished him, and his close friendship with the czar brought him to the pinnacle of wealth and power. He was made a count in 1702 and a prince in 1705 and became virtual ruler of the country for several years after Peter’s death in 1725. But in 1729 his enemies, the old Russian nobility, succeeded in having him exiled, and he died in Siberia that same year.

As Koepp and Nudel noted, the wooden portrait bears a striking similarity to painted, etched, carved, and modeled images of Menshikov. The exaggerated wig fashionable in the early eighteenth century appears in all of his portraits, as do the high forehead, large nose, and cleft chin. Positive identification of a figure from
other portraits is notoriously difficult, but other evidence points to Menshikov as the subject here. He would naturally appreciate association with one of history’s greatest military leaders and especially Alexander, his namesake. The scene of Alexander with his friend and counselor Hephastion would have reminded everyone of Menshikov’s close relationship with Peter the Great. The Russian commander would also have appreciated the reference to the Roman emperor Trajan, whose many victories in battle brought about an auspicious moment in the Roman Empire’s history. Both of the oval scenes on the cuirass show a ruler’s magnanimity, flattering compliments to any leader. Furthermore, Menshikov appreciated dexterity in wood carving: his private study, the Walnut Room, featured marquetry, and he installed a turnery for working wood and other materials in his Saint Petersburg palace. The first in the city made of stone, that building was richly decorated. We also know that a sculptor, probably Swiss, named Franz Ludwig Ziegler, or Zingler, residing in Russia, made a trip at Menshikov’s expense to western Europe and returned to Russia in 1703 accompanied by three sculptors, two Austrian and one German. There is no documentary evidence that any of them or Ziegler carved the bust, but they were available for the task. It has been proposed that the bust dates from that time, since after 1703 it probably would have incorporated the insignia of the Order of Saint Andrew, Russia’s highest military honor, which Menshikov received that year. His ennoblement in 1702 in the wake of his military victory over the Swedish army at Schlüsselburg may have been the occasion for commissioning the bust. Although our evidence is circumstantial, a strong case is made for identifying this striking image with one of Russia’s great heroes.

2. J. Thomas Quick, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Madison, Wisconsin, identified the wood as *Pinus sylvestris* on March 17, 1996. Carbon dating of the wood was conducted by Dr. George Bonani, Institute of Particle Physics, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich, on March 25, 1996; he concluded that the tree that was the source of the wood was felled no later than 1667. As it was common practice to cure wood for long periods of time before working it, the pieces from which this bust was made could certainly have been seasoned in a shop for thirty-five years before they were put to use, about 1703.
5. For a full discussion of the classical references, see ibid., pp. 170–73.
52, 53. Saint Francis Xavier / Saint Ignatius Loyola

**FRANCESCO BERTOS (ITALIAN, 1678–1741)**

Venice, ca. 1720–25

Pair of bronze statuette groups

*Saint Francis Xavier*: 25 × 14 × 6 3/4 in. (63.5 × 35.6 × 17.4 cm)

*Saint Ignatius Loyola*: 24 3/4 × 13 3/4 × 4 3/4 in. (62.5 × 35.2 × 11.7 cm)

Inscribed (on the book held by the putto at Saint Ignatius’s side):

AD MAIOREM DEI GLORIAM SOCIETATIS IESV FUNDATORE[ ]

[To the Greater Glory of God, Founder of the Society of Jesus]

Purchase, Assunta Sommella Peluso, Ignazio Peluso, Ada Peluso and Romano I. Peluso Gift, 2010. 2010.113 (Ignatius). 114 (Francis)


**THE VENETIAN ROCOCO SCULPTOR FRANCESCO BERTOS IS BEST remembered for bronze and marble groups of figures piled one atop another in pyramids that suggest acrobatic exercises. The technical virtuosity required to undercut so many components in marble or to attach a cluster of elevated figures in bronze pleased patrons who sought novelty and variety. Quite possibly it was the airy arrangements of his relaxed figures more than their meaning that attracted collectors. Many of his subjects hold props that indicate what virtue or vice they personify, but the elaborate allegories they seem to embody often defy interpretation.**

Many of Berto’s vibrant compositions seem as much designed to be decorative features of an interior as to be sculptural representations of a theme. Some of his works, such as a sweetmeat dish supported on three bird’s claws in the Metropolitan’s collection, are patently functional. Berto created a small body of devotional sculpture and ecclesiastical implements, including altar candlesticks, crucifixes, and reliefs, as well as marble and bronze statuettes.

Berto’s bronze statuettes of Saint Francis Xavier and Saint Ignatius Loyola are instantly recognizable as in his style, although they are unusually large at two feet high and despite the fact that images of saints are rare in his oeuvre. They are designed as complementary, turning toward one another. The artist’s breezy style animates the saints’ heartfelt gestures. Saint Ignatius Loyola points solemnly down to a book inscribed with the motto of the Society of Jesus held by an accompanying cherub. Saint Francis Xavier holds one hand over a cross near his heart and a staff in the other, while looking rapturously upward. The cherub skipping by his side holds a crucifix similar, in miniature, to those in three compositions by Berto in which the cross is flanked by Mary Magdalen and an angel. The little cherubs, with their dancing posture—both stand on one leg beside their saint on an extension of the self-base—are exactly the kind of youths the sculptor repeatedly chose for his multfigured groups, such as Victory (Art Institute of Chicago) or the Museum’s sweetmeat dish.

Charles Avery proposed that the centenary of the canonization of these founding saints of the Jesuit order—Pope Gregory XV canonized them jointly in 1622—might have been the occasion for a commission, finding their style appropriate for Berto about 1720–25. Little of Berto’s work is precisely datable. Avery’s is an attractive hypothesis, and he is clearly correct in proposing that the relatively unfinished backs of the statuettes suggest that the pair were intended to perch high on a retable or be protected within niches. Berto was expert at bronze casting, making complex figures like these appear
easy to realize. However, he had no hesitation in soldering joins that had failed to adhere and chasing quite broadly across the metal surfaces. It is, in fact, the artist's speed and casual approach to facture that help to identify his hand and that heighten the sense of motion conveyed by these statuettes.

1. Charles Avery has recently proposed a way of decoding some of the key groups; it is convincing, and it may help to elucidate the meaning of Bertos's other work; C. Avery 2008, chap. 9, "Iconography," pp. 73–86.
54. The Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter

MASSIMILIANO SOLDANI BENZI (ITALIAN, 1656–1740)

Florence; probably modeled 1725, cast 1730–37
Bronze group
18¼ x 17¼ x 10⅞ in. (46 x 43.8 x 27.6 cm)
Wightman Fund, 1985 1985.238

PROVENANCE: Probably the cast sent about 1737 by the sculptor to Giacomo Zamboni in London to sell on his behalf, or, alternatively, the one commissioned by Anna Maria Luisa de’ Medici, Florence (1722–d. 1743), and bequeathed to her nephew Marchese Neri Guadagni (from 1743); [art market, Paris, 1920?]; [George Bayntun, Bath, Somerset, England, by 1920s, until 1983; his sale, Aldridge’s, Bath, March 26, 1985, no. 98, as 19th-century French]; [Alex Wengraf Ltd., London, 1985; sold to MMA]


TWO SCULPTURES OF RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS MADE FOR THE electress palatine, Anna Maria Luisa de’ Medici, between 1722 and 1725 constitute the most significant commission of Florentine bronze groups of its time. The sculptures were not linked by a specific program but shared a pictorial attitude characteristic of the period. Surveying the series in 1976, Jennifer Montagu cited documents indicating that the bronzes, made by the city’s leading sculptors, Massimiliano Soldani Benzi, Antonio Montauti, Giuseppe Piamontini, Giovanni Battista Foggini, and Agostino Cornacchini, were exhibited in various rooms of the electress’s apartment in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence. Four of them stood on bases of ebony and lapis lazuli ornamented with gilt bronze designed by Foggini. Soldani’s Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter was placed on one of the bases and paired with Piamontini’s Sacrifice of Isaac (fig. 42). Of the twelve compositions, those that have not survived in bronze are known through terracotta models, Doccia porcelain versions, or plasters.

When acquired by the Museum, this cast of The Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter was believed to be the one in the electress’s collection, which after her death in 1743 passed to her nephew Marchese Neri Guadagni. However, documents discovered by Charles Avery and others and published recently by Dimitrios Zikos give evidence that Soldani cast one or more later versions of the model and raise doubts that this was the one for the Palazzo Pitti. From letters now in Oxford written by Soldani to Giacomo Zamboni in London, we learn that the artist made a wax model of the composition in 1725 and asked the Florentine merchant to sell a bronze after it on the English market. Soldani made his proposition in 1730, but the bronze arrived in England only in 1737. In a subsequent publication Zikos noted that the version belonging to the electress palatine was still in the Palazzo Rinuccini, Florence, in the nineteenth century; the Museum’s version, which was discovered in Bath, England, is thus more likely to be the later cast that Soldani sold through Zamboni. Further support for Zikos’s argument is that there is no cartouche with the artist’s signature and date on this work, although cartouches are present on the eleven other statuettes made for the electress’s collection.

If this is indeed a later version, it is nonetheless from Soldani’s hand and the only known bronze of the composition. The scene shows the Gileadite leader Jephthah fulfilling a vow that if he won a battle against the Ammonites he would sacrifice the first person whom he happened to meet afterward. Tragically, that was his beloved only child. The sculpture was paired in the Palazzo Pitti with Piamontini’s Sacrifice of Isaac, since both sculptures depict fathers in the act of sacrificing a child after a vow. While in the Piamontini bronze, the
angel stays Abraham from committing the execution, in Soldani’s. Jephthah prepares to strike. Soldani’s customary figural types are well suited to the scene. More graceful than brutal, the striding military leader’s posture suggests hesitation, but his swooning daughter’s body, splayed across the rocks, leaves no doubt that her murder is imminent. A draped female attendant consoles the doomed girl. To stage the scene, the sculptor created a rocky ledge with a seat for the victim to the left and a pyre and trophy of arms at the right. The props are superfluous to the composition, though they give detail to the story by showing the soldier’s weapons, laid aside after the battle, and the sacrificial fire. The flickering surface—especially striking seen from the rear, where drapery, tree bark, stone striations, and flames seem to whip in opposing directions—adds to the pictorial quality of Soldani’s work. Beautifully finished on all sides, it is nonetheless essentially frontal. Unlike painted treatments of the subject, in which the protagonists are surrounded by soldiers and other figures, Soldani’s focuses on the story’s basic elements. Yet the bronze group has all the drama and sweep of those pictures, stretching the limits of sculpture to compete with painting.

1. Montagu 1976
2. Lankheit 1962, p. 326, doc. no. 632; see also Montagu 1976, p. 129, where is illustrated a drawing at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (fig. 3), related to the four bases designed by Foggini.
5. Zikos 2005, p. 25. Zikos believes that the extensive chasing of the Museum’s version signals that it is a later cast.
6. Dimitrios Zikos in La principessa saggi 2006, p. 299; according to the dealer in Bath, however, this work had been on the art market in France in the 1920s.
55. Samuel Bernard (1651–1739)

**Guillaume Coustou the Elder (French, 1677–1746)**

Paris, ca. 1727
Marble portrait bust
37 1/4 x 27 3/4 x 14 3/4 in. (95.9 x 70.8 x 37.1 cm)
Purchase, Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation Inc. and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation Inc. Gifts, 1966 66.2104a, b

**Provenance:** The sitter (ca. 1726–d. 1739); his descendants the comtes de Coubert, La Boisnière, near Château-Renault (from 1739), including comte Félix de Forestier de Coubert (recorded in 1914) and comte Guy de Forestier de Coubert (in 1937); [Wildenstein and Company, New York, until 1966; sold to MMA]


Guillaume Coustou the Elder was a distinguished member of the prominent French dynasty of sculptors that included his older brother Nicolas, his uncle and mentor, Antoine Coysevox, and his son Guillaume. The gardens of Versailles and other châteaux provided this family with numerous opportunities for work; the elder Guillaume’s crowning achievement came at the end of his career, when his famous colossal groups the Horses of Marly were installed outside the Château de Marly in 1745 (Musée du Louvre, Paris).

Along with garden and palace decorations came commissions to create portraits of the estates’ owners. By virtue of his position and wealth, Samuel Bernard merited Coustou’s best efforts, and the sculptor delivered an exceptional work. Although Bernard’s origins were modest—he was a painter and engraver—he rose through his banking activities to become one of the wealthiest men in Europe, able to lend large sums of money to Louis XIV and Louis XV. As a result, in 1702 he was awarded the Order of Saint-Michel—the badge seen here dangling almost casually off his chest—and acquired property and titles, the barony of Rieux in Languedoc in 1707 and later the fiefdom of Coubert, which Louis XV elevated to an earldom in 1725. It may have been Bernard’s ennoblement that occasioned the bust. An eighteenth-century account states that Coustou took over the commission from another sculptor, François Dumont, at the latter’s death in 1726. This would put the age of the sitter at about seventy-six; but he was apparently in good health, having married for the second time at the age of sixty-nine. By family tradition, however, it was the wedding that prompted the bust’s commission. John Coolidge favored this earlier date, as he felt that the bust accorded better with Coustou’s style about 1720. More recently, scholars such as François Souchal have accepted a date of about 1726–27. In fact, there is relatively little stylistic development from Coustou’s bust of Marc-René de Voyer de Paulmy, marquis d’Argenson, of about 1721 (Versailles) and that of Louis Phélypeaux, comte de Pontchartrain, dated 1727 (Musée des Beaux-Arts de Limoges). The three share a similar format: the broad bust cut almost to the waist, robes flowing down to the socle, and sharply delineated features.

Of the three, Samuel Bernard is the most animated, the head twisted sharply, while a fluttering lace jabot, meandering silk sash, and twirling drapery crisscross his chest. From a distance, the motif of the drapery curling around the bottom creates a swirling motion that invites the viewer to circle the bust and confront Bernard head-on. From this vantage point, essentially a side view, the bust has surprising depth in terms of both the movement of the body in space and the physical excavation of the pleats of drapery. The face is framed by the wig and set off by the shoulder; at this angle the medal
of the Order of Saint-Michel, seemingly tossed aside, becomes prominent. Facial features are all deeply carved: the upper eyelids cast shadows; the lower lip protrudes (suggesting the loss of upper teeth); indentations sink into the cheeks. These indications of the sitter’s advancing age are so pronounced that the face remains the focus despite competition from cascades of curls and clothing. In its character, the face bears a remarkable likeness to a chalk drawing of Bernard by Hyacinthe Rigaud, dated 1727 (fig. 43). The pose of the sitter and even his clothes in the drawing are nearly identical to those of the bust, further justifying a date of about 1727 for the sculpture. The two-dimensional representation of Bernard also gives us renewed appreciation of Coulouis’s sweeping vigor as he carved the marble, bringing his subject to life.

1. Clermont-Tonnerre 1914, p. 73.
3. Clermont-Tonnerre 1914, pp. 75–76.
56. The Fear of Cupid’s Darts

JEAN-LOUIS LEMOYNE (FRENCH, 1665–1755)

Paris, 1739–40
Marble group
7 1/4 × 26 1/4 × 36 3/4 in. (182.2 × 66.7 × 93.7 cm)
Purchase, Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation Inc. and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation Inc. Gifts, 1967  67:197

PROVENANCE: Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France, Palais du Louvre, Paris (1740–62; his gift to Marigny); Abel-François Poisson, marquis de Marigny, Château de Ménars (1762–d. 1783); his heirs, the subsequent owners of Ménars (1781–1811); Claude-Victor Perrin, duc de Bellure, Ménars (1811–27); the comte de Brigode, Ménars (1827–30); through his widow to her husband; Joseph-Philipppe-François de Riquet, prince de Chinay, Ménars (from 1830); his daughter Marie-Henriette Valentine Riquet and her husband, the prince de Bauffremont (1879–81); sale, Ménars, June 11, 1881, no. 6, to Rothschild; Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, rue Saint-Florentin, Paris (from 1883); his wife, Baroness Alphonse de Rothschild (until d. 1911); her son Baron Édouard de Rothschild (recorded in 1929, d. 1943); [Wildenstein and Company, New York, until 1967; sold to MMA]

DIREC TED AT THE PASSERSBY ON A GARDEN PATH, THIS GROUP shimmers with movement. Two figures playfully enact a dramatic moment in the story of love. Cupid prepares to hurl a now-missing arrow at a nymph; in his haste, he has dropped the quiver at his feet. Leaning away, the girl instinctively protects her heart with outstretched palm, though she seems captivated by her assailant. This light-hearted encounter brings her swaying form into opposition with his; linking them is a diagonal movement from his threatening hand and upturned head to the reciprocal gesture of her hand and her head. Thin drapery flutters around her, exposing a shapely leg and breast and emphasizing her comely body and dancing pose.

The title Fear of Cupid’s Darts (La Crainte des Traits de l’Amour) long associated with the sculpture, is a bit coy. Is this nymph afraid of love? Her raised palm signals the target of her heart as much as it attempts to ward off the arrow. At first she appears to be looking down at Cupid, but in fact he is not in her line of sight; instead, she gazes out at the viewer. Her expression is hardly anxious or fearful — but rather amused. This disarming challenge to the effect of love is in fact aimed at the visitors disporting themselves in the garden, a site where secluded paths offered amorous couples opportunities to declare their passion to one another. The sculptural group is a perfect expression of the power and unpredictability of love, a favorite topic in the art and literature of mid-eighteenth-century France. The back of the sculpture has little visual interest, but out of consideration for diagonal approaches, the side views are artfully composed. Lemoyneclearly took the marble group’s site into account and directed its focal points accordingly.

Carved in 1739–40, at the end of a distinguished career, the Museum’s marble is a summa of the sculptor’s accomplishments. Jean-Louis Lemoynestarted out as one of several specialists in creating garden statuary for the châteaux of princes and nobles.1 A work from the middle of his career intended for the château at Marly, Companion of Diana (fig. 44) also shows a scantily clad female figure in movement.2 The difference between the two works is instructive: the earlier is more solidly grounded, while this later one has only the lightest connection with the earth, reflecting stylistic shifts at that time toward the Rococo. Two terracotta models permit us to trace the development of the forms of the nymph and her assailant in this group. The one in Chicago (fig. 45) is more upright; the nymph stands fast as Cupid tugs at her drapery and threatens her with his arrow, rather than preparing to hurl it. In the second model (private collection), Lemoynegave the girl a more emphatic twist and devised Cupid’s throwing gesture and the nymph’s protective movement — motifs


fig. 45 Lemoynec, terracotta model for The Fear of Cupid’s Darts, 1739–40. The Art Institute of Chicago


that encapsulate the marble group's meaning. Thus, the sculptor began with statelier and more classicizing poses reminiscent of those in Companion of Diana, but as his concept evolved, he pushed both figures off balance, emphasizing Rococo lightness and movement.

Seventy-four years old when this was carved, Jean-Louis Lemoyne may have been assisted by his son Jean-Baptiste, a rising star. Documents indicate, however, that payments received from the duc d'Antin, superintendent of royal buildings and gardens, were made to the father alone. When completed, several years after its commission, the sculpture went into storage at the Palais du Louvre. In 1762 the king gave it to the marquis de Marigny, who kept it at the Château de Ménars, together with other sculptures from his collection now in the Museum (see nos. 57, 58, 60).


2. See Wardroper 1984, pp. 27–30, figs. 7, 8.

3. See Réau 1923, pp. 184, 190, 192. The author cites payment of 6,000 livres to Jean-Louis. It was less than he requested, reflecting a decision of July 13, 1742, but Réau speculates, nevertheless, that Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne collaborated in the work.

4. See Dufay 1904; Lesueur 1912, pp. 95–96, 154, 253.
57. 58. Pair of monumental vases on the theme of autumn

**DEIGNED BY ANGE-JACQUES GABRIEL (FRENCH, 1698–1782)**
**EXECUTED BY JEAN-BAPTISTE PIGALLE (FRENCH, 1714–1785)**
**AND NICOLAS-SÉBASTIEN ADAM (FRENCH, 1705–1778)**

**Vase by Pigalle** (57): Paris or Versailles, 1742–45
Marble; H. 70¼ in. (179.4 cm), maximum diam. 52¼ in. (132.7 cm)

**Vase by Adam** (58): Paris or Versailles, 1745–47
Marble; H. 59½ in. (157.2 cm) maximum diam. 52½ in. (133.4 cm)
Purchase, Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation Inc. and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation Inc. Gifts and Rogers Fund, 1966 66.29.1 (vase by Pigalle), 2 (vase by Adam)

**PROVENANCE:** Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France, Salle des Antiques, Palais du Louvre, Paris (1745–70; his gift to Marigny); Abel-François Poisson, marquis de Marigny, Château de Ménars (1770–d. 1781); his heirs, the subsequent owners of Ménars (1781–1811); Claude-Victor Perrin, duc de Bellune, Ménars (1811–22); the comte de Brigue, Ménars (1827–30); through his widow to her husband, Joseph-Philippe-François de Riquet, prince de Chimay, Ménars (from 1830); his daughter Marie-Henriette-Valentine Riquet and her husband, the prince de Bauffremont (1875–81; sale, Ménars, June 10, 1881, nos. 3, 4, to Watel); Louis-Joseph Watel, Ménars (1881–1915); Albert Watel (from 1915); Mme Watel-Dehaynin (in 1935); Wildenstein and Company, New York, until 1966; sold to MMA

**THESE VASES ARE RANKED AMONG THE MOST IMPORTANT**

garden ornaments of the eighteenth century because of their royal commission and their artistic ambition. The architect Ange-Jacques Gabriel designed four vases in all, two representing spring and two autumn, for Louis XV’s château at Choisy, near Sceaux. Talented sculptors Jean-Baptiste Pigalle and Nicolas-Sébastien Adam each carved one on the theme of autumn, and the Flemish-born sculptor Jacques Verberckt carved the pair dedicated to spring (one of the latter is now in the Musée du Louvre, the other at the Château de Malmaison). Once completed, all four were stored at the Palais du Louvre and never reached their intended destination. The marquis de Marigny, who was Louis XV’s director general of royal buildings, gardens, arts, academies, and manufactures, as well as more significantly, the brother of the king’s mistress, Madame de Pompadour, eventually asked Louis if he could have them for his château at Ménars, and in 1770 the king gave them to Marigny. There they became focal points of the Grand Parterre, separating the château from the Loire River. Under successive owners, they remained in the garden until 1915, when they were removed to Paris.

Standing nearly six feet tall, these grand marble vases marked the intersection of garden paths at Ménars, and they complemented nearby busts of ancient Roman emperors. Like many garden ornaments of the period of Louis XIV and Louis XV, the vases are indebted to ancient precedent. The Medici Vase, a famous Roman marble of the first century a.d., was familiar to countless French tourists, first in Rome at the Villa Medici and after 1780 in Florence at the Galleria degli Uffizi. Its kalyx-krater form, based on an ancient Greek vase type, with fluted base and handles springing from satyrs’ heads, became a paradigm for Baroque and Rococo garden ornaments. This, and the equally famous Borghese Vase, also Roman, but of the first century B.C., now in the Musée du Louvre, featured figurative relief around the body. In the seventeenth century, vases with figurative relief were prominent commissions for Antoine Coysevox and François Girardon at Versailles. By contrast, some other garden vases at Versailles, such as Jean du Goulon’s Vase with Masks of the Sun God (1684), feature purely decorative and symbolic imagery. It is the latter tradition, also after ancient precedent, that the Ménars vases follow. On the Musée’s vases, Gabriel reprised such ancient motifs as satyrs’ masks, horned goats’ heads, and swags of fruit, to create representations of the seasons. Although his designs are lost, it is clear from the varied responses of Pigalle and Adam that Gabriel gave the sculptors considerable scope in interpreting his wishes. The basic elements
are identical. The urn-shaped body has an overhanging lip decorated with an egg-and-dart pattern, and its belly is enriched with gadroons, partially covered by acanthus leaves. Each vase rests on a base whose interlaced patterns are carved rather mechanically when compared with the decoration of the richly contrived body it supports.

It is on the body of the urns that the artistic personalities of the sculptors become apparent. If the forms are similar—aaddorsed bacchantes’ or satyrs’ heads in cartouches from which ivy swags depend, and goat’s-head handles emerging from the belly—nearly every detail differs. Pigalle adhered closely to the decorative logic of his vase (no. 57): the swags are shallower and less expansive than Adam’s more naturalistic ones. His cartouches are clearly demarked, unlike Adam’s (no. 58), which dissolve into decorative fancy, and he added castanets beneath the nymphs to identify them as dancers. His goats’ horns curl back simply, like the handles they are meant to suggest, while Adam’s take an extra twist before they touch the volute beneath. Pigalle limited his goats to their role as decorative elements, but Adam reveled in the unruly nature of the beasts, showing them chomping vigorously on ivy.

We know that Pigalle was responsible for the vase with the heads of two bacchantes because the fact is acknowledged in a register for the year 1742, when it was commissioned. The bacchantes’ broad face with narrowed eyes and sensuous curling mouth is nearly identical to that of Pigalle’s Mercury Attaching His Winged Sandal, a marble statue now at the Louvre, which he was carving during the same years. The Museum’s bacchante vase was Pigalle’s first official commission. While sticking to the program, the young sculptor gave free rein to his personal style in details like the faces. Adam revealed his style, developed during eight years of work in Rome, more emphatically. There is a strong stamp of the Baroque on works such as this satyr vase and his tomb of Queen Catharina Opalinska in the church of Notre-Dame-de-Bon-Secours in Nancy (1747–49). His taste for opulent forms and sense of drama come through even in decorative details like the goats’ horns and the arched eyebrows of the satyr’s head. What makes this pair of vases superior to most fine garden sculpture is the exuberance of the sculptors’ personalities expressed through the carving of otherwise conventional forms.
1. The princesse de Bauffremont sold the Château de Ménils to Louis-Joseph Watel in 1879. At that time her title to the vases was disputed by the state, but it was confirmed in 1880, and the following year Watel purchased them at an auction at Ménils. See Phillips 1967a, p. 244.


3. The War Vase by Antoine Coysevox (1684–85; marble, H. 98½ in., [250.2 cm]; Versailles); The Triumph of Amphitrite Vase by Francois Girardon (1684; marble, H. 45½ in., [115.4 cm]; Musée du Louvre, Paris).

4. See, for example, the Roman vase of the 1st century A.D. in the Musei Capitolini, Rome (inv. Albani, 1921; Jones 1912, vol. 2, pp. 105–6, no. 31a, vol. 2, pl. 28). The well-known Warwick Vase with its satyrs’ heads was discovered in 1769–70 at Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli. For its influence and the craze for vases in the eighteenth century, see Vassanania 2004, esp. pp. 33–34, no. 2 (entry by Katherine Danalakis).


59. John Barnard

JOHN MICHAEL RYSBRACK (FLEMISH, ACTIVE IN ENGLAND, 1694–1770)

London, 1744
Marble portrait bust
17 × 12 1/4 × 9 1/4 in. (43.2 × 30.8 × 23.2 cm)
Signed and dated (on back): Mi Rysbrack/Febt 1744
Inscribed (on back): John Barnard
Purchase, Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, The Moses Lazarus Collection,
Gift of Sarah and Josephine Lazarus, Bequest of Kate Read Blaque,
in memory of her husband, Valentine Alexander Blaque, and Bequests of
Mary Clark Thompson and Barbara S. Adler, by exchange, 1976 1976.330

PROVENANCE: Sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, April 6, 1976, lots
catalogue, to Moatti; [Alain Moatti, Paris, 1976; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: Vertue 1722–35/1933–34, p. 57; Webb 1954,
pp. 182, 217 (as unlocated); James David Draper in
Metropolitan Museum 1979, pp. 32–33, ill.; Balderston
2000, pp. 188, 190, figs. 9, 14; “Rysbrack: John Barnard”
2006, ill.

BORN AND TRAINED IN ANTWERP, RYSBRACK MOVED TO LONDON
in 1720. There, during the following two decades, he became the foremost sculptor in his adopted country. As he carved garden statues for such patrons as Lord Burlington at Chiswick House, architectural reliefs for Kensington Palace, and monuments and tombs in key sites such as Westminster Abbey, his fame steadily grew. This highly visible sculptor naturally received many commissions for portrait busts; in England he was one of the first to popularize the informal bust en négligée as well as all’antica busts addressing the latest taste in Neoclassicism. By 1740 he had been eclipsed by two younger masters trained in the Netherlands, Louis-François Roubiliac and Peter Scheemakers, but continued to receive commissions from loyal patrons. In 1743 the historian of British art George Vertue observed that Rysbrack “feels the effect in the decline of Business,” adding that he had “long been at the top of fortunes wheel here.”

It was in this late period that he carved the engaging and fresh portrait of the boy John Barnard. A beautifully rendered inscription names him John Barnard — the spelling of the surname varies in contemporary accounts — and a manuscript list of Rysbrack’s busts begun by George Vertue in 1732 mentions one of “D’ Bernard,” bishop of Raphoe, followed a few entries later by “a Son of M’. Bernard,” most likely this bust. The boy’s father, William Barnard (1696–1768), held a succession of ecclesiastical posts: prebendary of Westminster (1732–43), vicar of the church of Saint Bride’s, London (1739–47), dean of Rochester Cathedral (1743–44), bishop of Raphoe (consecrated in the church of Saint Michael’s, Dublin, August 19, 1744), and bishop of Derry (1746–47). The names of only two of his sons are recorded, Thomas (b. 1728) and Henry, both of whom served as clergymen in Ireland. James Draper wondered whether this bust represents a posthumous portrait of another son; the grave and somewhat melancholy expression supports his hypothesis.

The boy’s fashionable costume, however, is somewhat at odds with his serious demeanor. He wears a Hussar’s uniform, which was of blue silk trimmed with gold braid, with gold tassels and gold buttons. In the 1740s and later, references to Hussar costumes in masquerades are often found; the fad was born out of British sympathy for Hungary and Vienna in the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48). In the early 1740s the monthly magazine Female Spectator noted that “it is a common Observation, that in Time of War the very Boys in the Street get on Grenadier Caps, hang wooden Swords by their Sides, and form themselves into little Battalio’s: — Why then should we be surprized that Boys of more Years, but not older in their Understanding, should affect to look like Warriors for the Queen of
Hungary, and equip themselves as much as possible after the Mode of those who fight the Battles of that famous German Heroine.⁵ Painters followed the fashion: Sir Joshua Reynolds depicted several sitters in this costume, and in 1752 Thomas Bardwell painted a portrait in oil on canvas of James Scott, fourth son of Francis, Earl of Dalkeith (collection of the Duke of Buccleuch, Bowhill), as a boy of less than ten years dressed in Hungarian costume.⁶

Rysbrack made only a few busts of children, and they are among his liveliest works.⁷ John Barnard is akin to a terracotta bust he created four years later of Edward Salter, aged six (fig. 46). Salter wears a conventional jacket, vest, and ruffled blouse rather than the richly exotic costume of Barnard’s, but the sloping truncation of the arms, the twist of the head, and the tousled locks indicate that the sculptor was continuing a successful format. It is likely that Rysbrack modeled a clay bust in preparation for John Barnard, too.⁸ Apparently, he liked to carve his busts directly from a terracotta model rather than from a more developed plaster version. The Museum’s bust represents a vigorous translation of the freely worked clay into the exacting medium of carved marble. Rysbrack was known for the fine finish of his marbles, but the young Barnard’s innocence and simplicity shine forth even in the carefully polished final rendering.

---

4. Draper in Metropolitan Museum 1979, pp. 32–33.
6. Ribero 1977 charts the development of the concept, providing examples in paintings by Reynolds (figs. 8, 9) and an illustration of the Bardwell portrait (fig. 10).
8. An example, not seen by the author, was recently sold at auction: Bust of John Bernard as a Boy (1743; sale, Christie’s, London, July 7, 2005, no. 426).
60. Madame de Pompadour (1721–1764)

JEAN-BAPTISTE PIGALLE (FRENCH, 1716–1785)
Paris, 1748–51
Marble portrait bust
29 1/4 (with socle) × 18 3/4 × 11 3/4 in. (75.9 × 47.3 × 28.9 cm)
Inscribed (on drapery): JAP [in monogram, surmounted
by the marquise’s coronet]
Marked (on clasp on left arm): three towers, the main
charge of her coat of arms
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949. 49.770

PROVENANCE: Commissioned by the marquise de
Pompadour, probably for her residence, the Château de
Bellevue (1731–d. 1764); her brother Abel-François Poisson,
marquis de Marigny (1764–d. 1781), Château de Ménars; his
heirs, the subsequent owners of Ménars (1781–at least
till 1788); Madame de Mauleon, Château de Pescheuse;
Mme de Belissen, Château de Pescheuse; the subsequent
owners of Pescheuse (until at least 1907); Baron Maurice de
Rothschild, Paris; Jules Bache, New York (by 1920, until
1949; his gift to MMA)

EXHIBITED: "Fiftieth Anniversary Exhibition," The
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1920; "The Bache Collection,"
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, June 16–September 1943

LITERATURE: Wildenstein 1915–17, III; Breck 1920, p. 135, III.
p. 132; Fiftytieth Anniversary Exhibition 1920, p. 12; Cordey
1939, p. 18 (between nos. 156, 157); Réau 1950a, pp. 112–24,
171, no. 70, pl. 1; "French Decorative Art" 1954, III, p. 102;
Beaulieu 1956, III, no. 2; La scultura del Settecento 1966,
cover ill.; Raggio 1967b, pp. 222–25, figs. 7–10; Posner 1990,
p. 94, fig. 12; Raggio 1991, pp. 242–43, fig. 22; Scherf 2002,
pp. 281–82, fig. 1; Guilhem Scherf in El gusto "a la griega"
2007, p. 242, n. 7; Danielle Kisluk-Grosheide in Kisluk-
Grosheide and Munger 2010, pp. 176–78, III.

JEAN-BAPTISTE PIGALLE’S BUST OF MADAME DE POMPAUD AND
Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne’s bust of Louis XV (no. 61) were both owned
by the king’s mistress, though they were never intended as pendants;
nor is it likely that they were exhibited together until they were
acquired by the Museum. United, they represent the couple in superb
portraits by two of the greatest mid-eighteenth-century French
sculptors.

A pupil of Lemoyne, Pigalle did not pursue portrait sculpture to the
extent that his teacher did. His first official commission was a
marble vase with the attributes of autumn (no. 57) intended for the
royal château at Choisy. His early triumph was a statue, Mercury
Attaching His Winged Sandal, of which a small marble was presented to
the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture in 1744 (Musée du
Louvre, Paris) and a large version given by Louis XV to Frederick the
Great of Prussia (Bode Museum, Berlin). These successes brought the
young sculptor to the marquise de Pompadour’s attention. Officially,
the bust’s commission came from the superintendent of royal build-
ings and gardens, Charles-François Le Normand (Lenormant) de
Tournehem, who also happened to be Madame de Pompadour’s uncle;
it is likely that it was intended for her residence, the Château de
Bellevue, which was completed shortly before the bust was finished.
Le Normand de Tournehem had been seeking quarries of carvable
white marble in France so that it would no longer be necessary to
import the stone from Italy; Pigalle was given a block from a site near
Luchon in the Pyrenees to essay its quality. According to a later
account by the sculptor, "The marble of this newly discovered French
quarry is very difficult to carve: one cannot master it while working,
because it keeps flaking off under the chisel; and this peculiarity,
together with its extreme hardness, require not only infinite precau-
tions, but . . . also twice as much time for work as Carrara marble."

Whatever technical problems Pigalle may have encountered,
none are evident in the sensuous, pristine bust that emerged from
the recalcitrant stone. As if anticipating no difficulties at all, he set
himself the most delicate of carving assignments. The point d’Argentan
lace at the marquise’s bodice, the petals of the flowers crowning her
hair, and the wisps that curl into the locks of her elaborate coiffure
demanded the most subtle kind of work. Nearly hidden in the dress
are her initials and coat of arms. Falling off one breast and encircling
one arm, the dress shows off the Pompadour’s shoulders and long
neck. A gentle smile plays on her lips, and she turns her head grace-
fully to her right. Pigalle aimed for accuracy, and the sculptural
portrait accords with painted ones of the period by Jean-Marc Nattier
and others. This was his first commissioned portrait, and it is more
restrained than such later masterpieces of naturalistic observation as
his bronze bust of Denis Diderot (1777, Musée du Louvre). In the latter, the subject’s sagging eyebrows are modeled and chiseled with merciless accuracy, but they vibrantly bring the encyclopédiste to life. The combination of truthfulness and precision found in both busts is essential to Pigalle’s art.

Madame de Pompadour was famous as a patron of the arts, but her sculpture commissions were made less frequently than those in the decorative arts. Donald Posner has questioned the true purpose of her patronage, but its extent was vast. She owned fifteen residences, filled with so many possessions that their inventory after her death took almost a year to complete. Her personal taste in sculpture inclined toward sleek and sensuous marbles, and she owned important examples by Édme Bouchardon (Cupid Cutting His Bow from the Club of Hercules, 1750, Musée du Louvre), Étienne-Maurice Falconet (Winter, 1763–71, State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg), and Jacques-François-Joseph Saly (Hebe, 1757, Victoria and Albert Museum, London). She admired Pigalle, too, and ordered a replica of his Mercury Attaching His Winged Sandal. For Bellevue she commissioned Madame de Pompadour as Friendship, whose features are recognizable in our own bust, finished only two years earlier (fig. 47). Friendship once faced Pigalle’s standing statue of Louis XV, ordered in 1750 (destroyed).1

1. The account appeared in Nouvelles littéraires; translated in Raggio 1967b, p. 223.

fig. 47 Pigalle, Madame de Pompadour as Friendship, 1753. Marble. Musée du Louvre, Paris
Louis XV (1710–1774), King of France

Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne (French, 1704–1778)

Paris, 1757
Marble portrait bust
30 3/4 in. (78 cm) 
Signed and dated (on back): PARIS. B. LEMOYNE.1757
Gift of George Blumenthal, 1941: 41.100.244

Provenance: Probably commissioned by Mme de Pompadour and exhibited in Paris at the Salon of 1757 (1757–d. 1764; her sale, 1764, to the king); Louis XV (1764; presented to Laverdy); Charles-François de Laverdy, Château de Neuville, Gambia (1764–d. 1799); by descent to the marquis de la Briffe, Château de Neuville, Gambiais, George and Florence Blumenthal, New York (until her death in 1930); George Blumenthal (until d. 1941; his gift to MMA)


In 1730 in Paris the young Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne and his ailing father, Jean-Louis Lemoyne, signed the contract to execute a bronze equestrian statue of Louis XV for the Place Royale at Bordeaux. Despite a notorious casting disaster, Jean-Baptiste brought the work to completion in 1743. He went on to execute a monument to the king in Rennes (unveiled in 1754) and the presentation model for another at Rouen (cast in 1772). Louis was so well satisfied by these public celebrations of his reign that he ordered the sculptor to portray him in busts regularly, which Lemoyne did, until the king’s death, in 1774. Art historian Antoine-Nicolas Désallier d’Argenville’s claim that these were made every three or four years reflects the widely held perception of many courtiers at the time that Lemoyne was the king’s portrait sculptor of choice. In 1768 the king’s adviser on the arts, Charles-Nicolas Cochin, observed in a letter to the marquis de Marigny that Lemoyne was “the only artist who is now free to model after the King and who, consequently, is able to represent him as he actually is, with the greatest fidelity.” The sculptor had unusual freedom of access to the monarch for several decades. In all probability he sketched Louis — although few drawings for finished busts survive — and certainly he modeled him in clay. The artist’s familiarity with the royal features is reflected in this confident representation of the king.

Six busts of Louis by Lemoyne are listed in the records of the Administration of Royal Buildings (Direction des Bâtiments) but only two examples in marble are known today, one in a private collection in Paris, signed and dated 1749, and this one, also signed and dated, in the Museum. They are similar in format — the king wears a cuirass crossed by a sash and turns sharply to his left — but the Metropolitan’s bust is enlivened by a Rococo swirl of drapery. A comparison of the 1749 bust with this one, carved eight years later, reveals the qualities that led the king to favor Lemoyne. In both, Louis projects authority and wears the trappings of power — armor, a cord with the Order of the Golden Fleece, and the medal of the Order of the Holy Spirit (Saint-Esprit) pinned to his cloak — and in both there is an ease to the way he carries himself. In the earlier characterization he is thinner and more alert. The later one shows that with the passage of time his body filled out and he became more relaxed. His hair is tied back simply with a bow, his shirt drapes casually around his neck, and he withholds his gaze from the viewer in a manner that might seem modest were he not so clearly a person of power. The flourish of his cloak, partially covering the socle, recalls that most commanding of French royal portraits, Gianlorenzo Bernini’s flamboyant bust of Louis XIV (Versailles), but Lemoyne sought to characterize the monarch as approachable, as if seen by an intimate. One’s eye is
drawn to the sheen of the crinkled silk sash, the nubbly embroidery of the Order of Saint-Ésprit, and the smoothly combed hair. Rather than dazzling us with the effects of a state portrait, Lemoyne has produced a bust that engages us with closely observed textures, including the fleshy cheeks, slightly sagging eyelids, and wrinkled neck of a man of forty-seven years.

The warmth of character conveyed must have appealed to the king’s mistress, Madame de Pompadour, since she owned this bust as well as the one of 1749. It is likely that this bust, which was delivered on December 10, 1757, to Champs, a château Pompadour had rented, is the one exhibited at the Paris Salon earlier the same year. Following her death, in 1764, the king bought it and presented it to Charles-François de Laverdy, his controller general of finances. There also exists a replica, lacking the inscription, in the collection of the duc de Luynes at the Château de Dampierre, which is thought to be of sufficiently high quality to have come from Lemoyne’s atelier.  

1. Scherf 2009a, p. 432
2. Scherf 2009a
4. Quoted in Raggio 1967b, p. 222.
5. Brière 1907.
62. Model for the so-called Female Saint of Starnberg

IGNAZ GÜNThER (GERMAN, 1725–1775)
Munich, ca. 1755
Linden-wood statuette with pencil marks
8 7/8 x 4 1/4 x 2 3/4 in. (22.6 x 10.5 x 7.3 cm)
Inscribed (on a paper label glued underneath the base): Nach Feulner Orig./nalskizze Ignaz Günther geb. 1725/+1775 für die Kirche in Starnberg er-/richtet 1766–68. [according to Feulner origi-/nal sketch by Ignaz Günther born 1725/died 1775 for the church in Starnberg e-/rected 1766–68]
European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2008

PROVENANCE: Dr. Richard von Kühmann (German b. Istanbul, 1873–1949); descended in his family (until 2007; sale 403, Stuttgarter Kunstauctionhaus, March 21–22, 2007, no. 1073, to Blumka); [Blumka Gallery, New York, 2007–8; sold to MMA]

EXHIBITED: "Collecting Treasures of the Past," Blumka Gallery, New York, October 18–November 2, 2007


SMALL CLAY MODELS FASHIONED IN FRANCE AND ITALY AS guides for producing large-scale works in marble and bronze are well represented in the Museum. Clay and wax also served in northern Europe as modeling materials, but sculptors there often turned to wood to essay ideas for lifesize sculpture—a less common workshop practice in southern Europe. The German predilection for wood as a sculptural material promoted its use in a range of sizes. Until the acquisition of this study carved by Ignaz Günther, one of South Germany’s most brilliant sculptors, the Museum did not own a distinguished example of a wooden model for a monumental figure. Relatively rare outside museums in Munich and Berlin, wooden bozzetti such as this one testify to the German talent for attacking the grain of wood with chisel and blade.

This female figure swivels her head and right leg to her left, while her torso and arms twist in the opposite direction. A scarf falling from the back of her head and the swinging pleats of her robe accentuate the flurry of movement. Günther sliced some forms broadly but also whittled passages of surprising delicacy. The saint’s right hand has a cubicist blockiness, and her right leg is rendered simply as two planes. Long drapery folds are scooped out smoothly, while small shavings taken from her shoulder animate the surface. Examined closely, the locks of hair and features of the face dissolve into tiny facets, but seen from farther away the face and clothes are easily discerned because they have been rendered with such sureness of touch. Like the abbreviations of pen and ink on a drawing, the flicks of the chisel here create an abstract impression of form. In fact, Günther was an accomplished and prolific draftsman, who tossed off quick sketches and labored over more carefully finished studies. The drawings he made later in the 1750s for the Holy Trinity on the high altar formerly in the Benedictine church at Rott-am-Inn employ angular ink outlines, swathes of dark wash, and squiggled marks—the graphic equivalent of a carved model. The sculptor frequently exchanged chisel for quill, moving back and forth from two- to three-dimensional models as his conception for a work evolved.

This is one of two known wooden models for the so-called Female Saint of Starnberg (fig. 48), a key work from early in Günther’s career, produced about 1755, a year after he moved to Munich. The second wooden model, in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich, represents generally the same shapes as this one but is slightly more schematic. For instance, the left arm is rendered as planes of a block in the Munich example but here has been carved to suggest a rounding of form, and the same process of refinement can be seen as one flips from Günther’s earliest to his latest sketches for the Holy Trinity. The nearly lifesize wooden figure of the Female Saint of Starnberg floats

fig. 48 Günther, Female Saint of Starnberg, ca. 1755. Painted wood. Städtisches Heimatmuseum, Starnberg
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free of the architectural element that elevates her in this model, and removing the support lightened her appearance. In the final work the figure is elongated and the face is more frontal. The expressive, downturned eyes characteristic of Günther’s style are fully formed, elaborated from the other wooden model’s abbreviated features. Deeply shadowed folds of drapery were transformed into broader planes that reflect light, while thin, flickering edges lend greater delicacy to the figure; thus, from the Munich model’s squat proportions and the thinner ones of the Museum’s example, the sculptor created a more ethereal body, emphasizing the saint’s upward motion. The original context of the Starnberg saint is unknown, but the statue must have formed part of an altarpiece, where the rhythm of the pose responded to the movements of the other holy figures.

1. The subject of German eighteenth-century models for sculpture is thoroughly examined in Bayerische Rokokoplastik 1885; Barockplastik 1886.
63. Head of a Bearded Elder

AUGUSTIN PAJOU (FRENCH, 1730–1809)
Probably Paris, 1768
Terracotta bust on a bleu turquin marble socle
21$rac{1}{4}$ (with socle) × 12$rac{3}{4}$ × 9$rac{1}{4}$ in. (54.6 × 30.8 × 24.1 cm);
H. of socle 7$rac{1}{8}$ in. (18.4 cm)
Signed and dated (on right shoulder): Pajou/fe 1768

PROVENANCE: Edmond Courty, Châtillon-sous-Bagneux
(until d. 2002); his heirs (their sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris,
December 9, 2002, no. 30, to MMA)

EXHIBITED: “L’Esprit créateur de Pigalle à Canova: Terres
cuites européennes, 1740–1840,” Musée du Louvre, Paris,
September 19, 2003–January 5, 2004; “Playing with Fire:
European Terracotta Models, 1740–1840,” The Metropolitan
Museum of Art, January 28–April 25, 2004

LITERATURE: James David Draper in L’Esprit créateur 2003,
pp. 70–71, no. 23, Ill.; Draper in Playing with Fire 2003,
pp. 56–57, no. 23, Ill.; Draper in “Recent Acquisitions” 2003,
p. 25, Ill.

IN ADDITION TO THIS TERRACOTTA BUST, THE MUSEUM’S
holdings of works by or after Augustin Pajou include a marble bust
of Madame de Wally (no. 72); two terracotta statuettes, Ceres (ca.
1768–70) and Fidelity, the Mother of Constant Love (1799); two Sèvres
works in biscuit after a bust of Madame du Barry (1772); a biscuit
statuette of Bishop Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1784); several drawings;
and even a clock by Jean-Baptiste Lepaute with gilded-bronze figures
after models by Pajou (ca. 1780–90). 1 What the collection lacked from
this multi-talented artist was an example of a genre to which Pajou had
made distinguished contributions, the tête d’expression. This was an
exercise in depicting emotions that the Académie Royale de Peinture et de
Sculpture required of its pupils. The competition criteria, set forth
by the comte de Caylus, were that students “draw or paint, model in
the round or in relief, a lifesize head from nature, representing
the expression of a passion . . . this study must be done from nature and
not otherwise.” 2 “Despondency” and “Suffering” were two of the
subjects required of the budding academicians (in 1767 and 1773,
respectively); in sculpture, such tests of skill were usually executed
in terracotta. Pajou did not submit a tête d’expression to the academy,
but he did create several character studies of old men, unconnected
with other projects and not portraits — that is, independent works
of art. Prior to the discovery of the present bust, the most accom-
plished example known of the type was the Head of a Bearded Old Man
by Pajou in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. That work
(fig. 49) depicts a troubled, introspective man with deeply furrowed
brows and a luxuriantly flowing beard. Although it has been proposed
as preparatory to Pajou’s large statue of Saint Augustin at the Hôtel
des Invalides, Paris, Guilhem Scherf points out that the saint is
usually shown wearing a miter. 3

When this bust arrived in a warehouse prior to auction in 2002,
it was still protected by the 1940s newspapers in which the collector
Edmond Courty had wrapped it. Although signed and dated by Pajou,
the bust had not been published before the Courty sale. It invites
comparison with the head in figure 49, with downcast eyes and an
inward expression, modeled by the sculptor seven years earlier. An
equally vivid depiction of a bearded older man, the Museum’s example
stares ahead with a fierce, almost combative, expression. The brows
jut so far out that the sculptor must have intended them to cast the
eyes in shadow, adding to the sense of menace. The contrast between
the two heads caused James Draper to wonder whether a deliberate
pairing was intended, possibly of ancient philosophers, perhaps repre-
senting Aristotle and Plato. Given Pajou’s other forays in this genre,
however, Draper prefers to view the two works as reflecting Pajou’s

fig. 49 Pajou, Head of a Bearded Old Man, 1761. Terracotta.
Victoria and Albert Museum, London
continued interest in a subject that he had first studied in a 1754 chalk drawing, *Seated Bearded Elder* (Musée du Louvre, Paris). Pajou’s prolonged study of ancient sculpture, particularly busts of Stoics and other ancient thinkers, clearly informs this intense representation of a man gripped by thought. Yet its naturalistic flair, achieved through brilliant handling of the clay and flicks of the modeling tool, indicate that it is a pure exercise in expression and a celebration of the artist’s passion to define form, rather than a representation of a specific subject. The mantle, though not sufficient costume to identify the man, provides a matte foil to his curling locks and a tight frame for his turned head.

1. The accession numbers are (Madame de Wailly) 36.105; (Ceret) 1972.2; (Fisherly) 1986.282; (Madame du Barry) 43.1534; b. (Bishop Bosquet) 1986.260; (drawings) 57.215.104, 1793.388, 1956.24; (block) 1753.202126. See also James David Draper and Guilhem Scherf, in Pajou: Royal Sculptor 1998, nos. 12, 22, 20, 68, 78, 97, 213, 142.
3. Scherf in Pajou: Royal Sculptor 1998, pp. 170–72, no. 63, and see fig. 106 (a related work in the Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto) and fig. 107 (*Elder in a Turban*, Musée Bonnat de Bayonne).
4. Draper in Playing with Fire 2003, p. 56 and fig. 42.
64. Emperor Henry IV at Canossa

UBALDO GANDOLFI (ITALIAN, 1728–1781)
Bologna, ca. 1770–75
Terracotta statuette
23¼ × 9¼ × 7¼ in. (60.6 × 23.5 × 18.1 cm)
Stamped twice underneath with an indecipherable diamond-shaped Italian customs stamp and with what appears to be a date in Italian: 10 lug [1786] July 10, 1786
Purchase, Assunta Sommella Peluso, Ada Peluso, and Romano I. Peluso Gift, in memory of Ignazio Peluso, 2006
2006.499

PROVENANCE: Maria Clotilde Donini Baer, Bologna (by 1965); private collection, Florence (by 1990); David Rocksavage, seventh Marquess of Cholmondeley, Florence (by 1998); [Rainer Zietz, London, until 2006; sold to MMA]

EXHIBITED: *Scultura bolognese del Settecento,* Museo Civico, Bologna, December 12, 1965–January 12, 1966


Lacking marble quarries, Bologna developed sculptural traditions that relied on readily available materials such as clay and stucco. In the eighteenth century some Bolognese artists best known for terracotta work were Giuseppe Mazza and Angelo Piò. Even the city’s painters tried their hand at clay statuettes, and one such artist who occasionally practiced three-dimensional modeling was Ubaldo Gandolfi. Member of an artistic family that included his brother Gaetano, he was a prolific draftsman, becoming director of drawing at the Accademia Clementina in 1760. 1 The Museum’s study for *The Presentation of the Virgin Mary in the Temple,* an altarpiece formerly in the church of San Giovanni in Persiceto, gives a fine impression of Ubaldo’s ability to define forms with flowing washes of ink. 2 His principal occupation was the painting of church altarpieces in and around Bologna, and he also executed frescoes of mythological subjects for the Palazzo Malvezzi (ca. 1758), Palazzo Malvasia (ca. 1775–80), and Palazzo Pubblico. The paintings depend for their effect on close observations of facial expressions and gestures and on the spirited use of color and form to convey religious conviction. Gandolfi’s small sculptural output, which includes the dramatically gesturing monumental stuccos *Jeremiah and Isaiah* (1780) in the church of San Giuliano in Bologna, is mainly documented toward the end of his career. Attributions of terracottas to Gandolfi depend on one monogrammed work, *Saint Joseph and Child* in the church of San Giovanni in Monte, Bologna, dated about 1770.

The Museum’s terracotta was first ascribed to Gandolfi in 1965 by the scholar Eugenio Riccomini, on the basis of its close relation to the monogrammed example, and the attribution continues to be accepted. 3 Both statuettes have a theatrical presentation, the same type of male head, and a careful incising of surfaces. Certainly the pictorial setting of this one is highly unusual for sculpture: the bearded man reading a book is sheltering within a blasted tree. From behind, only the swelling form of the tree is visible; from the sides, his limbs protrude only slightly; from the front, he is seen neatly framed within the hollow trunk. The artist stretched the clay around the figure in a highly inventive manner, exploiting its plastic quality. Barefooted, the man stands on a crown; his tunic, which he clutches to his breast, is ornamented with cockleshells, the symbols of a pilgrim; and ropes tie a pilgrim’s flask to the tree. The artist used a tool with short teeth to roughen the surface of the tree, suggesting bark, and he brushed water over the figure to evoke the softness of cloth. Different types of clay give this statuette color: red for the tree, pure white for the clothes, and white mixed with red for the face. 4 Colored clays were used by other Bolognese sculptors in a manner suggestive of red,
black, and white chalk drawings, a combination of colors favored by draftsmen of the Emilia region.

When first published, the terracotta was titled “Henry II of England,” but the iconography does not support the idea. When it entered the Museum, Charles T. Little of the Department of Medieval Art suggested that its subject was more likely Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV (1050–1106), who was excommunicated by Pope Gregory VII following a dispute concerning jurisdiction over the clergy. In 1077 Henry traveled to see the pope at the fortified palace of Canossa. There he waited for three days in wintry weather, barefoot and wearing a hair shirt, for the pope’s judgment. By submitting to that penance, he persuaded Gregory to rescind his excommunication. This significant event in the history of papal rule was frequently a subject of art, generally paintings, in the nineteenth century (rarely before), and above all in Germany.5

Gandolfi’s terracotta is an early example of medieval revivalism, more prevalent in the following century. Many of the later depictions show the emperor standing in snow. As this would be difficult to render in clay, the sculptor devised — apparently without precedent — the ingenious solution of enclosing Henry in a tree to suggest the frigid weather he faced. It is not entirely surprising that this unusual subject was modeled in Bologna, not far from Canossa and located in one of the most important papal states during the eighteenth century.

1. For his career, see Biagi Maino 1999.
2. Acc. no. 80.3.501.
4. This description depends on the observations of Carmen Lorenzetti (1991, p. 65).
65. A Hypocrite and a Slanderer

FRANZ XAVER MESSERSCHMIDT (AUSTRIAN, 1736–1783)
Probably Pressburg (Bratislava), ca. 1770–83
Tin-alloy bust
14 1/4 x 5 1/4 x 11 3/4 in. (37 x 24.4 x 29.5 cm)
Purchase, European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund; Lila Acheson Wallace, Mr. and Mrs. Mark Fisch, and Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. Richardson Gifts, 2010; 2010.24

PROVENANCE: The artist (until d. 1783); by inheritance, the artist’s brother Johann Adam Messerschmidt (in 1783); Eskesel collection, Bratislava (before 1933); Baroness Karwinski-Gerngross, Vienna (until 1958); private European collection (1958–2010); [Roman Herzog, 2010, sold to MMA]


In the 1760s Franz Xaver Messerschmidt became the leading sculptor at the imperial court in Vienna, making lifesize statues of the emperor and empress and busts of the nobility. Following a trip to Italy in 1765, his rather florid Late Baroque style began to shift to more contained and severe forms influenced by his study of ancient sculpture and favored by the Neoclassicists. In the early 1770s he applied for the coveted position of professor of sculpture at the Austrian academy of fine arts but was refused on the grounds of mental instability. He may have suffered a nervous breakdown about that time; it has also been suggested that academic rivals exaggerated accounts of his condition to thwart his advancement. In any event, this professional crisis propelled him from the city; he traveled first to his birthplace, Wiesensteig, and settled finally in Pressburg (now Bratislava).

While he continued to fulfill occasional commissions, Messerschmidt focused obsessively on a series of sculptures that he referred to as Kopftücke, or “head pieces.” These busts included straightforward self-portraits, smiling or scowling; caricatural representations of men responding to a stimulus—for example, yawning or reacting to a strong odor; and hyperserious studies of mental, often introspective, states (fig. 50). Each of these works was unique, either cast in a soft tin alloy, which the artist favored, or carved in local alabaster. In 1777 a visitor to Messerschmidt’s studio, the art scholar Johann Rudolph Fuzelli, described them as “very much in his own likeness” and characterized the latest ones as “convulsive,” compared with the earlier work. In 1781 Friedrich Nicolai observed the sculptor peering in a mirror and working his facial muscles to produce the right grimace. Nicolai described the busts as admirable masterpieces fashioned “with great accuracy and verity.” Thus, contemporaries saw them as realistic, if often extreme, exercises in self-portraiture. Their statements also indicate an evolution in the series from what Nicolai called “simple heads conformable with nature” toward more intense, less normative images.

The meaning of the series has elicted various interpretations. The academically trained sculptor was clearly familiar with treatises on the pictorial and sculptural representation of human emotions. Most famous of those was Charles Le Brun’s lecture at the French royal academy in 1668—Conférence sur l’expression générale et particulière—published posthumously in several versions illustrated with diagrams. Messerschmidt would also have been aware of another seventeenth-century artist and critic, Joachim von Sandrart, and his theory of the four temperaments, or personality types, and how to represent them. In addition, it is highly likely that he had knowledge of certain scientific theories of the day. For example, the Swiss
physiognomist Johann Kaspar Lavater in his Physiognomische Fragmente zur Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe (1775–78) posited that a person’s character could be gauged by the shape of his head. The scrupulous attention Messerschmidt paid to his busts’ crania suggests knowledge of Lavater’s ideas. Medical theories that the artist certainly knew were those of the Viennese physician Franz Anton Mesmer, whose house in Vienna neighbored Messerschmidt’s. Mesmer believed that celestial bodies influence human instincts and that the senses, such as sight and hearing, are connected to internal organs and influence an individual’s character. He developed cures for his patients, including the application of magnets to parts of the body. Some of Messerschmidt’s heads, such as Ill-Humored Man (Musée du Louvre, Paris), have strips of metal on their mouths, seemingly mimicking this cure; moreover, their strain and tension reflect states of crisis that presumably could be addressed by Mesmer’s animal magnetism treatments, his baths, and hypnotism.

Despite the enormous sum that the distinguished art collector Duke Albert von Sachsen-Teschen reportedly offered for the entire series, the sculptor appears to have held on to the heads throughout his life. He completed no fewer than sixty-nine. After his death, his brother Johann Adam inherited the busts and ten years later exhibited forty-nine of them, including this one. Each of the busts was given a title at that time, and it is far from certain that they were the artist’s own descriptions. At the beginning of the nineteenth century a group of them was exhibited at the Prater amusement park in Vienna as curiosities. Later, many of them entered the city’s Museum für Kunst und Industrie (so named in 1865), and after World War I, a large number were transferred to the newly founded Österreichische Galerie, Vienna. They were increasingly sought by collectors in the years before World War II, when they also began to receive serious critical attention, notably by the art historian and psychoanalyst Ernst Kris.

In the last several decades they have been much studied and exhibited and are now recognized as an exceptionally prescient artistic exploration of psychological states and of the reduction of form.

This is one of the most formidable and introspective of Messerschmidt’s busts. A balding, blocky man tucks in his chin, causing wrinkles to form in the flesh of his neck and chest. His brow is deeply furrowed, and creases of skin radiate symmetrically from his mouth and around his jowls. Though the man concentrates fiercely, his eyes are vacant and do not acknowledge the viewer. Light punch marks in the tin alloy indicate the scalp. The chest is severely truncated, tapering at the front. Seen from the side, the bust becomes a blunt, almost brutal image of a rectangular head tipping forward on a socle that evokes into shoulders. Michael Kraf refers to this and a few other heads as “refusers,” those who decline any contact with their environment. Looking down, the subject challenges the viewer to confront him, denying ready access. The sculptor combines meticulously observed natural details, such as the stubble in the scalp, with a geometrical approach seen in the concentric wrinkles and nearly abstract profile. The result is a disturbing image that hovers between realism and abstraction, in our world yet out of it.

4. Sandrart 1675–79.
5. For Lavater’s possible influence on Messerschmidt, see Pfarr 2006b, pp. 299–300.
8. This head was number 39 in the catalogue issued the year following the exhibition. The subject was described as “A hypocrite—bigot—full of hypocrisy and vicious secretive schemes; superstitious, stupid and a secretive slanderer. Ghastly peculiarities!” Merkwürdige Lebensgeschichte 1794.
10. See Messerschmidt 2006; Messerschmidt 2010.
11. Kraf 2003a, p. 40; Michael Kraf in Messerschmidt 2003, p. 188.
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66. Sleeping Boy

PHILIPPE-LAURENT ROLAND (FRENCH, 1746–1816)

Rome, ca. 1774

Half-length terracotta figure, painted white

22 1/4 x 14 x 10 1/4 in. (57.3 x 35.6 x 25.7 cm)

Wightman Fund, 1990.1950.206

PROVENANCE: Sale, Christie’s, Monaco, June 16, 1990, no. 141, as anonymous eighteenth century, to MMA


GIVEN THE SCULPTOR PHILIPPE-LAURENT ROLAND’S REVERENCE for his master, Augustin Pajou, it is no surprise the terracotta Sleeping Boy shares the vivacity of Pajou’s Head of a Bearded Elder (no. 63). A young boy of about ten years has fallen asleep in an upright position. His right hand cradles his lolling head, while the left arm hides in drapery which circles from that shoulder to the other side. The fingers sink into the fleshy cheek and displace the lips from their normal position beneath the nose. These irregularities, along with the taut sinews of the hand and slightly disheveled hair, stand out against the smooth skin of his exposed torso.

The sculptor’s brilliantly observed, relaxed naturalism is all the more astonishing because the work was executed in Rome, where he was applying himself to rigorous study of antique art; however, James Draper, who first identified Sleeping Boy as one of Roland’s three known Roman sculptures, noted that ancient sculptures of sleeping boys may have served the artist as a precedent. He also pointed out that it is, in fact, the genre studies of painters like Jean-Baptiste Greuze that lie behind Roland’s intentions here.¹ From an account by Roland’s star pupil, Pierre-Jean David d’Angers, we know that the master modeled this and another half-length study, Old Man Sleeping (fig. 51), in Rome between 1771 and 1776.² Comparison of the two is enough to convince us that the artist was interested in their complementary natures, even if he did not intend them as formal pendants. The old man also rests head on hand, and details of bulging veins and wrinkled knuckles underscore his age. The greater width of Old Man Sleeping and the sound placement of the two arms, both of which are visible, reveal the relative precariouness of the boy’s pose, accentuated by the tall, irregular self-base and the drapery slipping off one shoulder. One senses that he may tip to one side and jolt awake, unlike the old man, who is firmly anchored in place.

Sleeping Boy is painted white, probably to cover firing cracks that are obvious in the unpainted Old Man Sleeping and possibly to give a patron the idea of what the clay would look like if translated into marble. The direct modeling of the clay makes it apparent that the terracotta was a study for, rather than after, a finished work. One was, in fact, carved: it is apparently the “little sleeper, marble” listed under the date 1774 in a manuscript of Roland’s work prepared for his family after 1847.³ This suggests a dating of the terracotta to the period after Roland arrived in Rome in 1771 but before the carving of the marble in 1774. An old photograph of the marble shows that the artist eliminated the high socle of our terracotta in favor of a short, circular one and reinforced the elbow with more drapery. That support stabilized the boy’s pose but removed some of its latent energy as well as

---

² Patrick Le Nouën in Autour de David d’Angers 1994, p. 56, under no. 11, ill. p. 57;
the visual interest of the asymmetrical composition. The making of a mold to cast a bronze version — one is known in the Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille — may have caused portions of the socle to shear off.

The lifesize proportions of the terracotta and the keenly observed details add to the appeal of this vivacious portrait of the unknown child who posed for Roland. Several other works by the artist in the Museum’s collection, including decorative carvings, a relief portrait of King Louis XVI (1787), a self-portrait, and a terracotta statuette, Bacchante Riding a Goat (1796), testify to his range and accomplishment as a sculptor, one of the best of his generation. This early work remains one of his most brilliant and inventive.

4. The photograph was published in Marcel 1901, p. 186. The marble was in the collection of Roland’s descendant Gabriel de Montigny until at least 1901 and apparently is still in the possession of the family in Aix-en-Provence (see Draper in Playing with Fire 2003, p. 53).
5. See Draper 1992b, fig. 6-8 (acc. nos. 07.225.18, 07.225.17A, 14 (acc. no. 1990.253), 15 (acc. no. 1990.64), 16 (acc. no. 1975.312.9).
CLAUSE MICHEL, CALLED CLODION (FRENCH, 1738–1814)

Paris, ca. 1780–90
Terracotta group
23 × 16⅞ × 11¼ in. (58.4 × 42.9 × 28.6 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913. 14.40.687

PROVENANCE: Baron Thibon, Paris (?); Horace de
Gunsbourg, Paris; Jacques-Antoine Doucet (until 1912; his
sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, January 5–8, 1912, no. 98,
to Altman); Benjamin Altman (1912–d. 1913; his bequest to
MMA)

LITERATURE: "Benjamin Altman Collection" 1913, p. 238;
Metropolitan Museum 1914, pp. 136–37, no. 75, ill. facing
p. 136; Metropolitan Museum 1928, pp. 136–37, no. 74, ill.
facing p. 136; "French Decorative Art" 1954, ill. p. 103;
Draper 1991–92, p. 25, ill.; Guilhem Scherf in Clodion 1992,
p. 392, under no. 89, fig. 208; Benge 1996, pp. 450–51;
"Clodion: Nymph and Satyr" 2006, ill.

CLAUSE MICHEL, CALLED CLODION, EXECUTED COMMISSIONS
for works on an architectural scale (see no. 68) and entered competi-
tions to design public monuments (see no. 69), but his phenomenal
success with terracottas for private collectors has forever identified
him with that genre. One of the finest is The Intoxication of Wine.
Racing into the arms of a satyr, a bacchante raises a cup to pour wine
into his open mouth. Her sprawling companion steadies himself on a
rocky seat with one stiffened arm while clutching her to him with the
other. The sculptor's finesse in modeling shows to full advantage: he
smoothed the clay to capture the sleek skin of the nymph's buxom
body and toolo the satyr's furry legs. The anatomical precision of the
satyr's rippling back muscles, the pronounced veins in his extended
arm, and the bent knuckles of his right hand reveal Clodion's mastery.
The composition of the figures is brilliantly resolved as the girl's
forward motion brings her into collision with his seated form. She
tips him back, so that each has a leg raised in the air, conveying the
heady combination of inebriation and lust.

Clodion did not invent the genre of terracotta nymphs and satyrs,
but he perfected it. The nymph's pose, for example, was apparently
borrowed from Abundance (1758, Musée Historique Lorain, Nancy),
a statue by his uncle Lambert-Sigisbert Adam, and it became part of
the repertoire that Clodion turned to, varying it slightly, throughout his career. He reprised the pose in such works as Running Bacchante Carrying Fruit in Her Tunic (1780–85, private collection) and Running Bacchante (1803–4, Musée Cognacq-Jay, Paris). The body and physiognomy of the satyr find echo in many of his works, particularly the Running Satyr at Waddesdon Manor, Buckinghamshire; with sunken cheeks, thick lips, sharp nose, and wildly tossed hair, the creatures are nearly as much animal as human. The sculptor’s training in Rome is revealed both in his choice of subjects playfully drawn from antiquity and in their strenuous poses influenced by Baroque sculpture. One scholar has observed that this precariously balanced satyr recalls the ancient marble called the Barberini Faun (Glyptothek, Munich), while the fundamentally frontal composition is indebted to a Roman Baroque masterpiece, Gianlorenzo Bernini’s Apollo and Daphne (1622–24, Galleria Borghese, Rome).

What distinguishes this group is its compositional rhythm. Her bare, bent legs alternate with his furry limbs; her pliant arms contrast with his rigid one. On the back of the group, Clodion’s sure sense of texture is manifest: the fine realization of the satyr’s rippling muscles becomes all the more pronounced when seen against the rapid combing of the rocky base, while the smooth stuff of the drapery sets off the bunched fur of his thighs. This perfect balance between the controlled artistry and the hedonistic subject reflects, as few artworks do, the gaiety and movement so prized by Rococo artists. James Draper has dated this and related groups to the 1780s. Another Clodion in the Museum, Bacchus and a Nymph, dated to the 1790s, exemplifies the more contained compositions and restrained poses that the artist and his workshop created later in his life, following the dictates of Neoclassicism.

1. Schifer 1992b, pp. 36–37, noted the influence of Adam’s Abundance on the artist.
68. Children and Satyr Children Stealing the Cubs of a Pantheress

CLAUDE MICHEL, CALLED CLODION (FRENCH, 1738–1814)

Paris, ca. 1781

Stucco relief

5 ft. 1 in. × 20 ft. 9 in. (1.55 × 6.33 m)

Purchase, Ella Morris de Peyster Bequest, 1959 59.24b

PROVENANCE: Louise-Adélaïde de Bourbon-Condé, Hôtel de Bourbon-Condé, Paris (ca. 1781–89); subsequent owners at the same location were Agence des Subsistances (1790–97); Gauthier (from May 10, 1797); Joseph Sands (January 25–May 10, 1798); Jules Victor Barras (August 15, 1798–May 10, 1799); Sibuet Georges (1799–July 1, 1810); Antoine Dubois (July 1, 1810–August 11, 1812); Boucard de Vanrobais (August 11, 1812–July 1825); marquis de Nicolay (July 16, 1825–1842); Collège Arménien (February 5, 1847–1880); the comtesse de Chambrun (1880–91); her husband, the comte de Chambrun (1891–99); Musée Social (from 1900); Mlle Val de Curzay (after 1900–before 1907); Les Dames de la Retraite (after 1900–before 1907); Féron Vrau (in 1907–8); Mme Le Pic-Gaillard (February 1911–1918); Mme Gallaud (in 1918); the vicomte de Canson (1911–58); his heirs Mme J. Deschamps and Mme S. de Canson, Paris (until 1959; sold to MMA)

CLODION, WHO WAS WELL KNOWN FOR SMALL TERRACOTTAS OF bacchanalian subjects (see no. 67), contributed to several large-scale decorations in stucco and stone for Parisian houses. His most productive years for such sculptures were the late 1770s and early 1780s. In collaboration with the architect Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart, he worked at the Hôtels Bouret, Bourbon-Condé, and Besenval, and at the convent of the Capucins, also in Paris. One of his most important commissions came from the prince de Condé, who hired the highly regarded Brongniart to design a grand house for his unmarried daughter Louise-Adélaïde de Bourbon-Condé (1757–1824). The severe interior court of this building was to be enlivened on three sides by hemicircular reliefs, or lunettes, surrounding circular windows, and on the two long sides of the court, the windows were to be flanked by a rectangular relief on each side (fig. 52). No documents confirm Clodion’s participation, but he signed preparatory terracottas (see fig. 53), and some of their motifs reappear in other of his works, leaving little doubt that he was responsible for all the stucco reliefs in the court.

Given the Hôtel de Bourbon-Condé’s checkered history, it is not surprising that Clodion’s connection with the reliefs was forgotten. The princess divided her time between the hôtel and the convent of Remiremont, of which she was abbess, until the Revolution forced her to emigrate. After her departure from France, in 1789, she lost title to the building, which was subsequently held by a succession of owners. From 1847 until 1880 it was occupied by Armenian monks of the congregation of Mekhitaristes, who covered Clodion’s licentious scenes. When the reliefs came to light again during repairs made in 1881, an article by the art historian Jules Guiffrey convinced a conservation commission to attempt—though unsuccessfully—to buy them. Eventually, the two identical sets of three reliefs on the long walls of the court—the lunette Satyresses Playing with Satyr Children and the rectangular panels Children and Satyr Children Leading a Goat to Sacrifice and Children and Satyr Children Stealing the Cubs of a Pantheress—m mirrored each other across the court, were divided between the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Musée du Louvre. Appropriately, the lunette on the end wall of the court ended up at the Musée Historique Lorrain, Nancy, in the region of the sculptor’s birth.3

The present installation in the Museum of the three stucco reliefs, high above the floor, gives a sense of what looking at them was like when they were elevated some twenty feet above the pavement of the hôtel court. Today, beneath the long reliefs, two of Clodion’s most expressive small terracotta studies are exhibited (see fig. 53). When curator James Parker published them in 1967, he believed that they

fig. 52 Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart and Clodion, Hôtel de Bourbon-Condé, Paris, 1785. View of the interior court
were reduced versions by the sculptor after his own compositions because they differ in their proportions and in the spacing of the figures from their counterparts in stucco. James Draper sees them instead as freely imagined works, preparatory to the final stuccos. One puzzling thing about them is their abrupt truncation at the ends. Observing that each terracotta is more compact in design than the corresponding stucco panel, and as a result more three-dimensional as the children pile up over one another, Draper conjectured that the sculptor at some point decided to stretch out the compositions to fit a wider and taller expanse of wall and also to complete the cutoff figures at the ends. While the stuccos have lost some of the terracottas' three-dimensionality, they acquire solemnity as the viewer's eye follows the processions across the wider panels. Recent conservation studies of both the Metropolitan's and the Louvre's stuccos revealed that the original off-white paint covering the reliefs was meant to harmonize with the court's pierre de tonnerre stonework. Both the subject matter and the material thus allude to marble reliefs found on ancient Roman buildings.

The subjects of both rectangular panels, but especially of the *Children and Satyr Children Leading a Goat to Sacrifice*, are based on the bucolic texts of ancient authors such as Virgil and Ovid, as Guilhem Scherf noted. In the relief with the goat, the smoking altar bespeaks the beast's impending sacrifice; this subject captivated postantique artists from Riccio in the sixteenth century to François Duquesnoy in the seventeenth. Goats and panthers are both associated with Bacchus, the first symbolizing the god's lust, the second referring to the animals that accompanied him back from India. Clodion imaginatively filled out the sacrificial scene with a troupe of...
children. A chain of them pull the goat, which resists by bucking off its rider. In *Children and Satyr Children Stealing the Cubs of a Pantheress*, Clodion suggests a narrative that proceeds from peaceful labor, to confrontation, to excited rescue. At left, children gather flowers to make a garland, which they pass along for others to tie around the neck of a pantheress. Observing that her cubs are being stolen, she lunges after the thieves, stepping on a fallen child. In his fright, one child stumbles; at the right others witness the action and rush to help their companions. In both friezes, children playing innocent games confront animal nature and arouse violence, reminding us that these childish scenes allude to bacchanalian rites. If the prince de Condé wished to give his unmarried daughter a cautionary message about the pleasures and pitfalls that awaited her in society, he appears to have succeeded: when she joined the convent, the future abbess shunned the bacchanalian frivolity and license that Clodion’s decorations describe.

2. The accession numbers of the lunette and of the other rectangular relief in the Metropolitan’s collection are 59.244 and 59.244a, respectively.
69. Model for a Proposed Monument to Commemorate the Invention of the Balloon

CLAUDE MICHEL, CALLED CLODION (FRENCH, 1738–1814)
Paris, ca. 1784
Terracotta group in two sections
43 1/4 x 24 3/4 x 20 7/8 in. (109.5 x 62.9 x 51.8 cm)
Signed: (on top section at lower back) CLODION;
(on lower section beneath brazier) CLODION
Purchase, Rogers Fund and Admiral Frederic R. Harris Gift, 1944. 44.21a, b

PROVENANCE: The artist, Paris (until at least 1792); anonymous sale, organized by François Léandre Regnault-Delalande, Paris, June 6, 1805, no. 190, sale. Feuchère père, Paris, January 17–18, 1829, no. 270; [Beurdley, Paris, by 1826]; [Jacques or Arnold Seligmann, Paris, before 1911];
George A. Kessler, Paris (probably after 1910 or 1911–d. 1918); sold by the Kessler estate to François Coty, Paris (1921–36; his sale, Galerie Jean Charpentier, Paris, November 30–December 1, 1936, no. 67);
Paul Gouvert, Paris (after 1939); [Arnold Seligmann, Rey and Company, New York, until 1944; sold to MMA]


THE INVENTION OF BALLOONING IN 1783 SPARKED A BRIEF BUT PASSIONATE PUBLIC RESPONSE. Joseph-Michel and Jacques-Étienne Montgolfier’s first public demonstration of a hot-air balloon on June 5 of that year was soon followed by Jacques Charles and the brothers Robert’s successful launch of a hydrogen balloon on August 27. At Versailles on September 19 the French royal family witnessed one of the Montgolfier brothers’ demonstrations, featuring the ascension of a cage containing a sheep, a cock, and a duck; the first manned balloon flight followed the next month. Popular enthusiasm fueled a fashion for images of balloons in the decorative arts—on clocks, fans, furniture, and plates. At the crest of this fad, Louis XVI decided to commission in honor of ballooning and the first aerial ascent a monument to be erected on the circular basin in front of the Tuileries palace. By January 1784 a competition to design the monument was under way; submissions from at least nine sculptors, including Augustin Pajou, Jean-Antoine Houdon, and Clodion, were soon received. But as quickly as the craze for ballooning arose, it plummeted: the inflated conveyances became so widespread that their novelty wore off, and the king abandoned the idea of a monument. Traces of the competition, however, survive. An inventory made by Pajou in 1792 listed seven models for the contest—including two by Clodion—in the Salle des Antiques in the Louvre; it is likely that they were soon returned to their makers.6

Although the monument was never realized, Clodion’s model in the Museum remains one of the most inventive and spirited sculptures of the era. It is in two parts: a column marked by a band of laurel at the base and by an egg-and-dart molding above serves as pedestal for a balloon about to be launched. This structure is bathed in clouds of smoke rising from below and of steam pouring from the opening at the base of the balloon. Running riot through the gaseous swirls are some thirty winged and grounded children who collectively gather straw, light it in a brazier, and swarm up the column to aid the progress of the launch. Using two different colors of clay, Clodion smoothed surfaces to suggest the steam’s vaporousness and peopled it with such spinning activity as to conjure the molecular propulsion of the ascent. Benjamin Franklin’s vivid description of an ascent explains the action seen in the model: "[The balloon’s] bottom was open, and in the middle of the Opening was fixed a kind of Basket Grate in which Faggots and Sheaves of Straw were burnt. The Air rarified in passing thro’ this Flame roze in the Balloon, swell’d out its sides and fill’d it."7 At the top, the traditional allegory of Fame with a trumpet and a figure of the Greek wind god Aeolus circle this modern device as if to drive it in the right direction.
How imaginative this composition is can be judged by comparing it with the other surviving model attributed to Clodion (fig. 54). In that more conventional concept, allegorical figures dominate: a winged genius raises a brand to fire the small balloon; two children support a medallion with portraits of the Montgolfiers for a seated Fame to admire; and two others chain Time, who is defeated by the brothers’ everlasting achievement.

It is hard to believe that a thirty-foot stone rendition of the present model could have captured the airiness and light-hearted charm of the terracotta. Perhaps Clodion’s reputation is better served by glimpsing the monument through the model than by even trying to imagine it greatly enlarged.

2. Lami 1910–11, vol. 2, p. 150; Galerie Jean Charpentier 1936, pp. 92–93, no. 67; “Sammlung François Coty” 1936, no. 67; notes in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
3. “Sammlung François Coty” 1936, no. 67.
4. See the excellent account of early balloon and Clodion’s model for the monument in Remington 1944.
5. See an example of carved balloons applied as finials to furniture in the entry by Danielle Kissel-Grosheide in Kissel-Grosheide, Koepe, and Rieder 2006, pp. 202–4, no. 84.
6. Furcy-Raynaud 1925–26, pp. 417–21, suggests that the models were sent back to the artists.

fig. 54. Clodion, second model for the Proposed Monument to Commemorate the Invention of the Balloon, ca. 1784. Terracotta. Location unknown.
70. Winter

JEAN-ANTOINE HOUDON (FRENCH, 1741–1828)
Paris, 1787
Bronze statue
5 7/8 (with socle) × 15 3/4 × 15 3/4 in. (143.5 × 39.1 × 50.5 cm)
Signed and dated (at top of base): Houdon. 1787
Bequest of Kate Trubee Davison, 1962. 62.55

PROVENANCE: The artist (until 1791; sold to Orléans); Louis-Philippe-Joseph d’Orléans, duc de Chartres, then d’Orléans (1791–d. 1793; confiscated during the Revolution and kept in a depot in Paris); perhaps the Forbin-Janson collection sale, Paris, May 2, 1842, no. 82; sale, Collot, Paris, January 16, 1844, no. 52; Richard Seymour-Conway (1800–1870), fourth Marquess of Hertford, Château de Bagatelle, Paris; Sir Richard Wallace (1818–1890), Bagatelle; Lady Wallace (d. 1892); Sir John Edward Murray Scott, Bt., Bagatelle (d. 1912); Lady Victoria Sackville, Paris (by bequest in 1912, until 1914); [Jacques Seligmann and Company, Paris, 1914–17; sold to Davison]; Henry P. Davison, New York (1917–d. 1922); his wife, Kate Trubee Davison (1922–62; her bequest to MMA)


This is one of Jean-Antoine Houdon’s most arresting nude figures, presented in a composition that simultaneously shows off his inventiveness as an artist and his prowess as a bronze caster. The composition may date as early as 1781, when Houdon proposed to make pendant figures of winter and summer.1 A small terracotta for Winter at the Musée Fabre in Montpellier appears to be his first essay in the subject, although the idea is already well developed. Winter (also called La Frelleuse) is conceived as a nude woman who has pulled a shawl over head and torso, leaving her naked from the waist down. Summer wears a shift and holds a sheaf of wheat and a watering can. Marble versions of Winter and its pendant were exhibited in the Salon of 1783, and both appear to have entered the collection of Anne-Charles-Modenx de Saint-Waast, a financier and owner of a well-appointed town house on the rue Saint-Honoré in Paris (the marbles are also now in the Musée Fabre).2

The Museum’s bronze was cast several years later, certainly by 1787, the date inscribed on the base. We know from a letter he wrote that Houdon was forced out of his foundry-studio in that year, so this sculpture and one of Diana (Musée du Louvre, Paris) are among the last he cast; he was still proud of his technical achievements in 1794, when he listed his best bronzes in a letter to the artistic director of the porcelain manufactory at Sèvres, Jean-Jacques Bachelier.3 Houdon exhibited our bronze version in the Salon of 1791, and Louis-Philippe, duc d’Orléans, bought it; the latter went to the guillotine in 1793, and the sculptor himself took the statue to the depot for Revolutionary confiscations, on June 5, 1794.4 Eventually, the statue was acquired, by the great English collector Richard Seymour-Conway and highly esteemed by him and later by his son Sir Richard Wallace, who displayed it at their Château de Bagatelle outside Paris. It passed down through several generations in that family, and during World War I was brought by a wealthy American collector to New York.

Houdon’s provocative rethinking of the iconography of winter found many admirers among collectors but also attracted some critical derision. Most often, that season is personified by a fully cloaked old man. The sculptor Étienne-Maurice Falconet was evidently the first to turn the figure of a young girl into an allegory of winter.

For his marble version, Houdon also borrowed Falconet’s motif of a water vessel burst by the expansion of ice. Since the tensile strength of bronze permitted the sculptor to omit this motif—which doubles as a support for the lower sections of the marble—the metal version is more elegant and pure in its outline, which tapers from the shrouded head and shoulders to the thin ankles at the base. By cloaking the figure only partially, Houdon conveys a strong sense of the bitterness of winter’s weather; it also gave him a golden opportunity to reveal a girl’s naked charms. When the marble version was submitted for exhibition at the 1783 Salon, the authorities placed it in a corner because, one of them commented, “a completely nude figure is less indecent than those draped with false modesty.” Later, another critic joked fun at the notion that a chilly model would cover her head rather than her torso, and yet another joked “that winter would be a very desirable season if pretty shivering girls did not cover themselves in any other way.”

The revelation of the nude female body is of course precisely what makes Winter so attractive in marble, bronze, and other versions—as alluring from behind as from the front. Its appeal lies not only in its seductive subject but also in its power as a work of art. The sculptor bids us peek into the girl’s face, half-hidden beneath the cloak and only visible if the viewer approaches looking upward. The purity of her silhouette encourages us to circle around her, and her body undulates as we move. As vibrant as her figure is, the simplicity of its lines makes the overall silhouette a rather stark abstraction. Houdon is best known for marble carving, but his bronze-casting technique was very fine. He supervised the work himself in his own foundry, which he had built for the purpose. By settling (scrubbing and tooling) the bronze he emphasized the plumpness of Winter’s flesh, especially in the thighs, and gave a sleek and sensuous shimmer to the surface—all of which are indications that the sculptor knew how to capitalize brilliantly on the metal’s properties.

6. Jean-Baptiste Pierre, director of the royal academy, to the comte d’Angiviller, director of royal buildings and gardens, August 5, 1785; see Furcy-Renaud 1966, p. 172.
8. All the various versions of Houdon’s Winter are listed by Scherf in Houdon 2003, pp. 233–35.
71. Sabine Houdon (1787–1836)

Jean-Antoine Houdon (French, 1741–1828)

Paris, 1788

White marble portrait bust on a gray marble socle
13¼ (with socle) × 8¾ × 5½ in. (33.3 × 22.2 × 14.9 cm)

Inscribed, signed, and dated (on back): SABINET HOUONDON/1788
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1930 50.145.66

Provenance: The artist (1788–d. 1828); his daughter Sabine Houdon, Paris (1828–d. 1836); his grandson Henri Perron, Paris (in 1836); descended in the family (until after ca. 1905); Jacques-Antoine Doucet, Paris (by 1906, until 1912; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, January 5–8, 1912, no. 119); [Duveen Brothers, London and New York, in 1912]; Judge Elbert H. Gary, New York (by 1914, until 1928; his sale, American Art Association, April 19–21, 1928, no. 25, not sold; sold April 22, 1928, by private agreement through Knoedler & Company, New York, to Harkness); Mary Stillman (Mrs. Edward S.) Harkness, New York (1928–d. 1930; her bequest to MMA)


The Great Portrait Sculptor Jean-Antoine Houdon is well represented in this Museum by his busts of such French Enlightenment figures as Voltaire and Denis Diderot as well as of contemporary Americans such as Benjamin Franklin and Robert Fulton.1 We also display some of his more personal likenesses of children: this one of his eldest daughter, Sabine, and two others of the daughters of friends, Louise Brongniart and Anne Audoud.2 Of the three, the bust of Sabine is the most tenderly realized. The artist lovingly rounded her pudgy cheeks, softened the tufts of baby flesh by her breast, and suggested the wisps of hair straggling over her forehead. The tiny, slightly puckered mouth and the flaps of the ear, appropriately oversized for a ten-month-old, are marvels of observation. At the same time, the angling of the head, the erect neck, and the sharp focus of the eyes give this child individuality.

Houdon entered this bust in the Salon of 1789 as “Head of a Child aged ten months,” without identifying the sitter. It was, however, inscribed at the back “Sabinet,” his nickname for Sabine (born February 25, 1787, died April 7, 1836); she kept the work throughout her life.1 The original plaster, in the Louvre, does not bear that inscription. It seems only natural that Houdon should have protected the privacy of his child by leaving the bust untilted at its first showing. As Guilhem Scherf notes, sculptors rarely named the children whose portraits they submitted for exhibition at eighteenth-century salons.4 In fact, at that time, it was extremely unusual to fashion portraits of children of such a tender age. The most famous precedent may be Jean-Baptiste Pigalle’s statuette of the one-year-old son of the banker Pâris de Montmartel, which was exhibited at the salon of 1750.5 None of Houdon’s busts of his three children—there are multiple likenesses of Sabine, as well as of Anne-Ange (1788–1843) and Antoinette-Claude, called Claudine (1790–1878)—is named in Salon publications, with the exception of one showing the four-year-old Sabine (1791). Surely, Houdon’s busts of children were labors of love, yet it is also true that a number of plaster casts and terracottas of them issued from his workshop, and the anonymity of the subjects allowed him to capitalize on the contemporary taste for generalized “têtes d’enfants” by presenting them as representations of the innocence of childhood.6

Houdon made two other busts of Sabine, both when she was a four-year-old. One of them, known in a plaster version of 1791 (Louvre), shows her with a full head of hair. The other is distinguished by drapery encircling the child’s torso in the manner of ancient Roman busts (1791, private collection).7 Of all the likenesses the sculptor made of his three daughters, the Museum’s example remains the

...freshest in concept and impact, and despite the fact that the child is represented at the youngest age she is the most alert and defined in personality.

The bust remained in the Houdon family for more than a century. Thereafter, it has charmed nearly everyone who sees it, achieving an elevated place in the history of taste as reflected in the art market. When it was sold in 1928 at the New York auction of Judge Elbert H. Gary’s famed collection, it realized the highest price paid until that date for a sculpture at auction, $245,000. Through the agency of Knoedler and Company, the Museum’s patroness Mrs. Edward Harkness beat out the dealer Joseph Duveen, a rare feat. The bust of Sabine held that auction record for more than four decades.8

2. Louise Brongniart, 1779, marble, acc. no. 14.40.670; Anne Audoud (1776–1840), first modeled ca. 1799–80, plaster, acc. no. 42.23.2.
5. Titled L’Enfant à la Cage (Child with a Cage), it is in the collection of the Musée du Louvre, Paris (R.F. 634).
6. Scherf in Portraits publics 2006, p. 166, no. 49, supports this point with a number of examples.
7. Scherf in Houdon 2003, pp. 33–40, nos. 17, 18; the author catalogues all the known busts Houdon made of his wife and children and recons their various versions and casts.
72. Madame de Wailly, née Adélaïde-Flore Belleville (1765–1838)

AUGUSTIN PAJOU (FRENCH, 1730–1809)
Paris, 1789
White marble portrait bust on a gray marble socle
24¼ x 19¼ x 10¼ in. (61,5 x 50,5 x 27,3 cm);
H. with socle 30¼ in. (76,5 cm)
Signed and dated (on back): PAJOU. F. 1789
Fletcher Fund, 1956. 56.105

PROVENANCE: Presumably the sitter (1785–d. 1838); Mme Camille Lelong, Paris (until 1903; sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, April 27–May 1, 1903, no. 298, to Wagram); the princesse de Wagram, Paris (from 1903); David David-Weill, Neuilly-sur-Seine; Mrs. William Salmon, New York (by 1920, until 1928; her sale, American Art Association, New York, January 4–7, 1928, no. 748); J. Horace Harding, New York (until 1941; his sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, March 1, 1941, no. 68); Baronne Cassel van Doorn, Englewood, New Jersey (until 1956; sale, Galerie Charpentier, Paris, May 30, 1956, no. 75; to MMA)

AUGUSTIN PAJOU WAS ONE OF THE FOREMOST SCULPTORS OF HIS ERA, Adept in all aspects of his practice, from architectural decoration and funerary monuments to portraits and statuary. Some of his most engaging works are portrait busts, a genre in which his personal side shines through clearly. While he exhibited them regularly at the Paris Salons, beginning in 1759, he did not, like Jean-Jacques Caffieri, make his living principally from their sale, often choosing to render likenesses of friends for pleasure. Pajou was an amiable man to whom friendships were important; those he maintained with the architect Charles de Wailly, the artist Hubert Robert, and the poet Michel-Jean Sedaine lasted more than fifty years.

At the age of sixteen, in 1781, Adélaïde-Flore Belleville married De Wailly. Eight years later, the sculptor carved this bust of Madame de Wailly, as a matron of twenty-four years, and a pendant bust of her husband, then fifty-nine, which is known only in plaster versions (see fig. 55).¹ Both were shown at the Salon of 1789. Three other pairs of busts of married couples by Pajou are recorded.² As in Michel-Jean Sedaine (1775, Victoria and Albert Museum, London) and Madame Sedaine, née Suzanne-Charlotte Sévigné (1781, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), the distinct personality of each individual emerges within an array of subtly complementary motifs. In contrast with the frank expression and roughly textured clothes of De Wailly, whose broad face and strong nose give him a leonine aspect, his wife is shown with one shoulder bared above elegantly gathered drapery and with a proud, somewhat reserved expression on her heart-shaped face. A striking mane of hair makes her a bit of a lioness, however. Her gaze is direct yet turned markedly away from a frontal view.

Pajou’s famous portrait of Madame du Barry (1773, Musée du Louvre, Paris) won him wide recognition. As accomplished as his court portraits are, their formality necessarily distances them from

fig. 55 Pajou, Charles de Wailly, 1789.
Plaster. Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille


the viewer. Made later in his career and at the height of his powers, Madame de Wally and Nathalie de Laborde (1789, Louvre) show more sensuous and accessible aspects. Pajou also had a profound ability to convey the essence of character and personality. Madame de Wally is cool and detached, particularly when compared with some of the artist’s liveliest and most engaging works, notably, Élisabeth Vigée-LeBrun (1783, Louvre). Yet one senses the intelligence behind the stern visage, and its severity is offset by the undraped breast and luxurious and unruly locks of hair. Rendering hair was one of the sculptor’s great talents, and here its arrangement seems to reflect a deliberate decision, as the flowing tresses relax the subject’s otherwise strict composure.

73. Belisarius and His Guide

ANTOINE-DENISS CHAUDET (FRENCH, 1763–1810)

Paris, 1794

Bronze group, mounted in a bronze circlet with floral ornament painted to resemble gilt bronze, into which is fitted the original rotating mechanism. H. 18 in. (47.5 cm); Diam. of integral bronze base 14 1/4 in. (36.6 cm). Inscribed, signed, and dated (on side of block on which Belisarius rests): DATE OBOLOM/BEILISARIO/ CHAUDET L 24 9 [Give an obolus to Belisarius/Chaudet made this in the second year of the Republic].

Rogers Fund and Edith Perry Chapman Fund, 2004. 2004.113a, b

PROVENANCE: Sale, Mont-de-Piété, Paris, April 18–23, 1803, no. 331, probably to Pérignon; the painter Alexis-Nicolas Pérignon (probably 1803–17; his sale, Galerie Lebrun, Paris, December 10, 1817, no. 156); Edmond Courty, Châtillon-sous-Bagneux (by 1968, until d. 2002; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, October 18, 2002, no. 47); [Charles Janoray, New York, until 2004; sold to MMA]


JEAN-FRANÇOIS MARMONTEL’S 1767 NOVEL BÉLISAIRES CREATED A VOGUE FOR REPRESENTATIONS OF THE BYZANTINE GENERAL FLAVIUS BELISARIUS (CA. 500–565). FOLLOWING VICTORIES AGAINST THE VANDALS AND OSTROGOths, BELISARIUS, ACCORDING TO LEGEND, WAS IMPRISONED BY THE EMPEROR JUSTINIAN, WHO FEARED THE OTHER’S POPULARITY. HE WAS FED ONLY AFTER BEING BLINDED AND WAS THEN REDUCED TO BEGGING. THE PROUD MAN’S SOLE REQUEST WAS FOR A CHILD TO GUIDE HIM HOME. THE PAINTER JACQUES-LOUIS DAVID’S BELISARIUS RECOGNIZED BY A SOLDIER WHO HAD SERVED UNDER HIM AT THE MOMENT WHEN A WOMAN GIVES HIM ALMS (MUSÉE DES BEAUX-ARTS, LILLE) HAD WON ACCLAIM AT THE SALON OF 1781. IT SHOWS THE BLINd WARRIOR SEATED BESIDE HIS GUIDE, WHO, HOPING FOR ALMS, OFFERS A HELMET TO A SOLDIER STARTLED BY THE REDUCED CONDITION OF HIS FORMER COMMANDER. SEVERAL SCULPTORS FOLLOWED SUIT. ONE OF THEM WAS ANTOINE-DENIS CHAUDET, WHO WOULD BECOME WELL KNOWN FOR A NOW-DESTROYED COLLOSAL STATUE OF NAPOLEON ERECTED IN PARIS AT THE PLACE VENDÔME. CHAUDET BORROWED (WITH SOME MISPELLINGS) THE INSRIPTION (IN LATIN) INCLUDED IN DAVID’S PAINTING, “GIVE AN OBOULUS TO BELISARIUS.” (AN OBOULUS WAS A SMALL GREEK COIN.) CHAUDET’S HERO’S DEMEANOR IS MORE RESIGNED THAN THAT OF DAVID’S PROTAGONIST, WHO IS ACTIVELY POSED. IN CHAUDET’S BRONZE, BELISARIUS GENTLY SUPPORTS THE EXHAUSTED GUIDE’S HEAD ON HIS LAP. HIS BLIND-MAN’S STAFF IS PROMINENTLY HELD, NOT CAST ASIDE, AS IN THE PAINTING; AND HIS HELMET IS RIGHT SIDE UP. JAMES DRAPER HAS NOTED THAT A DRAWING BY DAVID FOR THE FIGURE OF CRITO IN HIS PAINTING OF 1787 THE DEATH OF SOCRATES (WHICH HE DEDICATED TO CHAUDET) INSPIRED THE VIEW FROM THE GENERAL’S LEFT. BELISARIUS’S ARM IS SLUNG INSIDE HIS ROBE, WHICH FALLS IN FRONT OF THE BLOCK ON WHICH HE SITS, BESIDE HIS BENT LEFT LEG.

Belisarius’s fall from grace and dignified response to his reduced circumstances provided a moral exemplar that resonated in the last years of the ancien régime and the ensuing Revolutionary period. By the 1790s the French generals’ fortitude in resisting the royalist coalition was admired; in this context, an image of a general enduring the consequences of a principled stand was sure to stir many viewers. In 1791 Chaudet had exhibited a terracotta group on the theme of Belisarius at the Salon de la Liberté, the first art exhibit organized by the National Constitutional Assembly. Although the terracotta model has been lost, a plaster cast representing this early stage of composition was acquired in 1818 by the Louvre. While contemporary sculptors such as Houdon, Moitte, and Stouf presented busts of the Byzantine hero as têtes d’expression, Chaudet, by concentrating on Belisarius’s ravaged but noble features, created a narrative group that rivaled history painting. The plaster model displays a blockier head, which Draper relates to the ancient marble head of Brutus in the Musei Capitolini in Rome, and the general grasps the boy’s back with a
The Museum's bronze refines the initial idea. Belisarius is more sensitively modeled and his body thinner; his hand protectively encircles the boy's shoulders. Quite eloquently, it reflects a passage in Marmontel's novel in which Belisarius says, "please just take care of this child who guides me and who is more delicate than I." The French scholar Luc Benoist wrote in 1945 that Chaudet "lovingly" chased the bronze of Belisarius himself, but Draper finds it more likely that the sculptor turned to an experienced founder. Of several known casts, this is the finest. It probably is the one sold in Paris in 1803 at the municipal credit institute known as the Mont-de-Piété and sold again by the painter Alexis-Nicolas Pérignon in 1817, since the catalogues of both sales refer to the round gilt socle and the fine quality of the casting. The rotating device built into the socle makes it possible to give the small sculpture a close inspection, while at the same time viewing it as though one were walking around it.

1. The French Revolutionary calendar was adopted on November 24, 1793, but was calculated from September 22, 1792. The years were numbered from one to fourteen. The second year of the Republic ran from September 22, 1793, to September 21, 1794.
3. Draper 2007, Both painting and drawing are in the Metropolitan (acc. nos. 51.45 and 61.1161.1, respectively).
4. Salon of 1791, no. 549: "Groupe, en terre cuite, de Belisaire, Par. M. Chaudet."
5. It is now on deposit at the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille (32¾ × 24¼ × 26¾ in. [83 × 62 × 68 cm.]; inv. LL33); Isabelle Leroy-Jay Lemaistre in Skulptur aus dem Louvre 1989, pp. 62–63, under no. 13.
6. On the tête d'expression, see entry 65 in this volume. The busts in that style mentioned here are Jean-Antoine Houdon, Belisarius (Salon of 1793, plaster, Musée des Augustins, Toulouse); Jean-Guillaume Moitte, Belisarius (ca. 1791, terracotta, Musée des Augustins); and Jean-Baptiste Jouffroy, Belisarius (marble exhibited in 1791, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles).
8. Quoted in ibid., p. 492.
10. Draper in Cast in Bronze 2009, pp. 492–93, no. 143, discusses the documentation and the related works. Another bronze version of Belisarius and His Guide has come to light in the Williamson Art Gallery and Museum, Birkenhead (on long-term loan to the Grosvenor Museum in Chester). This was graciously brought to my attention by Eike Schmidt.
74. Artemisia in Mourning

PHILIPP JAKOB SCHEFFAUER (GERMAN, 1756–1808)

Stuttgart, 1794
Marble relief
19¼ × 11½ × 11¼ in. (50.2 × 30 × 5 cm)
Signed and dated (at base of column): Scheffauer f/1794
Purchase, Anna-Maria and Stephen Kellen Foundation
Gift, 2010-2010.228

PROVENANCE: Sale, Kunsthau Lempertz, Cologne, November 22, 2008, no. 1227; [Charles Janoray, New York, until 2010; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: Spemann 1909, Appendix, p. 142, doc. no. 274, pp. 145–47, doc. nos. 238, 240, p. 150, doc. no. 245 (letters from Philipp Jakob Scheffauer to Professor Oberthür, March 26 and August 29, 1794, February 4 and August 3, 1795)

THE GERMAN SCULPTOR PHILIPP JAKOB SCHEFFAUER TRAINED under Augustin Pajou in Paris and spent four years studying in Italy. In his mature style, the refined elegance that he had absorbed from Pajou merged with a precision of form acquired from intense observation of ancient art. After returning to Germany in 1789, he produced sculptures that are less severe in form and more delicate in sensibility than those of the paragon of the Italian Neoclassical style, Antonio Canova (see no. 75). Alongside his rival Heinrich Dannecker, Scheffauer worked almost exclusively for the court of Württemberg, carving busts of Duke Karl Eugen and prominent citizens, as well as creating decorations for castles around Stuttgart. Compared to the highly productive Dannecker, who outlived him by more than thirty years, Scheffauer produced relatively few works. The most distinctive are small, exquisitely carved reliefs—often illustrating tales from antiquity, often paired—for the intimate chambers favored in private residences during this period. Representative of this genre are Scheffauer’s Sappho (fig. 56) and Ariadne Abandoned on Naxos, which Friedrich III, duke of Württemberg, purchased in 1803 to decorate his mahogany-paneled library at Schloss Monrepos, near Ludwigsburg. Scheffauer clearly envisioned a similar destination for this work: in March 1794 he wrote his friend and mentor Professor Oberthür, “The bas relief of Artemisia was executed in marble, and I am quite pleased with it, especially since it has found favor with impartial connoisseurs. Now I only await a buyer.” Artemisia, queen of Caria from 352 to 350 B.C., was sister and wife of King Mausolus, in whose memory she constructed an elaborate marble monument, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, one of the wonders of the ancient world. Since ancient times, this powerful queen of exemplary virtue had frequently been chosen as a subject in art, and admiration for her still resonated in nineteenth-century Germany. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s 1809 novel Die Wahlverwandtschaften (Elective Affinities) includes a scene at a party in which the character Luciane adopts the role of Artemisia in a tableau vivant.

Given the interest during the Neoclassical period in antique subjects and Scheffauer’s fondness for portraying women of ancient times, it is not surprising that he chose to represent Artemisia. Impressive is the understated way he devised here to convey both her dignity and the intensity of her grief. The queen’s impassive visage and stooped form recall such famous antiquities as the Hellenistic sculpture Niobe and Her Daughter (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence). Scheffauer’s composition is based on a conventional Neoclassical funerary scene representing a woman leaning against her husband’s bust or urn. Sharp, vertical pleats emphasize Artemisia’s elongated body, a proportional canon that characterizes all of Scheffauer’s
figures. The compactness of his composition is achieved by the winding drapery that joins the queen to the urn. By placing Artemisia’s dangling arm prominently — her hand occupies the center of the composition — Scheffauer built the relief’s emotional impact on one eloquent gesture. Even though her face betrays no emotion, the queen’s bared shoulder and breast, helpless right arm, and tender embrace of the urn with her left reveal her anguish. In 1797 one critic observed that “an equally strong impression is made by a bas-relief in Carrara marble that depicts Artemisia weeping over the ashes of her husband. . . . [It] offers an admirable expression of controlled grief.”⁵ A small terracotta by Scheffauer also entitled Artemisia in Mourning (Stadarchiv, Stuttgart) reprises the relief's composition in a statuette, but the pose and overall effect are stiffer. A freer, more successful interpretation by Scheffauer of his own invention is Friendship in Mourning, a terracotta of 1801 (private collection, Germany).⁶ Commissioned by Duke Friedrich to commemorate his friend and minister of state Count Johann Karl von Zeppelin, that grieving figure achieves, like the present marble, the contained emotion expressed in Scheffauer’s best work.

2. Both statues remain in the Schloss Monrepos collection; see Fischer 1993, figs. 75, 76. For other works by Scheffauer at Monrepos, see Christian von Holst in Dannecker 1987, vol. 1, pp. 195-97.
3. Scheffauer to Oberthür, March 26, 1794 (in Spemann 1909, Appendix, p. 142, doc. no. 244); see also Holst in Dannecker 1987, vol. 1, pp. 425-26, no. 722. I thank the gallery of Charles Janway, New York, for providing a monograph on Scheffauer’s life and this work in particular.
75. Perseus with the Head of Medusa

ANTONIO CANOVA (ITALIAN, 1757–1822)
Rome, 1804–6
Marble statue
93 1/8 × 73 1/8 × 40 1/2 in. (242.6 × 191.8 × 102.9 cm)
Fletcher Fund, 1967. 67.110.1

PROVENANCE: Commissioned from the artist by Count Jan and Countess Valeria Tarnowska, Dzików, Poland (1806–49); their heirs, Dzików (1849—before 1871; sold to Wawra); [C. J. Wawra, Vienna, until 1871; Freiherr Carl von Schwarz, Vienna (after 1871); descended in his family (until 1967; sold through Piero Tozzi, New York, to MMA)


WHEN COUNTESS VALERIA TARNOWSKA FIRST MET THE SCULPTOR Antonio Canova, on December 5, 1803, she recorded the event in her diary: “I saw the great Canova! I saw him amidst his glory, surrounded by his masterpieces—simple, modest, he seems to ignore the fact that he has become immortal.” Canova was universally acknowledged to be the preeminent sculptor—for many, the dominant artist—of his era. Determined to have a work from his hand, the countess negotiated a contract, signed by Canova on April 14, 1804, for a version of the artist’s marble Perseus with the Head of Medusa (1797–1801),

The composition proved to be one of the most important of Canova’s career. It closely reflects his admiration for the art of antiquity and signals his fame as the rival of ancient masters. It was obviously, if freely, based on the Apollo Belvedere, whose loss had been widely mourned in Italy ever since Napoléon’s troops carted it off from the Vatican to Paris in 1797. In its frontal and majestic motion, Perseus’s stance recalls the antique Apollo, but Canova’s hero’s gaze is focused on the severed head of the monster Medusa, which in turn was based on another famous antiquity, the marble mask known as the Rondanini Medusa (Glyptothek, Munich). When finished, Canova’s marble was purchased by Pope Pius VII, who placed it in the niche where the Apollo Belvedere had once stood. Implicit in this act was a championing of contemporary Italian art and defiance of the French conquerors of Italy. The following year, Canova was further rewarded with the post of inspector-general of antiquities and works of art in Rome and the Papal States.

That the sculptor undertook scrupulous, even pedantic, research when planning the Perseus is evident in the label he placed by the finished statue in his studio:

It is said that when Perseus, son of Jupiter and Danaë, was sent by King Polydectes to fight the Gorgons, he received the sandals and the wings from Mercury who loved him especially. These wings he attached to the prodigious helmet he received from Pluto, which made invisible whoever was wearing it. Many authors describe this helmet as a Phrygian cap, with two ears; in fact, one sees one like it worn by a Pallas (once in the collection of Cardinal Guastier) because this goddess also wanted to use it on several occasions. It is also said that he received from Vulcan a diamond sickle, which as Hyginus tells, he used to cut off the head of Medusa. The shape of this pointed and hooked weapon is found on many ancient monuments and Homer and other ancient writers call it probably harpé. To explain the meaning of this term, Suidas applied to it the Greek word lancia répanon, which means sickle-shaped and pointed knife.

Interestingly, Canova omitted the polished shield, in whose reflective surface the hero could view safely the fearsome Medusa, whose face turned men to stone. The sculptor's label suggests both the zeal with which he combed ancient visual and literary sources for authentic details and background material and also the keen interest of his audience in such facts.

Countess Tarnowska requested a marble version of the Perseus, "in all similar to the other one now in the Vatican Museum" (according to the contract), and the resulting statue was likely based on a plaster cast in Canova's studio. It was Canova's practice to model his sculptures in clay and then make plaster copies, which could withstand the rigors of sculptural work. For example, the Museum possesses a lifesize plaster model of Canova's Cupid and Psyche, which he used as a guide for carving the marble versions now in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, and the Musée du Louvre, Paris. The contract further stipulates that the countess's version should be a statue of Carrara marble carved by [Canova]. By this point in his career, Canova had a large workshop to assist him, but most patrons presumed that the sculptor would finish the work himself (in most cases, assistants would work the marble up to a certain point, copying the plaster model, and the master would give it the finishing touches). The Museum owns a lifesize version of Canova's Paris, for instance, which Canova left unfinished in his studio at his death; the following year it was completed by a studio assistant for Robert, Viscount Castlereagh, second Margrave of Londonderry. In a list of his best-known works that Canova dictated in 1816, he refers to the present sculpture as "Perseus — replica of the first one, with some small variations, shipped to Poland to Countess Tarnowska."  

Some scholars have proposed a different history of this commission. In his article of 1821, Count Potocki states that the original version made for the pope had a flaw in the marble and that Canova carved a second version for him, giving the first to Countess Tarnowska. His account is unlikely, as neither marble has any visible flaws and the language of the contract has the usual proviso that Canova should make a copy of an existing work by his own hand. The Museum's Perseus is indeed slightly different from the one in the Vatican (fig. 58), as Canova himself noted. There is a slight slimming of the torso and a more pronounced swing to the drapery; moreover, the marble strut that Canova inserted under the hero's left arm in the Vatican marble he apparently had the confidence to omit from the second version. Such stylistic streamlining and technical improvement characterize many of the artist's replicas.

Recent scholarship has made it possible to construct a more detailed history of the Museum's sculpture once it left Canova's studio.
A letter from a Viennese banker named Franck to Canova in early summer 1806 indicates that the Perseus was en route to Poland, so it must have been completed by then. Although it was originally intended for the Tarnowski Palace in Dzików, it ended up at the countess's father's estate in Horochów because of concern that it might be too heavy for the palace floor. Sebastiano Ciampi says that it was at Horochów by August 1806. Evidently, the statue's weight preoccupied the sculptor, for he wrote to the countess in 1807 that he sent with the statue a plaster head of Medusa (fig. 57), lighter than the marble one. If she worried about stress on the arm, then she could replace it with the plaster and put a candle in the hollowed-out marble version where it could gleam, if she so chose, as a ghostly table ornament. This playful suggestion that the Medusa had decorative potential reminds us that Canova often recommended viewing his statues by candlelight in order to appreciate fully the quality of their surfaces. Clearly he considered the head a discrete element that could stand on its own, unlike the one in Benvenuto Cellini's famous Perseus (Piazza della Signoria, Florence), which is shown dripping blood.

---

2. This contract was acquired by the Metropolitan Museum in 1967 (acc. no. 67.369). It was published in Raggio 1969, an article that gives the fullest account of the statue to date.
4. Acc. no. 65.46.
6. “Altre Perseo replica del primo con qualche piccola varia-
8. Polacchi 1821, p. 75.
10. Ciampi 1818, p. 15.

---

fig. 58 Canova, Perseus with the Head of Medusa, 1777–80. Marble. Museo Pio Clementino, Vatican Museums
Inscribed: (on back of column base) CETTE STATUE DE
GRETRY FUT ERIGEE EN 1804./PAR H. DE LIVRY./ET POSSEE AU
THEATRE DE L'OPERIE-COMIQUE EN 1810 [This statue of
Grétry was commissioned in 1804 by H. de Livry and
installed in the theater of the Opéra-Comique in 1810]. (on
scroll in Grétry's left hand) Duo Du Sylvain/Amande/Ave[c]
ton cœur s'il est fidèle qu'aurois je encore à désir[e]r [Duo
from Sylvain/Amande/"with your heart if it be true/what
else could I desire?"] (on front of column) La Fausse Magie/
Céphale et procri/Les maries. Samnites/Marocco/Le jugement
de Midos/L'Amant jaloux/Les Evenements imprues/Aucassin et
Nicolette/Andromaque/Colinette à la Cour/L'embarras des
Riche/La Caravane/L'épéeve Villageoise/Richard Cœur-de-
Lion/Panurge/Le marig d'Antonio/Le Comte d'Albert./Le
Rival Confident/Les meprises Par Resssemblance/Raoul Barbe-
bleue/Pierre Le Grand/Guillaume Tell/Elisa; (on side of
column) Les Vendangeuses/Isabelle et Gertrude/Le Huron./
Lucile/Le Tableau Parlant./ SYLVAIN ./Les Deux
Avares/L'Amitié À L'épreuve/zémir et Azor./L'Ami De la
maison/Le Magnifique/Le Rosière de Salenci; (on back of
column) Le Prisonnier Anglais/Amphitryon/As Pasiea/Callas/
LiéBeth/Anacreôn 4/6 & 8; (on pages of open book)
MEMOIRE/OU/Concils Sur/La/Musique

PROVENANCE: Installed at the Théâtre Feydeau, Paris, in
1809 and later moved to other locations occupied by
the company of the Opéra-Comique (probably sold in 1887);
(dealer, London, in 1892); [Philpipp Sichel, Paris, until 1899];
Rodolphe Kann, Paris (in 1907); [Wildenstein and Company,
New York, until 1969; sold to MMA]

EXHIBITED: "Patterns of Collecting: Selected Acquisitions,
1965–1973," The Metropolitan Museum of Art, December 6,
1975–March 23, 1976

INCREASINGLY REVIVED TODAY, THE OPERAS OF COMPOSER
André Grétry enjoyed enormous popularity in Paris during his life-
time and far into the nineteenth century. One of his first successes,
Le Tableau parlant (1764), was followed by some sixty more; the
titles of forty-one of them are inscribed on the column of this statue
formerly erected in Paris, at the entrance of the Théâtre Feydeau,
where his music was often performed. Although he lost much of his
property during the Revolution, subsequent governments rehabilitated
him, conferring honors, pensions, and monuments. One of his greatest
fans, Hippolyte, comte de Livry, commissioned this statue in 1804,
committing 12,000 francs to its purchase and choosing its sculptor,
Jean-Baptiste Stouf.

The choice of subject was endorsed by the Académie Française,
which encouraged the creation of portraits of the great men of France.
In a series of statues for the Louvre's Grande Galerie, this project was
enthusiastically promoted by the comte d'Angiviller when he took
office as director of the royal buildings and gardens in 1774. While
earlier public portrait statues had mainly commemorated the deceased,
Grétry was very much alive in 1804. Controversy surrounded the
proposal to honor this living composer, although there were precedents,
including Jean-Antoine Houdon's bust of Gluck, which had
been placed in the Opéra by the king's orders in 1778. Later, Grétry
reflected on this issue in a chapter of his Réflexions d'un solitaire, written
in 1801–13 and titled "On the Danger of Public Honors Rendered
before Death: Letters Relative to the Erection of My Statue." The
dissenting voices did not scuttle the project, though they may have
prolonged its completion, which occurred only five years before
Grétry's death.

James Draper has thoroughly analyzed the sources and composi-
tion of the sculpture. He notes that Grétry lent Stouf two busts of
himself by other artists to use as models for the head; however, only
one sitting with Grétry is recorded. Doubtless, the artist made studies
on paper and in clay to guide him in the process of imagining and
completing the statue. He was a brilliant modeler, and a terracotta
study in the Minneapolis Institute of Arts for his statue of Saint
Vincent de Paul suggests that a similar preparatory work once existed
for the statue of Grétry. Stouf's marble of Saint Vincent de Paul
(1786–98, Hospice des Enfants-Trouvés, Paris) is notable for its active
pose and the sense of compassion it projects. In fact, the comte de
Livry's choice of Stouf was prompted by widespread admiration for his
statue of the energetic saint who dedicated his life to serving the
poor. Draper is surely correct that Augustin Pajou's Descartes (1777,
Palais de l'Institut, Paris), another statue in d'Angiviller's series of
The composer's much more active pose is Stoup's own invention. Grétry's hip juts to his left. One foot is raised on the column base, so that the knee extends out forcefully at the same sharp angle as the right elbow. Thrust apart, Grétry's hands clutch paper and quill; his faraway gaze suggests that he is experiencing a moment of musical inspiration and will soon pen further notes on the sheet in his left hand, which is inscribed with lyrics written by Jean-François Marmontel for Grétry's opera Sylvain (1770): "With your heart if it be true what else could I desire?" Robed en neglige—in the simple clothes he wears at home—the composer is an ordinary man, not a heroic nude or clad in ancient draperies, as was still expected for important monuments about 1800.

His seemingly casual stance is in fact charged with energy, and the high-voltage points—elbow, knee, and foot—are subtly reinforced by the corners of the pedestal. The column base, set at a forty-five degree angle to the pedestal, emphasizes Grétry's akimbo limbs. A book flush with the base props up another tome, flipped open to show its title, "Mémoire, ou Essais sur la Musique"—reminding us that Grétry devoted his late years to philosophical writing.

Designed to stand before an auditorium entrance, the figure of Grétry appears relaxed yet alert and forceful, welcoming the visitors streaming around him toward the doors, and his presence reminds them of the creative act behind the performance they came to hear. The list of operas inscribed on the column is a preview of the season's bill.

1. Breitl 1884; Charlton and Bartlet 2001; Charlton 2007–
8. But fashionable male portraits of the period often show the sitter leaning back in a relaxed attitude against a pedestal. Anne-Louis Girodet-Trioson's Portrait of Jean-Baptiste Belley (1797, Versailles) is an example.
77. Allegory of the Maréchal de Villars’s Victory at Denain

**Model by Louis-Simon Boizot (French, 1743–1809)**

**Executed and Later Modified by Pierre-Philippe Thomire (French, 1751–1843)**

*Paris; 1806, modified 1818*

Bronze group: 35 x 27 x 18¼ in. (88.9 x 68.6 x 47.3 cm)

Signed (on front of circular base): **Boizot FCT. FONDU ET CISELÉ PAR THOMIRE**. Inscribed (on front of hillock): **DENAÎN/1712**. Marked: (on base beneath winged figure, the 1833 inventory number of the Garde-Meuble Impériale) 3120; (on right side of base, twice, the 1835 inventory number of the Palais-Royal) P.R. 752.

Purchase, Mr. and Mrs. Claus von Bülow Gift, Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Paterson Gift, Bequest of Louis Einstein, by exchange, Rogers Fund and funds from various donors, 1978-1978-55

**Provenance:** Pierre-Philippe Thomire (1806–11); Trésor du Domaine Extraordinaire, Paris (1811–17); Garde-Meuble Impériale, Paris (1817–18; after restoration, 1818–39, and at intervals thereafter until 1833); Palais de Versailles (1833–40); Palais des Tuileries, Paris (1850–54); Palais-Royal, Paris (1855–92); [Coleman’s Auction Galleries, New York, until 1967; sale, October 19, 1967, no. 633, to Dalva]; [Dalva Brothers, New York, 1967–78; sold to MMA]


**This Exceptionally Fine Napoleon-era Bronze Group**

Cast in 1806 as an homage to the emperor was altered in 1818 to reflect the political sentiments of the era following the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy to the throne of France. Its convoluted history was reconstituted through tenacious art-historical and archival detective work by James Draper and David Harris Cohen. When it appeared at a 1967 New York auction, described as “Angel and two figures, signed Denain 1712,” nothing was known about this puzzling object. An inscription on the base signaled to Draper that it was the product of a collaboration between one of the finest sculptors of the epoch, Louis-Simon Boizot, and the foremost specialist in the production of bronzes, Pierre-Philippe Thomire. Boizot had developed a specialty in furnishing models for porcelain biscuit groups at the Sèvres Manufactory. This bronze group, with its columnar figures, abutting but separated on their circular base, is similar to Sèvres productions such as Peace Guided by Victory (Musée National de Céramique-Sèvres). He also produced bronze mounts for furniture and clocks. His eye for detail, such as the splintered staffs of the flags on the ground, was well served by Thomire’s excellence in chasing metal, yet it is in the crispness of drapery pleats and pristine surfaces of cloth and flesh that the success of the modeler’s and the caster’s collaboration shines most brilliantly.

The artist and the bronzier joined forces to produce this independent group for exhibition at the industrial exposition of 1806, clearly in the hope that it would be purchased by the emperor. In an undated letter to Napoléon, Thomire refers to it as the “Battle of Austerlitz” (scene of the emperor’s greatest victory), and he later sought to place it in a passageway where it might attract the ruler’s attention. When this stratagem failed, the bronze was exhibited in the 1810 Salon, where it was described as “The Emperor elevated on a hillock, having at his feet flags captured from the enemy at Austerlitz.” Napoléon finally did receive the work, in 1811, not as a purchase but as collateral for a loan to Thomire’s foundry.

The bronze group remained in storage and after the fall of Napoléon was scheduled to be destroyed as one of those works “covered with the emblems of the usurper,” until a reprieve came in the form of a proposal of February 23, 1818, to replace the head of Napoléon with one of the maréchal de Villars, hero of the battle.
of Denain in 1712. Thomire himself was to make the change.

Despite this politically correct alteration, the bronze apparently remained in storage until 1855, when it was displayed in the first salon of the grands appartements of Prince Napoléon in the Palais-Royal. How it came to leave that palace in 1892 and where it was before its discovery in New York are unknown.

The appearance of Boizot and Thomire’s figure of Napoléon before its torso, head, and right arm were replaced in 1818 was clarified in 2009, when a bronze Napoléon appeared on the art market (fig. 59). The figure is the same height as the one of Villars; the pose is similar, too, except that the right arm is raised to hold up a gilded orb. That emblem of state is probably a later replacement for an original statuette of victory (such as the one mentioned in Thomire’s description of the present work in his loan application). The recently discovered bronze Napoléon is also similar to the present statuette of Villars in the details of belt, hem, and sandal, though there are variations in the treatment of drapery at the emperor’s left side, and he does not hold drapery with his left hand. The back is fundamentally different, and one wonders whether it is a variant of the Napoléon figure in the unmodified 1806 sculpture.

Close inspection of the figure of Villars confirms that Thomire’s 1818 intervention included the following changes: the right arm was lowered and made to point, presumably toward the battlefield of Denain; the maréchal’s bewigged head replaced the laurel-crowned head of Napoléon; and the edge of the tunic was revised. Since this group was assembled from separately cast parts, it was relatively simple for the foundry that first created it to make the adjustments, although the join of the torso to the diagonal of the tunic is imperfect. Finally, as a substitution for a Napoleonic triumph, Villars’s decisive battle in the War of the Spanish Succession on behalf of Louis XIV was an appropriate royalist victory to commemorate. In the Salon of 1781 the sculptor Robert-Guillaume Dardel showed a model of “Marshal de Villars holding his sword in one hand and in the other the palm of victory, which he snatches from the eagle of the Empire”—a sign that the general continued to be remembered in art long after his death. The comte d’Angiviller’s late eighteenth-century Great Men of France series resulted in many commissions honoring other figures of the period of Louis XIV.

Replacing Napoleonic furniture mounts with decorations lacking Napoleonic insignia saved many fine French furnishings from destruction during the regimes that followed. In the case of this sculpture, the adroit splicing in of a historicized head and torso rescued one of the finest Empire bronzes from the foundry furnace.

3. For example, Minerva, History, and Immortality Paying Tribute to Catherine II, Legislator (1785), modeled by Boizot and executed by François Rémont for the secretary made by David Roentgen for Catherine the Great (State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg); see Christian Baudez in Cast in Bronze 2009, pp. 462–65, no. 131.
4. Archives Nationales, Paris, O5 622 (April 7 and 8, 1807) and F1 507 (August 7, 1807). See Cohen 1979, pp. 185–86.
6. In a list of the objects he submitted as collateral for the loan, Thomire describes the present work as follows: “No. 1. Un Groupe en bronze représentant S. M. l’Empereur tenant d’une Main la Victoire et appuyé sur Minerve derrière et la renommée publiant ses conquêtes; chaque figure porte 70 cent’ce hauteur” (No. 1. A group in bronze representing His Majesty the Emperor holding a Victory in one hand and leaning on Minerva; behind is Fame proclaiming his conquests. Each figure measures 70 centimeters in height); Archives Nationales, Paris, O5 623, fol. 98. Quoted in Cohen 1979, pp. 186–87.
8. “De faire placer dans un très beau groupe la tête du Marechal de Villars à la place de celle de Buonaparte, de recevoir à cet objet la submision de M’ Thomye”; Archives Nationales, Paris, O5 1949*, fol. 32, 33. Quoted in Cohen 1979, p. 188.
11. Thomire’s description is quoted in note 6 above. Antonio Canova’s monumental marble of Napoleon (modeled in 1802, Apsley House, London) probably inspired Boizot’s conception of the emperor holding a figure of victory.
12. It is also different from the bust of Napoleon in biscuit, modeled by Boizot in 1798. See Anne Billon in Boizot 2001, pp. 235–40, no. 85.
14. For another example, see Witt-Doerringer 1989.
78. Nessus Abducting Deianira

BETTEL THORVALDSEN (DANISH, 1770–1844)

Rome: modeled 1814–15, carved 1821–23 or 1826
Marble relief
39 5/8 × 49 5/8 × 5 3/4 in. (100.3 × 125.7 × 14.6 cm)
European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2004
2004.174

PROVENANCE: Count Paolo Marulli, Naples (until 1865); Sebastiano Marulli; sale, Finarte Semenzato, Venice, May 4, 2003, no. 621; [Alain Moatti, Paris, until 2004; sold to MMA]


THE DANE BETTEL THORVALDSEN VIED WITH ANTONIO CANOVA for sculptural commissions throughout Europe and after the Italian's death, in 1822, became the foremost Neoclassical sculptor in Rome. Thorvaldsen's severe style, informed by careful study of the art of antiquity, shows to best advantage in his reliefs. His preeminence in this field won him the sobriquet "patriarch of the relief." 1

One of the artist's largest and most dramatic compositions is Nessus Abducting Deianira. With its erotic and violent undertones, the mythological subject of a centaur abducting Hercules' wife, Deianira, while ferrying her across the river Euvenus was popular in the Renaissance and Baroque periods but infrequently depicted during the soberer era about 1800. Thorvaldsen shows Nessus rearing amid the waves and twisting back to plant a kiss on the cheek of Deianira, who struggles and gestures toward Hercules on the riverbank, out of our sight. The starting point for the composition was a late Hadríanic–early Antonine Roman marble relief known to the sculptor through a book he could consult in his other library that illustrated ancient sculpture restored by the eighteenth-century artist Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. 2

Four drawings in the Thorvaldsen Museum, Copenhagen, permit us to follow the relief's evolving design. 3 While some elements, such as the fluttering lion's skin tied around the centaur's neck, are clearly adopted from the ancient relief, the sketches show an ever-tightening confrontation between the antagonists, heightened by changing their course and positions. The compact group with radiating limbs reflects compositional patterns of ancient cameos and coins, which the artist collected, while certain passages, such as the centaur's fleshy cheeks and rumped hair, are modeled after antique sculptures also in his private collection and today in the Thorvaldsen Museum. 4

It was Thorvaldsen's practice to begin by making a clay model of his subject and then to cast it in plaster. Letters written by a Danish painter in Rome, Christoffer Wilhelm Eckersberg, fix the date of the original model for this relief in 1814 or 1815. 5 The sculptor's studio diaries record a marble version of a "centaur" carved in 1821–23 and a "marble centaur bas-relief" executed in 1826. 6 This version was commissioned by Count Paolo Marulli, major-domo of Ferdinand IV, king of Naples (1751–1825), for his house on the Riviera di Chiaia in Naples. Records indicate that Marulli incorporated the relief into the wall of a room next to two other Thorvaldsen reliefs, Night and Day (1815, possibly the version now in an Italian private collection). Nearby, on a pedestal, stood Antonio Canova's herm of a vestal virgin (1821–22, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles). 7 Marulli was engaged in installing this room about 1822, so it appears that his version of Nessus Abducting Deianira was the marble carved in Rome in 1821–23.
but this cannot be confirmed. The three sculptures were still in his town house in 1843–47 but had been dispersed by 1863. Four other marble versions of this relief are in Denmark (Thorvaldsens Museum and Castle Jægerspris, Zealand). The original plaster is also in the Thorvaldsens Museum.9

Images of this famous composition circulated throughout Europe in the form of engravings and plaster impressions made from carved-shell cameos. The Museum owns an exceptionally fine cameo copy of the "Nessus Abducting Deianira" by Giuseppe Girometti (fig. 60). It attests to the esteem in which Thorvaldsen's contemporaries held the composition.

3. For the drawings and an in-depth study of the relief and its sources, see Wardropper 2006.
5. See Bransden and Jensen 1973, p. 88.
**79. Marie-Amélie, Queen of the French**

**BARON FRANÇOIS-JOSEPH BOSIO (FRENCH, 1768–1845)**

Paris, 1841
Marble bust
32 1/2 (with socle) × 22 1/2 × 12 1/2 in. (82.9 × 58.1 × 32.1 cm)
Signed and dated (on socle, below subject’s left shoulder): LE BARON BOSIO/MDCCCLX
Wrightsman Fund, 1950–1990.60

**PROVENANCE:** Commissioned by Louis-Philippe, king of the French, and presented to Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha (1841–d. 1883); his descendants (until 1950; sold to Roth); [Anthony Roth, London, until 1950; sold to MMA]

**LITERATURE:** Lami 1914–21, vol. 1, p. 159 (first version); Hubert 1964, p. 114, n. 1; James David Draper in “Recent Acquisitions” 1990, pp. 31–32, ill.

---

**THE PROMINENT SIGNATURE ON THE SOCLE OF THIS BUST**

announces the sculptor’s baronetcy, which he received in 1828. Born in Monaco, Bosio had trained in Paris with Augustin Pajou, studied in Italy after a stint there in the French army during the Revolutionary wars, and established himself in France by 1807. Soon he began portraying the imperial family in full-length statues and busts — of Napoléon and Joséphine, as well as of the emperor’s second wife, Empress Marie-Louise, and his stepdaughter, Queen Hortense of Holland. The Museum owns a fine replica dating to 1810–12 of Bosio’s bust of Napoléon’s brother Jérôme Bonaparte, king of Westphalia, which displays the clarity of the sculptor’s Neoclassicist style and the mannered carving of details that combined to make him so fashionable a portraitist.1 Under the Bourbon restoration, he continued to sculpt portraits of rulers, as a marble bust of Louis XVIII (1814, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Marseilles) testifies, and found success with historical subjects, such as Henry of Navarre as a Boy (plaster 1822, silver 1824; Musée du Louvre, Paris) and the bronze equestrian monument to Louis XIV in the Place des Victoires (1816–22).

King Louis-Philippe’s obsession with royal iconography ensured that there would be abundant images of himself and his wife, Queen Marie-Amélie, for posterity.2 Their “bourgeois monarchy” (1830–48) is evoked to perfection in an earlier bust of the queen by Antonin Moïne (fig. 61), first exhibited at the Salon of 1833. Crowned with an enormous ostrich-plumed hat, she is engulfed in a torrent of clothing including blouse, scarf, beads, epaulettes, and ribbons. Moïne’s is an image of modernity taken almost to the point of parody through scrupulously realistic attention to detail. Six years later, when Bosio took up his chisel to execute this bust, her beaklike nose, elaborate curls, and fastidious dress remained the queen’s identifiable features. Seen in her late fifties, she carries herself with the haughty dignity of her rank, having been a princess of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. A stylish silk turban worn at a rakish angle sets off her austere face. As
exotic accessories to evening wear, turbans crested in popularity in England and France in the 1830s. The delicate floral band on the turban is repeated on an edge of her dress, just visible beneath a sumptuous ermine stole. The tails dangling from this wrap rhyme peculiarly with the corkscrew curls surrounding her face. What saves Bosio's efforts from the nearly comic effect of Moïne's overly lavish decorative detail is the almost abstract structure of the queen's body. With geometric precision, the angled slopes of her shoulders support the long cylinder of the neck. This purity of line — the essence of Neoclassicism — compellingly balances the rich textures of the dress. Against this basic design and the formidable strength of character projected by her eyes and mouth, the potentially distracting curled locks — truly bravura carving — do not overwhelm the image. This stylish period coiffure dominates the sculpted female portraits by Pierre-Jean David D'Angers, but here Bosio has tamed it with strong design elements. The queen's elongated neck may reflect the study of Italian Mannerists, such as Parmigianino and Bronzino, who were much admired by Bosio, and of Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, the contemporary painter whose elegance most closely corresponds to his own. Here, late in his career, Bosio blended his early interest in Neoclassical line with a realistic approach that captured perfectly the aloof mien and love of finery of the wife of the "bourgeois monarch."

This bust was commissioned in 1837. Bosio was paid for the first version in 1838, and it was exhibited at the Salon of 1839; it appears to be the work now in Versailles. A contemporary critic observed: "[Bosio] recently executed a bust of the Queen, one of his most carefully meditated works and among the most notable of his oeuvre. This bust of the Queen Amélie is of a character as pure as it is noble. The resemblance, its grace, its dignity are perfect. It is a masterpiece." The king and queen evidently shared this high opinion, as they ordered three replicas from Bosio. One was finished by August 26, 1841, and given before the end of the year by Louis-Philippe to Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, by then King Ferdinand II of Portugal. The date on the socle of the Museum's example is the same as that of this commission. It was a gift to a prince into whose family two of the ten children of Louis-Philippe and Marie-Amélie were married. The replication of busts of royalty was normal practice in the period, but this example was evidently of sufficient quality and personal allure to represent the queen in a foreign court where her family presided. Of the other two replicas, now lost, one was finished by 1838 and sent to Vienna; the other, completed by 1844, was deposited in the headquarters of the National Guard in Paris. The acclaimed likeness brought Bosio the commission for a full-length statue of the queen in state dress; the ermine wrap is formally draped across her shoulders and the turban has been replaced by a crown and veil. This impressive work, seen here in the plaster model (fig. 62), appropriately conveys the queen's regal bearing.

4. See, for example, David D'Angers's Émile Joubin (1829, marble, Art Institute of Chicago) in Wardroper 2001, p. 10, fig. 12.
6. It entered the Musée du Louvre on December 24, 1839, as inv. no. LP-471, now Versailles, inv. no. MV5472.
7. "Il a exécuté récemment un buste de la Reine, l'une des productions les plus sérieusement médités, les plus nobles de son oeuvre. Ce buste de la reine Amélie est d'un caractère aussi pur que noble. La ressemblance, la grâce, la dignité sont parfaits. C'est un chef d'oeuvre"; Payot 1842, p. 135. See also Barbarin 1910, p. 109.
8. Hubert 1964, p. 114, n. 1; documents all of Bosio's busts of the queen.
LORENZO BARTOLINI (ITALIAN, 1777–1850)

Florence, 1845
Marble group
64¼ (with pedestal) × 49½ (maximum) × 51¼ in.
(163.5 × 126.4 × 130.2 cm)
Inscribed, signed, and dated (on side of quiver):
Di commissione del principe/Anatolio Demidoff/Bartolini
fece 1845 Firenze [Ordered by the prince/Anatole Demidoff/
executed by Bartolini 1845 Florence]
Gift of le Duc de Loubat, 1903. 03.111a–d

PROVENANCE: Commissioned by Prince Anatole Demidov, Villa San Donato, near Florence (1845–d. 1870; his sale, Paris, March 4, 1870, no. 228, to Loubat); the duc de Loubat (Joseph H. de Loubat), Paris (1870–1903; his gift to MMA)

LITERATURE: Righi 1845; Saltini 1862, p. 28; Dandolo 1863, p. 308; Tinti 1936, vol. 2, p. 13, no. 24, p. 23, no. 43, pp. 75–76; Ettore Spalletti in Bartolini 1978, p. 58, under no. 18 (plaster model); Menaker 1982, figs. 1–3; Raggio 1991, p. 245, fig. 34; Spalletti 1996, p. 208, figs. 74, 75; Chelazzi 1998, p. 72; “Bartolini: La Table aux Amours” 2006, ill.; Mazzocca 2008, pp. 296–99, no. 41, ill.

LORENZO BARTOLINI WAS PERHAPS THE MOST SUCCESSFUL Italian sculptor in the quarter century following the death of Antonio Canova. The inscription on the quiver in this unusual group testifies that it was expressly commissioned from the artist by one of the great patrons of his day, Prince Anatole Demidoff. Heir to an immensely wealthy Russian family, Demidoff filled his magnificent palace outside Florence, the Villa San Donato, with contemporary as well as older art. As the owners of mines in the Ural Mountains, his family had acquired a taste for marble and semiprecious stones. A spectacular example of their love of art and the material it is made from is the colossal Russian malachite vase that once decorated San Donato and is now in this Museum. In addition, the villa’s sala delle statue (sculpture gallery) was filled with works by an international array of artists, including Canova’s marble Letizia Ramolino, Mother of Napoleon I (1804–7) and Hiram Powers’s Greek Slave (ca. 1843). The room once featured the principal group of a colossal monument to Count Nikolai Demidov, which occupied Bartolini from 1828 until his death in 1850 (it was installed outside the villa in 1870). The commission for this ambitious marble memorial to Anatole’s father signaled that Bartolini was the son’s principal sculptor.

Into the context of a villa lavishly decorated with contemporary sculpture, The Demidov Table fit perfectly. Bartolini’s decision to show figures seated or lying on a table-like platform, which he repeated in Table with the Sons of Lady Bingham (before 1847, plaster, Galleria dell’Accademia, Florence; whereabouts of marble unknown) was unusual in the 1840s; however, he was not alone in using this format. Another sculpture in Demidov’s collection, Auguste Clésinger’s Woman Dying from Snakebite (1847), is similarly presented. By lifting the children to the height of the viewer’s waist, Bartolini made examining these vulnerable figures an intimate act. The viewer can rotate the sculpture by means of a circular metal device hidden beneath the table. The circularity of the top is reinforced by the signs of the zodiac and the sun and moon around the rim, which make reference to the celestial globe.

The marble precisely follows the preserved plaster model in its composition; only the inscription and heavenly symbols are added. Although the figural group is entirely by Bartolini, it is likely that its pedestal, decorated with neo-Rococo ribbons and flowers, though original, is a workshop production. The youths’ legs tuck into the curvature of the table. Their heads rest at different levels: one child lies directly on the table, his head slightly projecting beyond the edge; the head of the second is propped upon the back of the first; the third child sits upright, leaning on an elbow. Their forms pile into a
loose pyramid, obscuring one another so that the whole group can be understood only by walking around it. By comparison with Bartolini’s very human portraits of the Bingham boys, who respond affectionately to one another, these children seem otherworldly. Two are sleeping, one with a touchingy open mouth. The third is wide awake, engaging us directly and pointing heavenward.

In a letter to his studio assistant Eliso Schianta, Bartolini himself supplied—if cryptically—the meaning of this sculpture:

Stretched out upon the plan of the world is Cupid, God of generation, sustaining and watching over the symbolic genius of dissolute wealth without virtue, who snores in his sleep, released from feasting and love, his head rumpled, the cup with the excess from his belly overturned, and covered for the rest by remains of the bacchanale, dreaming of past diversions in pleasure. Left to himself, the Genius of ambitious rectitude in work sleeps the agitated sleep of misfortune and glory, and serves as a cushion to the Destiny which oppresses him, covered by the respectability conferred by knowledge, his head extending beyond the periphery of the world: indicating thereby that he had no other happiness than in the other life. In the circle that indicates the celestial vault is the opulent sun that heats it; the Moon is warmth for the unfortunate.⁶

Writing on February 3, 1845, to Giovanni Benericetti-Talenti, inspector of the Florentine academy of fine arts, Bartolini requested a copy of Nicolas Boileau Despréaux’s Satyres so that he could refresh his memory on the subject of the table, which he said he drew from the book.⁷ In her interpretation of the iconography, Deborah Menaker notes that the sculptor’s recollection of his source was imprecise. Boileau Despréaux makes no literal reference to a table aux Amours (table of Loves), as Bartolini called it; yet the tenor of this allegory derives from the poet-philosopher’s championing of hedonism and those who remain close to nature.⁸ Using the artist’s observations as a guide, Menaker identifies the figures as Bacchus (Love of Life’s Pleasures, with overturned cup) sleeping in the arms of Divine Love, while Unhappy Virtue, or Correct Behavior (Love of Work or Knowledge, holding calipers, a sign of rational philosophy and mathematical order), lies at the bottom of the pile. Love of earthly pleasure and love of the divine are thus superior to the allegorical figure of rectitude, whose head extends beyond the world to express his yearning for heavenly grace. In a statement made between 1844 and 1846, Bartolini expanded on the theme of the limitation of “correct behavior” and condemned the rule-bound artist, favoring instead the one who gives free rein to the imagination.⁹ Menaker’s interpretation correctly deciphers an allegory that was universal in appeal and attractive to an educated man like Demidov but was also an intensely personal theme for the sculptor.

1. Acc. no. 44.152a, b; see Wolfram Koeppe in Kislik-Groszeide, Koeppe, and Rieder 2006, pp. 226–26, no. 94.
5. “Questo è tutto lavorò di Bartolini,” as noted by his studio assistant Eliso Schianta in a list of his works compiled in 1846; see Tinti 1996, vol. 2, p. 23.
81. Theseus Fighting the Centaur Bianor

ANTOINE-LOUIS BARYE (FRENCH, 1795–1875)

Paris: modeled 1849, cast ca. 1867

Bronze group

45⅓ × 45⅓ × 20⅞ in. (126.4 × 114.9 × 52.7 cm)

Signed and dated (on rocks near centaur’s left rear leg):
A.L. BARYE PARIS [date illegible]

Gift of Samuel P. Avery, 1885. 85.3

PROVENANCE: The artist (sold to Boer’s); [Boer’s Bazaar, Royal, The Hague, until 1885; sold to Samuel P. Avery, who presented it to MMA]


LITERATURE: Salon of 1850, p. 257, no. 3771 (plaster model); Barye 1889, p. 46, no. 392; De Kay 1889, pp. 77–80, 150, ill. no. 60 (engraving); Remington 1940b, fig. 30; Clare Vincent in Metropolitan Museum 1987a, p. 126, pl. 57; Vincent 1993a, p. 73; Poletti and Richarme 2000, p. 109, no. 133

ANTOINE-LOUIS BARYE IS FAMED FOR HIS ANIMAL SCULPTURE, a genre that earned him and his followers the initially demeaning name animaliers. He studied his subject intensively, regularly drawing the creatures on view at Paris’s first zoo, the Jardin des Plantes. His knowledge of their appearance and behavior helped him to create convincingly authentic sculptures of wild and domestic animals. Like his friend the painter Eugène Delacroix, he often depicted scenes that emphasized their savagery. Combining a realistic rendering with a Romantic sensibility, his sculpture of a combat between a tiger and gavial (an Indian crocodilian) won him his first medal at the Paris Salon in 1831. Unfortunately, six years later his Salon submissions were rejected as more like the work of a goldsmith than that of a sculptor.1 Barye had indeed trained first with goldsmiths and practiced extensively with metalworkers, experience that made him one of the most adept bronziers of the nineteenth century. Certainly, too, he faced the old academic bias that animals were less important subjects for art than those drawn from history or mythology. Despite another rejection, by the jury of the 1843 Salon, he continued to produce bronze animal sculpture for an increasingly enthusiastic clientele.6

When at last he returned to the Salon, in 1850, he presented two key works: an animalier composition sure to rile those who scorned such subjects, Jaguar Devouring a Hare, and a more traditional mythological group, Theseus Fighting the Centaur Bianor, which in a sense is also a sculpture of animal combat. Barye’s profound knowledge of horse anatomy is displayed as he shows Bianor’s equine half straining to keep a footing on the rocky base. The hooves’ precarious perch on the stones creates a strong sense of disequilibrium; here, at the height of the action, the combatants are about to crash to the ground. Against his foe’s desperate evasions Theseus calmly readies the final blow. As violent as this composition is, its subject was more acceptable to the artistic establishment than the brutality of wild beasts. The scene is drawn from book 12 of Ovid’s Metamorphoses, in which is related the battle between the Lapiths and Centaurs, including Bianor’s death; Barye closely followed the story in its details.3 The French sculptor would also have known ancient representations of this battle—most notably, the reliefs carved on the metopes of the Parthenon—through prints or plaster casts, as the critic Théophile Gautier was the first to note.4 For the specific motif of Theseus pinning back the centaur’s head, Barye turned to a well-known Italian Mannerist sculpture, Giambologna’s lifesize Hercules and Nessus (finished 1594, Loggia dei Lanzi, Piazza della Signoria, Florence). Such ancient and Renaissance references were expected in academic work of the mid-nineteenth century, although the strife between Barye’s figures exceeded the limits
of decorum generally acceptable in officially sponsored art of the time.\(^5\)

The monumentality of Barye’s 1850 Salon submissions reveals his ambition to be perceived as a major sculptor, and his subsequent reception in France and America proved his success in achieving that goal. The critic Albert de La Fizilie stated that there was no stronger work in the 1850 Salon than *Theseus Fighting the Centaur Bionor*.\(^6\) The first bronze produced from the original plaster was made for the Musée Crozatier in Le Puy-en-Velay.\(^7\) The second is the Museum’s. According to Samuel P. Avery, the donor of our version, it was cast by Barye about 1867 and sold to Boer’s Bazaar Royal in The Hague; Avery purchased it there and immediately presented it to the Museum.\(^8\) At the original scale, only the Museum’s example, the Musée Crozatier’s example, and another example in the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., are known to have been produced in Barye’s atelier before he died, in 1875. A number of posthumous bronzes exist at the original scale, and the foundry of Ferdinand Barbedienne circulated four editions of reductions.

After Avery’s gift to the Museum in 1885, Barye’s star shone brightly in the United States. An exhibition of his work was held in New York in 1889–90 to raise funds for a monument to the artist in Paris.\(^9\) American sponsors formed the Barye Monument Association and succeeded in erecting this tribute to one of the nineteenth century’s greatest sculptors in a park behind Notre-Dame Cathedral on the Île-Saint-Louis, Paris, in 1894.\(^10\) The crowning feature of the monument was a colossal bronze version of *Theseus Fighting the Centaur Bionor*, which was destroyed in World War II. Barye’s work continued to be collected at the Metropolitan Museum: today there are fifty-nine of his bronzes, plasters, and waxes in the collection, mainly of small-scale animal subjects, as well as an extraordinary group of his watercolors, given by the Havemeyer family.

---

1. For this incident and for Barye’s dealings with the artistic establishment, see Jonston 2006, p. 9; Lemaitre 2006, p. 38. See also Pivar 1974, pp. 7–9.
3. Metamorphoses 1.3.344–49.
4. Gauthier 1866; see also Saunier 1925, p. 38.
5. Benge 1984, p. 48, reviews the sources for this composition.
6. See ibid.
7. Musée Crozatier inv. no. D852.1; see Poletti and Richarme 2000, p. 109, no. F33.
8. Samuel P. Avery to General Luigi Palma di Cesnola, May 20, 1885, Samuel P. Avery Correspondence, Office of the Secretary Records, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives.
9. Barye 1885; Vincent 1993a, p. 73.
The Jewish Woman of Algiers (left)
Paris, 1862
Algerian onyx-marble, bronze, gilt bronze, amethyst, and enamel; white marble socle; red and white marble pedestal with gilt-bronze mounts and ornaments
33⅜ (with socle) x 25⅗ x 13⅗ in. (90.2 x 64.1 x 34.9 cm)
Pedestal: 41⅞ x 18¼ x 18⅞ in. (105.1 x 46.4 x 46.4 cm)
Signed and dated (on drapery at front): Cordier/1862

The Goat Tender of the Colonies (right)
Paris, 1861
Algerian onyx-marble, bronze, gilt bronze, and enamel; white marble socle; red and white marble pedestal with gilt-bronze mounts and ornaments
37⅞ (with socle) x 23⅝ x 12⅞ in. (95.9 x 59.1 x 31.1 cm)
Pedestal: 41⅞ x 18¼ x 18⅞ in. (105.1 x 46.4 x 46.4 cm)
Signed and dated (cast in the bronze arm bracelet): Cordier/1861

European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2006
2006.112a–c (Goat Tender), 2006.113a–c (Jewish Woman)

Charles Cordier combined two personal interests—the new science of ethnography and polychrome sculpture—to produce an entirely original category of work. In 1848, following training at the Petite École (École Spéciale de Dessin et de Mathématiques) in Paris and with the sculptor François Rude, he exhibited, when only twenty-one, at the Paris Salon. His first submission, a plaster bust of Said Abdallah of the Darfour tribe, coincided with the abolition of slavery in France and its colonies, established by law on April 27 of that year. In his unpublished “Mémoires,” he wrote, “My art incorporated the reality of a whole new subject, the revolt against slavery and the birth of anthropology.”1 Three years later, he was named ethnographic sculptor to the Musée d’Histoire Naturelle in Paris, and in that capacity he traveled to Algeria (1856), Greece (1858–59), and Egypt (1865). Sketches and models made during the voyages inspired a series of portraits of the people of those and other countries that would become the mainstay and lasting achievement of his career.

As a young student in Paris, Cordier was also aware of the ongoing academic debate as to whether ancient Greek and Roman sculpture was colored or not. Antoine-Chrysostome Quatremère de Quincy’s reconsideration of the fifth-century-b.c. gold-and-ivory statue of Olympian Jupiter (destroyed) had brought about a more accurate knowledge of polychromy in antique art when published in 1814.2 Ancient Roman statues composed of variously colored marbles, such as the Old Fisherman (also known as Dying Seneca; Musée du Louvre, Paris), and Renaissance mixed-media works by Nicolas
Cordier, such as Moor (ca. 1600, now Versailles), both then at the Palais du Louvre, drew his attention. His 1856 mission to Algeria gave him the opportunity to study African physical types; on that trip he also found onyx deposits in recently reopened ancient quarries and, inspired by historical example, began to use the material in his sculpture. The Negro of the Sudan (1856, Musée d’Orsay, Paris) was the first work in which he fit a bronze head into an onyx bust and turban. Cordier was not alone in his taste for color in sculpture: his contemporary Jean-Léon Gérôme in France and the younger Vincenzo Gemito in Italy and Alfred Gilbert in England were similarly inclined. But Cordier was the most consistent in combining colored sculpture and ethnographic subjects.

Cordier’s most lavish multimedia busts of ethnic people found favor with collectors at the highest social level, for example, Napoléon III and Queen Victoria, who were no doubt drawn to them because of their own colonialist interests. For such costly commissions he would create a model that could be varied with different stones and paints. The Goat Tender of the Colonies (La Capresse des Colonies), for instance, features a brilliantly striated chunk of Algerian onyx-marble that evokes a vibrantly colored costume; it contrasts with the darkly patinated bronze head and shoulders that are inserted into the stone. Smooth flesh and nubby hair are set off by gold and enameled earrings. For another version of The Goat Tender, in the Musée d’Orsay, Paris (fig. 64), Cordier selected a less variegated marble for the drapery and he complemented its golden hue by gilding the turban.

The Goat Tender’s alert, upturned face and coquettish smile contrast with the sober, downturned countenance of The Jewish Woman of Algiers (La Juive d’Alger). For the latter, a predominantly white onyx-marble is matched with a white enamel fired into the bronze floral pattern of the blouse. Brightly colored enamels make stripes in the turban and in the brooches that pin it to the hair. Inset amethyst eyes gleam against the smooth surface of the woman’s bronze skin. For a different version in the Musée de Beaux-Arts, Troyes (fig. 63), Cordier used red enamel for the blouse, which he matched by painting part of the marble cloak red and gold. For grand sculptures such as these, he delighted in varying the colors and effects.

As Cordier’s busts were increasingly sought by collectors, he began to create pairs, generally male and female, as decorative ensembles. The Goat Tender (first version exhibited in 1861) was paired with The Negro of the Sudan (first shown in 1856) in an exhibition in London in 1862. The Jewish Woman of Algiers was paired after 1866 with The Arab Sheik of Cairo, in examples in the Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam, and in two now-lost pairs. By contrast, the
Metropolitan’s group presents a same-sex pair representing different countries and races of the African continent.

The Museum’s two busts were exhibited in 1863 in the Exposition de la Société Artistique des Bouches-du-Rhône, Marseilles, and purchased there by the Cercle des Phocéens, a gentleman’s gambling club in that city. The first owners of the busts may have viewed them as decorative representations of the opposite sex, but Cordier’s idea in creating them was to illustrate the universality of beauty. In his words, “Because beauty is not the province of privileged race, I give to the world of art the idea of the universality of beauty. Every race has its beauty, which differs from that of other races. The most beautiful Negro is not the one who looks most like us, nor the one who presents the most pronounced characteristics associated with his race. It is the individual in whom are united such forms and traits, and a face that reflects with harmony and balance the essential moral and intellectual character of the Ethiopian race.”

At the time of their purchase, the Cercle des Phocéens acquired pedestals for the busts, evidently based on designs by Charles-François Rossignieux. These neo-Rococo matching pedestals in red and white marble are decorated with gilt-bronze decorations of sprays of flowers— one with horn, flute, panpipes and thyrus, the other with torch and bow. Cordier used this design for other pedestals. Having himself designed a number of torchères and atlantids to ornament interiors in the Second Empire style, he was mindful of the need to integrate his sculpture with the decor of the room where it would stand. As he wrote in 1864, “Polychrome sculpture is not made for gardens, but for interiors that are already lavish.”

Fig. 64. Cordier. The Goat Tender of the Colonies, 1860. Silvered bronze, gilt bronze, and onyx-marble. Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

2. Guérin de Quincy 1825. See Bühm 1986, pp. 53-54.
4. Busts of Said Abdullah and The African Venus were purchased by Queen Victoria and are now in Osborne House, East Cowes, Isle of Wight; Durand-Réville and Margerie 2004, p. 205, nos. 480, 481. The version of The Goat Tender of the Colonies illustrated here at figure 64 was purchased for Emperor Napoléon III in July 1861; on that work, see note 5 below.
5. Ibid., p. 151, no. 64 (ill. p. 50).
7. Ibid., p. 152, nos. 70, 71.
9. They were numbers 343 and 344 in the exhibition; Margerie 2004a, p. 231.
11. Cordier to the comte de Nieuwerkerke, translated in Margerie 2004a, p. 153 (entry of April 1862). Similar pedestals were chosen for The Goat Tender and Negro of the Sudan (Durand-Réville and Margerie 2004, p. 153, nos. 70, 71). See also the photograph by Léon Cordier of his father’s stand at the Exposition Universelle of 1867, showing a similar pedestal supporting Arab Sheik of Cairo (in Facing the Other, 2002, p. 81).
84. Ugolino and His Sons

JEAN-BAPTISTE CARPEAUX (FRENCH, 1827–1875)
Paris, 1865–67
Marble group
77% × 59 × 43% in. (195.3 × 149.9 × 110.5 cm)
Signed and dated: (at right front facet of base) J.B. CARPEAUX./ ROME 1860; (at right rear facet of base) J. B. CARPEAUX ROMA 1860 Purchase, Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation Inc. and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation Inc. Gifts, and Fletcher Fund, 1967 67.250

PROVENANCE: Dervillé et Compagnie, Paris; Stephane Dervillé, Paris; descended in his family until 1950; [Wildenstein and Company, New York, until 1967; sold to MMA]


UGOLINO AND HIS SONS, JEAN-BAPTISTE CARPEAUX’S FIRST GREAT triumph, pushed past contemporary rules of decorum and can still cause shock. Even after the sculptor’s death, notoriety was attached to it: “A challenge to sculpture,” wrote Charles Blanc in Le Temps in 1875, and in an obituary of the following year an anonymous critic observed, “a ghastly composition, all of unmixed horrors.” As early as 1854 Carpeaux described an ideal work that would combine the genius of his literary and artistic heroes, Dante and Michelangelo: “The statue thought of by the bard of the Divine Comedy and created by the father of Moses, this would be a masterpiece of the human spirit.” His eventual choice of subject for the grand sculpture he envisioned was a particularly grisly passage from Dante’s Inferno on the punishment of the thirteenth-century Pisan tyrant Ugolino della Gherardesca who, imprisoned and starving, ate his own children. The artist specified the verses that had seized his imagination in a letter to a friend: “When I recognized myself in their four faces, I gnawed my hands in grief, and my children, believing that this was due to hunger, rose suddenly, saying, ‘Father, we would be less sorrowful if only you would eat us.’”

Ugolino and His Sons was the culmination of five years of study at the Académie de France in Rome, where the talented artist was enrolled after winning the prestigious Prix de Rome in 1854. The young pensionnaire continually bristled at academic rules and strictures during his stay at the Villa Medici, but the sculptural group is deeply indebted to his contemplation in Italy of ancient statuary and, above all, of the passionate marbles and frescoes of Michelangelo. Drawings in his sketchbooks reveal that toward the end of 1857 he contemplated making a figural relief whose shallow space would reflect the close quarters of a prison. As the subject evolved from a relief to a freestanding work, the central figure assumed the attitude of Michelangelo’s Lorenzo de’ Medici (Medici Chapel, church of San Lorenzo, Florence). Carpeaux also spoke of the impact that the Hellenistic statue Laoeides and His Sons (Vatican Museums) had on his work; certainly, the intertwined figures and exaggerated anatomy of that ancient marble are keenly felt in the Ugolino group. Maquettes in terracotta and plaster and various drawings record Carpeaux’s long struggle to resolve the composition; especially troublesome was the addition late in the design process of the child at the far left. The primary motif of the tyrant chewing his fingers in despair—a ghoulish presage of the cannibalism to follow—based on the verse from Dante that Carpeaux quoted in his 1858 letter, remained the central focus of the final work. With frightening realism, the sculptor depicted the four children of different ages wrapped around their
seated father. Only his chained foot now indicates the prison locale. But the figures, interlocked in a tightly compressed pyramid of flesh, express their trapped existence through their immobility. Ugolino's taut muscles and pronounced veins, his clenched toes and tense back muscles, not to mention the fierce scowl, all convey that he is horrified by the knowledge that he will devour his own children. Their slim, emaciated bodies, contrasting with his still-powerful physique, add to the pathos and the horror.

Obstinate, Carpeaux stuck with his theme, despite the academy's rule against choosing subjects from Dante, and he ignored the requirement that he complete a marble statue in the round based on the plaster during his final year of study. The Roman public poured into his studio, nonetheless, to see the completed plaster model, and the academy, recognizing its success, even paid to ship it back to Paris. There it was exhibited at the École des Beaux-Arts in 1863. The shock value of the sculpture drew babed comments from the critics but brought the artist immediate renown. He resisted attempts to make him alter the composition, and the state agreed to purchase the model and to pay for a cast in bronze to be erected in the Tuileries gardens.8

The Museum's marble version resulted not from a state commission but from a commercial venture. France had few sources of marble as fine as those of Italy, and a stone merchant named Cyr-Adolphe Dervillé was eager to promote his quarry, Saint-Béat, in the Haute-Garonne. In 1865 he decided to provide Carpeaux with stone and with money to hire a professional carver, hoping to obtain a celebrated work that would call attention to his marble.9 In 1866–67 Victor Bernard carved it in Paris under Carpeaux's supervision. At least one critic, Paul Mantz, deplored the translation into another medium. He found the Ugolino group pretentious and thought that in the marble version Carpeaux exaggerated the central figure's body, making his muscles, he said, like the planes of a topographical map.10 The artist, however, took great pride in the marble, which was shown at the Exposition Universelle of 1867 and helped to establish his name and his career.

From this startling debut, Carpeaux went on to become the prime exponent of sculpture in the Second Empire. He was known for his free-spirited compositions, especially La Danse (Genius of the Dance; Musée d'Orsay, Paris), which was completed in 1869 for the Paris Opéra. Even in this central decoration for a bastion of French culture, Carpeaux continued to defy cultural conventions. He shocked Parisians with its blatant sensuality and unbridled exuberance, as in Ugolino and His Sons by he had alarmed the academicians by presenting a taboo subject candidly.

2. Carpeaux to Bruno Chérier, 1854, quoted in Clément-Carpeaux 1956-57, vol. 1, p. 78. Michelangelo's famous figure of Moses for the tomb of Pope Julius II is in the church of San Pietro in Vincoli, Rome, where Carpeaux must have seen it.
3. "Quand je reconnus mon propre aspect sur leurs quatre visages, je me mordis les deux mains de douleur, et mes enfants croyant que c'était de faux se levèrent tout à coup disant: O Père! Nous serons moins douleur-nous si tu manges de nous," Carpeaux to J. B. Faure, September 18, 1858, quoted in Maille de Pensievile 1921, pp. 153-54.
5. Ibid., p. 160, figs. 160-63.
6. Carpeaux to Charles Laurent-Daragon, December 19, 1857, in Figaro: Supplément littéraire, June 16, 1906. See Wagner 1896, pp. 157, 293, n. 120. "The subject is dramatic to the nth degree. There is a great analogy to the Laocoön."
85. Saint Tarcisius

ALEXANDRE FALGUIÈRE (FRENCH, 1831–1900)

Paris, ca. 1868

Marble statue; 23⅛ × 52 × 20 in. (59.7 × 132.1 × 50.8 cm)

Signed (on top of base at front right corner): A. Falguière

Inscribed (on top of base): TARCISIVM . SACRVM . CHRI STI .

SACRAMENTA . GERENTEM . CVVM . MALESA . NA . MANUS .

PETETER . VULGARE . PROFANIS . IPSE . ANIMAM . POTIVS .

VOLVIT . DIMITTERE . CAESVS . PRODERE . QVAM . CANISVS .

RABIDIS . COELESTIA . MEMBRA

European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Fund, 2007

PROVENANCE: The sculptor (until d. 1900); his wife
(1900–1907; her estate sale, Georges Petit, Paris,
May 14–15, 1907, no. 8); Emile Laffon, Paris (1838–1953);
Baron Henri de Rothschild (1872–1942), Château de La
Muette, Paris; the duc de Trévise, Château de Sceaux; by
descent, the marquis de Vibraye, Château de Cheverny,
Loire-et-Cher; [Charles Janoray, New York, until 2007;
sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: James David Draper in “Recent Acquisitions”
2008, p. 42, ill.

TOULOUSE-BORN ALEXANDRE FALGUIÈRE FOUND WIDE ACCEPTANCE
as a sculptor in Second Empire Paris, receiving numerous commis-
sions for monuments to be erected in public buildings and squares.
Official success came early. He won the Prix de Rome in 1859 and
studied at the Académie de France à Rome until 1865. Winner of the
Cockfight, his required submission piece to the Salon, was exhibited
in Paris in 1864. Although in his subject—the diversions of Italian
peasant boys—it followed a tradition established by Falguière’s early
master François Rude and his fellow student at the academy, Jean-
Baptiste Carpeaux, its earthy realism was criticized in some quarters;
however, this did not prevent the French government from ordering a
bronze version (Musée d’Orsay, Paris). The sculpture that solidified
his reputation, however, was Saint Tarcisius, the plaster version of
which Falguière exhibited at the Salon of 1867, after his return from
Italy. Again, the government supported him, purchasing the plaster
and commissioning a marble version (Musée d’Orsay), which won the
medal of honor at the Salon of 1868. Even Carpeaux’s Ugolino and His
Sons (no. 84) did not receive the same full measure of official esteem
that Saint Tarcisius did, since the state ordered only a bronze and not
a marble of it.

Although Falguière’s marble of this Early Christian subject
appears idealized, his model was a real Italian boy. A photograph in
the artist’s collection (fig. 65) shows him coaxed into a histrionic
swoon, a sheet draped over his recumbent body. For the finished
work, Falguière stretched and smoothed the cloth to emphasize the
body’s curves. During his stay in Rome, when he may have first
conceived the subject, he obviously saw the famous Baroque sculp-
ture by Stefano Maderno of another early Christian martyr, Saint
Cecilia (1600, church of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere). By repute, that
statue depicts the saint lying in the same position as her body was
when it was discovered, and the poignant simplicity of the marble
rendering of its subject was an example a nineteenth-century
sculptor could not ignore.

Outside of cemeteries, recumbent statues of male youths are rare.
James Draper has noted that François-Joseph Bosio’s The Wounded
Hyacinth (1817, marble, Musée du Louvre, Paris) is similarly posed,
with one knee drawn forward and the torso raised on the elbows.
Pierre-Jean David d’Angers’s sculpture of the young Revolutionary
hero Joseph Bara lying dead (1838, plaster model, Galerie David
d’Angers, Angers) was well known, and Jacques-Louis David’s painting
of the same subject (1794, Musée Calvet, Avignon) was famous.
Any one of those works may have inspired Falguière, who himself
acknowledged the influence of a contemporary sculpture, Carpeaux’s

fig. 65 Photograph of the model for Saint Tarcisius. ca. 1868. Musée Rodin, Paris
Ugolino and His Sons. The young son to the left in Carpeaux's composition, a figure that the artist added to heighten the pathos of the scene late in the design process, was certainly a model for Saint Tarcisius.

Early Christian subjects gained popularity in the mid-nineteenth century. In Falguière's case, a widely read contemporary novel inspired him: Cardinal Wiesman's Fabiola, or the Church of the Catacombs, which was published in Rome in 1854, a few years before Falguière arrived there. In the book, Wiesman gives an account of a Roman boy named Tarcisius, an acolyte in the early Christian church, who was attacked by jeering pagans on the Appian Way as he carried the eucharistic bread from the catacombs to condemned prisoners in the city. As the inscription on this marble makes clear, the youth chose to die rather than surrender the host to unbelievers. A scattering of stones by his right side and the wert on his forehead are evidence of his martyrdom. With hands crossed over the host, closed eyes, and a yearning expression, Saint Tarcisius struck a chord with the public. In the first version, the inscription is contained in a tabletlike rectangle on the side of a pyramidal base. In the second version, the sculpture now in the Museum, which Falguière kept for himself (or failed to sell), the letters of the inscription are scratched rudely into the blue-tinged marble, carved to simulate the rough paving stones of the Appian Way. This and other variations—the arrangement of the stones, the lowered hips, the absence of decoration on the host—signal that this is not merely a copy but a revision. Pointing marks on the marble show how and where these changes were made.

1. The inscription on the top of the base translates as: "While Saint Tarcisius was carrying the Blessed Sacrament of Christ, a band of thugs demanded that he relinquish it into their profane hands. However, thrown to the ground, he preferred to give up his own life rather than relinquish the celestial body to enraged dogs."

2. Janson 1985, p. 253, notes that it was Saint Tarcisius that made Falguière's reputation and compares its reception to that of Ugolino and His Sons.

3. Report in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, Metropolitan Museum.
86, 87. Jupiter and the Sphinx / Venus and the Sphinx

AUGUSTE PRÉAULT (FRENCH, 1809–1879)

Paris, 1868

Pair of sculptural groups in tinted plaster

*Jupiter and Sphinx*: 46⅞ × 44¼ × 23¼ in. (119.1 × 112.1 × 60.3 cm)

*Venus and Sphinx*: 42⅞ × 45 × 23¼ in. (108 × 114.3 × 60.3 cm)


1981.319.1 (Venus), 2 (Jupiter)

PROVENANCE: [Heim Gallery, London, until 1981; sold to MMA]


AUGUSTE PRÉAULT WAS THE QUINTESSENTIAL FRENCH romantic sculptor. Like Pierre-Jean David d’Angers (with whom he studied briefly) or Antoine-Louis Barye, he rejected the conventions of Neoclassicism. His lack of formal training explains the strident, often deliberately awkward forms of his sculpture at the beginning of his career and why it was consistently rejected by the directors of the Paris Salons. Only after the Revolution of 1848 did he begin to receive official commissions.

Even though by 1868 the state had already purchased a number of sculptures by Préault, it is still remarkable that the Museum’s provocative plasters were accepted as the basis for stone carvings to ornament the garden of an imperial residence at the Palais de Fontainebleau. Describing them in 1879, Camille Pelletan suggests how they must have appeared to the artist’s contemporaries: “[Préalult never modeled] a masterpiece stranger and more personal than the pair of sphinxes. . . . One recognizes in them: the profound, chimerical, and powerful character of the Old German masters’ bizarrely symbolical creations.”¹

Correspondence in 1866 between Préalult and the comte de Nieuwerkerke, France’s superintendent of fine arts, indicates that the sculptor responded to a request for an idea for a sculpture with a sketch of a “decorative sphinx for the entrance of a Garden or a Palace.”² On January 31, 1867, the commission was granted and Fontainebleau was specified as the site for which it was destined. Bronze casts of ancient sphinxes stood in front of a wing of the palace when the Mannerist artist Francesco Primaticcio was in charge of the decorations in the 1550s, and the precedent may have piqued Préalult’s fancy.³ French Mannerist art may have guided his approach, but a drawing he made earlier, in Rome, shows that it was Michelangelo’s Creation of Adam on the Sistine Ceiling that directly inspired the pose of Venus here.⁴ (In the same decade, the young Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux also turned to Michelangelo for a pose—that of Ugolino—but found it not in a painting but in a sculpture; see the entry for no. 84.) Clare Vincent has proposed that Jupiter’s features are borrowed from an ancient statue of Mausolus carved for that ruler’s tomb at Halicarnassus and that the horns of the sphinx on which Jupiter is seated are those of the Hellenistic god Zeus-Ammon.⁵ In placing the figures of deities on the backs of fabled creatures, Préalult was following antique and Renaissance precedents—like other late nineteenth-century artists—but his manner of doing so broke all rules. The figures’ poses are tense and awkward, and their musculature is exaggerated. The spirit of the grotesque in these two groups resonates in gargoyelike statues modeled by Emmanuel Frémiet in the mid-1870s, carved in stone, and
placed outside Napoléon III’s remodeled medieval château, Pierrefonds.6

Alphonse Royer asked Préault to make changes in the pose and musculature of the figures when he inspected them before accounts were settled, and it appears that Préault did accommodate his criticisms before these plaster models were made, in 1868.7

The Franco-Prussian War intervened, and the stone versions were not carved until 1870 and then installed only in 1872. No longer assigned to the courtyard of Fontainebleau, they were first placed above the garden cascades and after 1967 exiled to the end of the canals.

1. Pelletan 1879, p. 97.
3. S. Prommel 2005, see also Occigiani 2010.
6. The Museum owns a glazed stoneware version of one of Frémiet’s plaster models, made about 1883, by Émile Muller (acc. no. 2003.280); see Jeffrey Munger in “Recent Acquisitions” 2004, p. 30.
7. See Margerie in Préault: Sculpteur romantique 1997, p. 221, who transcribes the relevant passage from the Archives Nationales, Paris, F° 2770.
88. Girl in a Straw Bonnet

ALBERT-ERNEST CARRIER-BELLEUSE (FRENCH, 1824–1887)

Paris, ca. 1868–70
Terracotta bust
36¼ (with socle) × 22¼ × 15½ in. (91.8 × 56.2 × 39.4 cm)
Signed (on left side of base): A. Carrier.Belleuse

PROVENANCE: [Shepherd Gallery, New York, until 1987; sold to MMA]


The prolific Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse found great success in France and in England, where he lived from 1850 to 1855. He marketed his work astutely, organizing special auctions, producing editions in bronze and terracotta, and designing decorative sculptural pieces that circulated widely in copies. Reacting against the static imagery that clung to portraiture, which was still under the sway of late Neoclassicism, he breathed new life into the genre in the 1850s by following the example of such realistic sculptors as Pierre-Jean David d’Angers. As June Ellen Hargrove has observed, his portraits of women are few, and for them he often worked in a neo-Rococo mode, participating in the eighteenth-century revival that began and flourished in the mid-nineteenth century. One critic described his busts as made “with a skill and spirit seldom seen in sculpture since the end of the eighteenth century.” The Goncourt brothers, devotees of the art of the eighteenth century, found this return to the artistic values of an earlier century mawkish; they described him as a “shoddy merchandiser of the nineteenth century, this copier of Clodion. Still others deplored what they saw in his work as excessive realism.

In its appealing freshness, Girl in a Straw Bonnet exemplifies the best in Carrier-Belleuse’s art. With her right arm, the subject clutches her robes up to her breast while the lace ties of her bonnet, dripping with field flowers, flutter across her chest. The straw hat itself is a tour de force, suggesting the pliable nature of its material beneath a pile of even more petals. The broad brim frames her face; her expression is a knowing smile beneath a fringe of attractively unkempt hair. The sculptor used the devices of past masters, such as Jean-Antoine Houdon, to create lifelike effects: the swirled lines gouged in the pupils to give a glint to the eyes and the virtuosic jabbing of the clay to form the dentelles of the lace. The girl’s soft cheeks and shoulders show that the artist could rival the eighteenth-century master of modeling, Clodion, in his ability to smooth the clay to approximate the texture of flesh. Neither Houdon nor Clodion, however, would have piled on as many effects as the nineteenth-century sculptor does here. He exaggerates the accessories of the dress to make a theatrical effect, layering flowers over lace over cloth to create lively lines and shadows.

Carrier-Belleuse gets away with this excess because of his sure touch as an artist and the sense of immediacy he is able to achieve. He appears to have responded instinctively to his subject, and the reported speed of his working methods matched the rapidity of his eye. Describing a series of modeling sessions when the artist was making a bust of Emperor Napoléon III at the Tuileries Palace in July 1864, the royal librarian Alfred Maury wrote: “This Carrier works
with incredible quickness. We watch him manipulate the clay with extraordinary ease.” Carrier-Belleuse often cast his terracottas from molds, sometimes freshening details or adding new ones afterward. This bust — unique rather than part of an edition — appears to combine some casting with virtuoso modeling of flowers that could never have emerged intact from a mold. More important, it captures a fleeting moment in the spirit of a lively woman.

The identity of the girl is unknown. The women Carrier-Belleuse portrayed were generally, as Hargrove notes, actresses or singers, wives or daughters of friends, and high-society ladies, whose identities were discreetly concealed. This portrait bears some resemblance to Carrier-Belleuse’s bust of the actress Marguerite Bellanger, mistress of Napoléon III, who was something of a muse to the artist (ca. 1864, private collection, London). Her heavy eyelids, sensuous mouth, and dreamy expression recall those features of this terracotta bust. Another bust of Bellanger, described in a sale catalogue as “a study of a woman in meadow flowers” (sold in 1868, now lost), may have inspired the present one. Carrier-Belleuse signed his work before 1868 “A. Carrier” and afterward, almost without exception, “A. Carrier-Belleuse.” Since the Museum’s bust bears his full name, it was likely made toward the end of the decade 1860–70. The sculptor also produced a good number of “fantasy busts” in editions, sometimes of historical personages, often simply of pretty women garbed in period accessories. Girl in a Straw Bonnet has some of the inventiveness of those works, but the subject is clearly a specific individual, animated and witty, breezing through a spring day.

1. Hargrove 1977, p. 120.
4. “Ce Carrier travaille avec une incroyable prêtesse et nous le regardons monter sa terre avec une aisance extraordinaire”; Maillet 1921, p. 794 (letter to his wife of July 31, 1864).
Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux (French, 1827–1875)

Paris, 1873

Marble bust

20 1/2 × 14 1/2 × 11 1/4 in. (52.1 × 36.8 × 28.9 cm)

Signed and dated (on left side): Chislehurst (sic) 13 Janvier 1873 / B. Carpeaux.

Inscribed (on front at bottom): NAPOLEON III.

Purchase, Anne and George Blumenthal Fund, Munsey and Fletcher Funds, funds from various donors, Agnes Shewan Rizzo Bequest and Mrs. Peter Oliver Gift, 1974. 1974.297

Provenance: Empress Eugénie, Chislehurst, London, then Farnborough Hill, Hampshire, England (1873–6; 1920; her sale, Hampton and Sons, Farnborough Hill, July 18–27, 1927, to Fabius); Raymond Fabius, Neully-sur-Seine (1927–36); Fabius Frères, Paris, until 1974; sold to MMA.


The most successful sculptor of his epoch in France, Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux assiduously cultivated the imperial family for the honor of portraying its members. As early as 1852–53, he speculatively carved a marble relief of the emperor receiving Abd-al Kader at the Palais de Saint-Cloud and in 1853–55 began a plaster group on the theme of the empress protecting orphans and the arts (Musée des Beaux-Arts de Valenciennes). Despite these initiatives to attract commissions from Napoléon III and Empress Eugénie, it was not until he was asked to do a marble statue of their son, Prince Imperial Louis-Napoléon, and the dog Nero (1867, Musée d’Orsay, Paris) that he became a favorite at court. Subsequently, busts of the emperor’s cousin Princess Matilda Bonaparte and the empress were requested and then issued from Carpeaux’s studio. A number of the artist’s sketches of the family in informal settings and at formal receptions reveal that he had relatively easy access to the court and was familiar with Bonaparte features. Carpeaux did not carve a bust of the emperor, however, until the end of Napoléon III’s life. Finished posthumously, it is one of the most moving and brilliantly executed portraits by the preeminent Second Empire sculptor.

The dramatic circumstances of his commission contribute to its emotional power. In 1871, after Napoléon III sought refuge in England following the events of the Paris Commune, Carpeaux was summoned by Louis-Napoléon to portray the emperor at his retreat at his place of exile in Chislehurst. Back in Paris, having barely begun the project, the sculptor was hastily recalled to England to complete the bust. As the event, he arrived after Napoléon’s death and could only make sketches of the emperor laid out on his funeral bier on January 13, 1873, the date inscribed on the bust. Carpeaux executed a remarkably candid image, devoid of the usual costume and accessories. As Alison McQueen perceptively commented, he was able to deviate from the traditional representation of authority in his characterization of the emperor only because death freed the sculptor from normal constraints; however, the nude chest clipped into a herm shape recalls classical portrait busts, while the boldly incised name at the front marks this as an imperial image. By their styling, the pointy mustache and prominent goatee identify the period to which the bust belongs. Contrasted with such decisive motifs, the troubled, averted eyes plainly reflect the former emperor’s loss of power after his dethronement. The sagging flesh around the eye sockets and the raised eyebrows, slightly knit together, express hurt and anxiety. In the side view, the locks of hair sweep forward to call attention to the eyes. The marble surface is carved with extraordinary delicacy and precision, rendering a vivid, palpably truthful portrait.
This personal memento of Napoléon III was kept in the private residences of the empress, first at Chislehurst, later at Farnborough, where it presided over the central hallway. Only one other marble example was authorized; it was made from the plaster model for Prince Pavel Demidow, who was closely connected to the family through Princesse Mathilde, divorced wife of Prince Anatole Demidow.\(^5\) Comparing the Museum’s bust to the copy, which lacks its vitality, reinforces the impression that Carpeaux labored personally over the first bust rather than accepting the help of a praticien, a professional marble carver, the typical practice of the busy artist. The Louvre acquired the original plaster for the Museum’s bust in 1895.\(^6\) Several smaller terracottas and plasters were produced by Carpeaux’s atelier for Bonapartists.\(^7\) Carpeaux tended to make full use of commercial reproductions of his most famous compositions; the limited edition of this work reflects its personal nature as well as the loss of patronage in the period following the emperor’s deposition. A Carpeaux drawing made in Westminster Abbey at this time bears an inscription “Study for the monument of Napoléon III.”\(^8\) Yet, if the sculptor dreamed of executing a memorial to the emperor, this never happened. Instead, Napoléon III was interred in a simple sarcophagus of Scottish granite in the parish church of Saint Mary’s in Chislehurst.

---

3. Ibid., nos. 189–99.
4. McQueen 2003, p. 43.
5. See Second Empire 1978, p. 218. The present location of the marble that was made for Paul Demidov is unknown.
7. See, for example, the terracotta bust in the Musée des Beaux-Arts Jules Chéret, Nice (Carpeaux 1986, n.p., no. 79), and the plaster in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptoteke, Copenhagen (I.N. 1562) (Munk 1993, p. 147).
8. McQueen 2005, p. 40, reviews what is known about this tomb project.
90. The Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer

EDGAR DEGAS (FRENCH 1834–1917)
Paris; model executed ca. 1880, cast 1922
Bronze statuette, partially tinted, with cotton skirt and
satin hair ribbon; wood base
38¼ x 17¼ x 14½ in. (97.8 x 43.8 x 36.5 cm)
Marked: (in bronze rectangle let into base) CIRE/PERDU/
AA HEBRARD [lost/wax/AA Hebrard]; (in bronze seal on left thigh)
CIRE/PERDU/AA HEBRARD; (on left thigh to right of seal) (A)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.370

PROVENANCE: The bronze founder A. A. Hébrard, Paris
(in 1922; sold to Havemeyer); Mrs. H. O. (Louiseine W.)
Havemeyer, New York (1922-d. 1929; her bequest to MMA)

EXHIBITED: “The H. O. Havemeyer Collection,” The
Metropolitan Museum of Art, March 10–November 2, 1930;
“Splendid Legacy: The Havemeyer Collection,” The
Metropolitan Museum of Art, March 27–June 20, 1953

LITERATURE: Havemeyer Collection 1930, p. 39, under
nos. 350–458; Havemeyer Collection 1931, p. 223, ill. p. 222;
Rewald 1936, pp. 16–20, 144–45, no. XX; Reff 1970,
pp. 277–78, 288–89, fig. 1; Reff 1971, pp. 155–58, n. 45,
fig. 26; Vincent 1993b, pl. 78; Czestochowski and Pinoges
2002, pp. 264, 265, no. 73, cast A; Vincent 2004, ill.
“Degas: The Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer” 2006, ill.
Other notable publications on this statue include Pinoges
1991, pp. 188–90, no. 73 (bronze version in the Musée
do’Orsay, Paris; with bibliography); Degas and the Little
Dancer 1998; Lindsay, Barbour, and Sturman 2010, pp. 116–37,
no. 15 (entry by Suzanne Glover Lindsay on wax model in
the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; with bibliography).

EDGAR DEGAS’S FAMOUS STATUE OF A BALLERINA CAME TO THE
Museum as part of the bequest of Louiseine Havemeyer. Together with
numerous paintings and sketches by the artist, Mrs. Havemeyer
donated seventy-one of his bronzes, the first nearly complete set of
the artist’s works in bronze to enter any museum.¹

The wealthy and adventurous collector’s interest in Little Fourteen-
Year-Old Dancer dates to her first glimpse of the wax model for it on view in 1881 at the Paris Salon. Self-taught in sculpture, Degas made
numerous wax models on wire armatures. The subjects — dancers,
women bathing, and horses — also feature in his paintings, but the
sculptural studies are not preparatory for specific oil canvases as
much as they are independent explorations of three-dimensional
form. He showed the waxes to friends and ordered plaster casts of
three of them during his lifetime, so their creation was not an entirely
private activity.² Yet the only one he ever exhibited in public was the
wax version of Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer (National Gallery of Art,
Washington, D.C.).³ Degas decided to make the sculpture of tinted
wax with real cloth, tulle, and ribbon, and the result reminded many
viewers of the displays in Madame Tussaud’s wax museum in London.
The glass vitrine in which it was shown at the Salon also called to
mind the wax mannequins in a costume show at the Paris Exposition
Universelle of 1879.⁴

Mrs. Havemeyer’s reaction to Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer in
1881 not only reveals her own enthusiasm but conveys the impression
the sculpture made on the public at large: “Paris could scarcely main-
tain its equilibrium . . . [Degas] became the hero of the hour. His
name was on all lips, his statue discussed by all the art world.”⁵
Long afterward, she continued to be smitten by the wax model and
attempted to buy it in 1903. After the artist’s death, in 1917, his heirs
engaged the Hébrard foundry to cast bronzes of seventy-two of the
waxes that survived in Degas’s studio (Little Dancer, the seventy-third,
was cast separately). They were produced in editions of twenty (plus
one for the heirs and one for the foundry). When the Musée du
Louvre failed in its effort to acquire the first bronze set of Degas’s
sculpture — the set marked “A” — Mrs. Havemeyer, advised by her
influential friend the American painter Mary Cassatt, succeeded in
buying it, during its premier exhibition at the Galerie A. A. Hébrard
in Paris in May 1921.

The largest of the wax models, the Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer
was also cast in multiples. Hébrard’s chief bronze founder, Albino
Palazzolo, used the wax sculpture to create two plaster models (now
in the Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, Nebraska, and National Gallery of
Art, Washington, D.C.), and they served as the basis for twenty-nine
known bronzes, most of which were produced between 1922 and 1937.\textsuperscript{6} Cast in 1922 (and marked “A” because it is part of the first set), the Museum’s bronze has a tinted bodice, a tutu made of cotton, and a hair ribbon of satin (both original fabrics have been replaced), to replicate the appearance of the original wax model.

Much has been written about the genesis of Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer and its importance in the history of modern sculpture. Mrs. Havemeyer’s recollection of the sculpture in her autobiography is useful for assessing its position in the history of art. “To some it was a revelation, to others an enigma. The graceful figure was as classic as an Egyptian statue and as modern as Degas! . . . All Paris said: . . . Who has achieved this wonderful creation? Whoever he is, he is modern to his finger tips and as ancient as the pyramids!”\textsuperscript{7} Some of the statue’s power comes from the rigid frontality of the pose, a reference to ancient Egyptian statuary that was recognized by the artist’s contemporaries. At the same time, its realism shocked viewers.

Degas’s model was the young Marie van Goethem (born June 7, 1865), a student at the École de Danse and by 1880 a professional dancer at the Paris Opéra. Degas’s sketches of Marie (see fig. 66) indicate his intense concentration on her form. The artist frequented the Opéra, making endless studies of dancers in motion and at rest. In the bronze, his model has adopted a classic ballet stance, with her right leg advanced and turned. Yet there is a deliberate awkwardness to the pose — in the uncompromising way that the arms just down behind and the head tilts back; moreover, the features of this precocious adolescent are far from pretty. Unorthodox yet riveting, Degas’s Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer became an instant icon in the history of sculpture.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] For the history of the bronze sculptures, including this Museum’s, and their distribution, see Czestochowski and Pinget 2002. Of seventy-three bronzes by Hébrard, all save numbers 19 and 41 entered our collection. One other bronze, The Little Schoolgirl, had a separate casting history; see Czestochowski and Pinget 2002, p. 269, no. 74. For the Havemeyer bequest, see Vincent 1993b.
\item[2.] Millard 1976.
\item[3.] See Suzanne Glover Lindsay in Lindsay, Barbour, and Sturman 2010, pp. 116–17, no. 15.
\item[4.] Claretie 1881, p. 3; cited by Richard Kendall in Degas and the Little Dancer 1998, p. 70.
\item[5.] Havemeyer 1961, p. 233.
\item[6.] Czestochowski and Pinget 2002, pp. 264–67, no. 73.
\item[7.] Havemeyer 1961, p. 234.
\end{itemize}
91. Adam, or The Creation of Man

AUGUSTE RODIN (FRENCH, 1840–1917)
Paris; modeled 1880 or 1881, cast 1910
Bronze statue
76 ¼ x 30 ¾ x 32 ½ in. (194 x 77.2 x 82.6 cm)
Signed (on base): Rodin
Gift of Thomas F. Ryan, 1910 11.173.1

PROVENANCE: Commissioned by the Museum from the artist


AUGUSTE RODIN’S FIRST COMMISSION FROM THE FRENCH government, The Gates of Hell, was intended to be the portal for a new building to house the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris, but that edifice was never constructed. Nonetheless, Rodin worked on the project for two decades, exhibiting a plaster version of The Gates in public for the first time in 1900. Even though the colossal doorway was never cast in bronze in his lifetime, the numerous figures he invented for it inspired many of his finished sculptures, and some became independent works of art in their own right.1 In a letter of October 20, 1881, to the commissioners at the Ministère de l’Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts, the sculptor referred to “two colossal figures that will stand at either side of the gate.”2 Albert Elsen identified them as Adam and Eve, the original sinners, as seen in an early sketch by the artist.3 The sculptor had exhibited a plaster of Adam at the Paris Salon of 1881, so he may have invented the figure before he thought of associating it with the government’s architectural project. Rodin later produced versions of Adam and Eve as independent compositions. Nonetheless, Adam can be considered as a flanking element and as pendant to Eve (fig. 67). Both figures tuck their heads into their shoulders; in Eve’s case, her remorse is evident, as she hides behind her arms. In contrast to her more fluid form, Adam’s body is defined by taut musculature: two deliberately awkward arms reach down in parallel movements, and his bent knee tightens the leg tendons. Both bodies also twist—overly in Adam’s case, with more subtlety in Eve’s—as if toward each other across the doors they were intended to flank.

Adam is one of a series of powerful male nudes that established Rodin as a major sculptor in the 1870s and early 1880s. They include The Age of Bronze (Metropolitan Museum of Art)4 and Saint John the Baptist Preaching (Museum of Modern Art, New York). Of these, Adam offers the clearest homage to Michelangelo, whose marbles, such as the Dying Slave and Rebellious Slave (Accademia, Florence, and Musée du Louvre, Paris), and fresco The Creation of Adam on the Sistine Ceiling in the Vatican, Rodin had passionately admired and studied in Italy before he returned home in 1876.5 Adam’s extended right forefinger alludes to the awakening gesture in Michelangelo’s painted Creation scene.

This particular sculpture helped to establish Rodin’s reputation in America. The New York investor Thomas Fortune Ryan, who collected works by Rodin as well as Italian Renaissance art, gave several of the French artist’s marbles to the Museum (see no. 92); he also contributed funds to purchase other works by the man generally recognized as the greatest living sculptor. In 1910 one of the foremost

American sculptors, Daniel Chester French, who was chairman of the Museum’s Sculpture Committee, visited Rodin’s studio in Meudon with Vice Director Edward Robinson; at that time they commissioned the present work, which is evidently the first bronze cast from a plaster model that Rodin had created several decades before. Two years later, the Museum dedicated a gallery to Rodin’s work, a tribute it has rarely accorded to a living artist; this was an especially noteworthy event since the display preceded the establishment of the Musée Rodin in Paris by four years and the founding of the Museum of Modern Art in New York by seventeen years.

In the new gallery, the bronze Adam and Eve were joined by some forty other sculptures and drawings, many of them gifts from the artist himself. Based on this core collection, the Museum has assembled a comprehensive representation of Rodin’s work in all media executed throughout his career.

1. See Elsen 1960, among many other treatments of the subject.
3. The sketch is in the Musée Rodin, Paris (ibid., pl. 42).
4. Acc. no. 07.127.
6. Rodin’s list of works to be supplied to the Metropolitan Museum includes the entry “Adam; Jamais de bronze ou de marbre, à faire, 20,000” (Adam. Never in bronze or marble, to make, 20,000); list dated July 22, 1910. Thomas F. Ryan Correspondence, Office of the Secretary Records, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives. The original plaster is now in the Musée Rodin, Paris (Grappe 1927, p. 37, no. 28); another plaster is in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen (Rostrup 1964, p. 138, no. 734). Other bronze casts are in the Musée Rodin, Paris (Grappe 1927, p. 37, no. 27); in the Rodin Museum, Philadelphia (see note 5 above), and in the Öffentlichen Kunstsammlung Basel (Gantner 1993, p. 26, fig. 11).
92. Orpheus and Eurydice

AUGUSTE RODIN (FRENCH, 1840—1917)
Paris; probably modeled before 1887, carved 1893
Marble group
48% × 31% × 25¼ in. (123.8 × 79.1 × 64.5 cm)
Signed and dated (on left edge of background rock):
A. Rodin/1893
Gift of Thomas F. Ryan, 1910 10.63.2

PROVENANCE: Charles T. Yerkes (until 1910; his sale, American Art Association, New York, April 11–13, 1910, no. 251, to Ryan); Thomas F. Ryan, New York (1910; his gift to MMA)


IN 1894, AUGUSTE RODIN EXPLAINED THAT ORPHEUS AND EURYDICE and Cupid and Psyche were his first original works to reach the United States.1 Both marble sculptures have erotically charged subjects; here, the smooth naked bodies of a man and woman, agitated by passion or distress, emerge from a cleft in rough rock. Doomed or fraught relationships between men and women were frequent subjects for Rodin and favorites with clients, who were responding to a widespread mood of fin de siècle fatalism. Many of these compositions of intertwined but frustrated figures originated in the depictions of tragic couples from Dante’s Divine Comedy, such as Paolo and Francesca, that Rodin devised in the 1880s for his monumental doorway called The Gates of Hell (see entry for no. 91). When he turned the earlier models into independent statues, Rodin often reworked or varied them; thus, Francesca’s pose with arms outstretched horizontally, reaching for her unattainable lover Paolo, becomes in Orpheus and Eurydice a vertical arrangement of figures, one behind the other, touching but not engaging.2

Orpheus’s story enjoyed renewed popularity at the end of the nineteenth century.3 In the version of the myth given in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, the bard Orpheus followed his dead wife into Hades, where he charmed the god of the underworld into permitting him to lead her back to the land of the living. Orpheus failed to keep the sole condition of this bargain—that he not look back at Eurydice during the journey—and lost her forever.4 In Rodin’s statue, the couple’s sleek, beautiful bodies parallel one another. Eurydice reaches forward to embrace her husband, who clutches his head in anguish, torn between wanting to save her and needing to be sure that she is still following. Rodin brilliantly exploited the unfinished passage of marble—a device adopted from Michelangelo, who famously left many of his sculptures incomplete—to suggest the craggy cavern from which they emerge. The sculptor specified that the group be backlit, leaving the rocky background in shadows; he intended that Orpheus emerge into brightness while Eurydice hovers in the “penumbra.”5 The lovers’ vulnerability is underscored by the thinness of their naked limbs, which are emphasized by the diagonally chiseled lines and pockmarks of the unfinished stone. Their skin is highly polished, but the hair is not, suggesting the nebulous mental states of the couple as they move through a limbo between reunion and eternal separation, elation and grief.

The model for this sculpture dates before 1887, during a period when Rodin was actively working on figures for The Gates of Hell. In that year, for publisher Paul Gallimard, he made a drawing of it to illustrate the poem “Bénéédiction” from Charles Baudelaire’s
Les Fleurs du Mal. Rodin hired many assistants to help him with marble carving; but Orpheus and Eurydice's intensely personal and lyrical quality suggests that the master closely supervised, if not actually carved, this moving work of art.

1. Rodin's letter of July 23, 1894, is quoted in the catalogue of the Charles J. Yerkes sale (see Provenance above). Yerkes, a Chicago business tycoon, had recently purchased them for his house on Michigan Avenue. In 1910 Thomas F. Ryan presented both Cupid and Psyche (acc. no. 10632) and Orpheus and Eurydice to the Museum, having acquired them at Yerkes' sale in April.
2. The marble version of Paolo and Francesca was carved in 1904 (Musée Rodin, Paris). Tancock 1976, p. 188, notes that Rodin repurposed the prone figure of the Martyr on The Gates of Hell for the standing figure of Orpheus.
6. The edition of Baudelaire's Les Fleurs du Mal prepared by Gallimard was printed many years later, in 1940 in Paris, for the Limited Editions Club of New York (Baudelaire 1887/1940, ill. p. 6).
**Glossary**

**Cross-references are indicated by small capital letters.**

allentico. An Italian phrase meaning after the antique or in ancient style, used to describe entire works of art or details that are based on or influenced or inspired by ancient Greek or Roman art or literature.

armature. A skeleton of wood or metal made to support a sculpture fabricated in a soft material, such as wet clay or plaster.

atlantid. The statue of a male figure used as a vertical support, usually for architecture. Its female counterpart is called a Caryatid.

banderole. A long, narrow flag, sometimes bearing an inscription.

base. A general term for the lowest element of a sculpture, serving as a support for the whole. Also, the lowest element of a pedestal. A base that is integral to a sculpture is called a slab-base.

bozzetto. An Italian word for a small three-dimensional sketch of a sculpture, usually in terracotta but sometimes in wax or wood. See also atlantid.

cast. To create a sculpture or part of a sculpture (both of which are called casts) by pouring liquid metal or pressurizing a malleable material into a mold and allowing it to harden. By this method, called casting, one or more copies of a sculpture may be produced. Also, to take an impression from an object using a malleable substance.

chasing. A method of decorating metal objects with designs hammered in from the front.

core. The solid inner part of a mold for casting a hollow piece of metal sculpture using the lost-wax technique. The amount of space left between the core and the exterior wall of the mold determines the thickness of the cast metal. Cores are made of an inert, heatproof material such as foundry sand. Pins or rod called core pins, usually made of iron, are inserted to hold the core in correct alignment with the exterior wall of the mold.

depth mask. An impression taken of a person’s face or head after death. An impression made of the face or head of a living person is called a life mask. See also cast.

edition. Copies—of identical size, form, and composition—of an original model, made at the same time from the same set of molds.

fettling. The process of trimming or cleaning away unwanted tools marks or rough edges from the surface of a sculpture cast in terracotta, plaster, wax, or metal.

figure serpentinata. An Italian term for a figure whose pose is twisted to create a serpentine or spiral curve.

firing. Heating clay sculptures in an oven, called a kiln to harden them and fire any applied coating, such as a glaze, to the clay.

foundry. The establishment where metal is cast.

gilding. Generally, the application of a thin layer of gold to the surface of an object by painting, burnishing, or inlay. Fire gilding is a chemical process used to coat a metal object with gold. A paste composed of gold dissolved in mercury is brushed on the object and then adhered by heating over an open fire.

glaze. A silica-based preparation applied to the surface of an artwork. When fired in a kiln, it forms a decorative and protective glossy coating.

herm. See term.

inscription. Any text on a surface. Inscriptions on sculpture commonly give the artist’s name or initials and birthplace, the title or subject of the work, and its date of execution. Inscriptions are frequently written in Latin and often include the words fecit (he/she made it), sculptor (he/she carved it), and opus (work or artwork).

in situ. A Latin phrase meaning in place, used of works of art that are in their original location.

life mask. See death mask.

lost-wax casting. Also called cire perdue casting. A method of making a piece of metal sculpture by replacing a wax model of it with molten bronze or other metal. The wax can be applied in a thin layer directly on a core fashioned in the desired shape (for example, a plaster cast of the sculpture) and then surrounded by a heat-resistant material, such as sand. Alternatively, the wax can be pressed or poured into the inside of a mold of the sculpture, which is then packed with sand. Meanwhile, core pins have been driven through the wax and core to keep them in the correct position, and a system of channels called sprues has been installed. At this point, the mold is heated. The wax melts and flows out through the sprues. Molten metal is then poured into the mold, taking the place and shape of the wax. When the metal has cooled and hardened, the mold and core are removed, leaving a replica of the wax model.

maquette. A small-scale model, usually in clay or wax, for a finished sculpture.

model. A preparatory or preliminary version of a sculpture. Beginning with a chunk of raw clay, wax, or plaster, an artist builds or models the figure by adding pinches of material. Also, an original version from which copies are made.

modello. A small-scale finished sculpture in terracotta or other inexpensive material. It is larger and more finished than a bozzetto.

mold. A hollow, or negative, container used to cast, or give its form to, a substance placed within and allowed to harden.

morceau de réception. A French phrase meaning reception piece. A work made by an artist to demonstrate his skill in his chosen field to the members of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture in Paris. Membership and rank in the academy depended on how favorably the work was received.

patina. A natural or applied surface finish. Natural patina occurs by oxidation after a sculpture has undergone a certain amount of weathering. Artificial patinas are achieved with chemical pastes brushed on the surface of the work and sometimes heated to make adhesion more durable.

pedestal. A support of large dimensions, often designed in three parts, with a cornice at the top, a dado in the middle, and a base at the bottom.

pendant. Any artwork intended for display as one of a pair.

plug. A usually cylindrical piece of metal used to fill a hole left when a core pin was removed from a metal sculpture (see core). Plugs are also used to repair small flaws that occurred when a work was cast.

painting. A system for making an exact copy of a finished sculpture by transferring measurements from the sculpture to corresponding points on a block of raw stone. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, more sophisticated methods were developed to enable sculptors to create reduced and enlarged versions of their work.

punching. A method of making decorative designs or patterns on surfaces such as metal, wood, or gilded gesso, and of sharpening details on cast bronzes. Also, a technique for making relief (or repoussé) decorations on metal.

reduction. Reproduction of a sculpture on a smaller scale than the original. The reverse process is called enlargement.

relief. Any carved, modeled, or molded work that projects from its continuous flat background. Reliefs are classified by their degree of projection. In a low relief, the figure project only slightly (as to medals and coins). In high relief, the figures project at least halfway out from the background. Between these two types is the half-relief. The lowest degree of relief, in which the projection barely exceeds the thickness of a sheet of paper, is called shallow relief.

retable. A structure behind an altar enclosing painted panels or carved works. It is called retablo in Spanish.

Salon. The annual exhibition of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. It was held, beginning in the seventeenth century, in the Palais du Louvre, Paris. After the Revolution, the Salon were sponsored by the Académie des Beaux Arts.

socle. A small support for a sculpture, usually decorated with moldings.

statuette. A sculpture in the round that is smaller than half lifesize.

strut. A long and narrow piece of stone that connects fragile parts of stone sculpture to prevent breakage.

stuccato. An Italian word for the artisan or artist who specializes in stucco work.

term. A sculpted figure or bust that terminates in a rectangular pillarlike base. Also called a herm.

titre d'expression. A French phrase used to describe a painting or sculpture of a human head that expresses a strong emotion. Students at the French academy were required to make each works as part of their training.

truncation. The termination of a bust at the bottom edge.
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