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There recently went on display in the Harry Payne Bingham Galleries at The Metropolitan Museum of Art a large, unsigned double portrait of an eighteenth-century nobleman and his wife (Figure 1). The painting is attributed—correctly, as we shall see—to Martin van Meytens the Younger (1695–1770), but until recently the sitters had been identified only as A Huntsman and His Wife. The canvas makes an imposing impression, not least on account of the woman’s voluminous white satin skirt, her self-assured gaze, and her superior position with respect to the man (echoed by that of the spaniel over the dead game birds). Despite his hunting garb and accoutrements, the nobleman is shown as subservient in love, thanks to the presence of a small lapdog, whose finely braided leash is held by his wife—a touchingly prosaic laccio d’amore.

The original donors of the work to the Museum (in 1950), Mr. and Mrs. Nate B. Spingold of New York, had thought it to be a work by Nicolas Desportes (1718–1787). That was a reasonable surmise, as Desportes (a student of Hyacinthe Rigaud) had specialized in still lifes with hunting themes; he was, moreover, at the French Académie Royale in 1757 with a self-portrait in hunting costume with game and dogs. But the Museum’s curators were able to reattribute this painting to Meytens with some confidence, for the artist’s mature style is strongly distinctive—as he himself recognized. According to an anonymous 1755 biographical sketch, for which Meytens apparently furnished many details, “He only very rarely put his name on his paintings or portraits, when it was absolutely required of him.” This assertion is paraphrased in an extended obituary notice (in which the 1755 sketch is attributed to a certain Dünant or Dunant) that appeared in the Kunsthistorische Akademie zu Augsburg shortly after Meytens’s death in Vienna in 1770, with the additional remark, “Man wird ihn aber doch kennen”—in essence, “one will know him by his manner.” The sitters in the Metropolitan portrait remained unknown, however, for four and a half decades after its acquisition. But once the painting went on display, the situation could be rectified, and it was not long before the present author, on a visit to the Museum, recognized that the face of the male figure is the same as that in a 1765 engraved portrait of “Le C[ome] Jacques Durazzo / Ambassadeur Imperial / a [sic] Venise en MDCCLXV / Peint par Meytens / Commencé a Vienne par Schmutzer / Achevé a Venise par Wagner” (Figure 2). Despite the elimination of the female figure and the change of setting from a forest to a study, it seems clear that the Metropolitan’s portrait served as the model for the engraving (which, somewhat unusually, is not reversed in direction). The count’s face, body, and clothing (above the waist) are essentially the same; the left arm has been rotated upward, pointing to books and papers instead of a hunting dog, but the arrangement of the fingers is little changed. The curious description of the two engravers’ work, in different cities, reflects the count’s precipitate departure from Vienna, where during the previous decade (1754–64) he had headed the imperial theaters, and his subsequent appointment—thanks to the intervention of Chancellor Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz, according to one courtier’s account—as ambassador to the Venetian Republic. Judging from the Metropolitan’s portrait, it is easy to believe this same courtier when he says that Durazzo’s bride, Ernestine Aloisia, née Ungnad von Weissenwolf, was “of exceptional beauty . . . and even passes for the most beautiful woman here. . . .”

The identification of the couple in the Museum’s portrait lends the work additional interest on several counts. The 1765 engraving and its inscription confirm the attribution of the painting to Meytens and set a terminus ad quem for its execution. The new information also adds to our knowledge of Meytens’s Viennese clientele and suggests an interesting, multi-layered biographical program for the painting. The
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The notes for this article begin on page 171.
Figure 1. Martin van Meytens the Younger (Swedish, 1695-1770). *Count Giacomo Durazzo (1717-1794) in the Guise of a Huntsman with His Wife, Ernestine (1732-1794)*. Oil on canvas, 228.9 x 190.5 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Nate B. Spingold, 1950, 50.50
Vienna’s Museum’s Meytens portrait is the best surviving likeness of both Durazzos, each of whom—and the count most particularly—was a patron of the arts. As director of Vienna’s court theaters and sponsor of the composer Christoph Gluck, Giacomo Durazzo (1717–1794) helped initiate a major reform of both opera and ballet, one that drew equally on French and Italian traditions. Later, as his adoptive country’s ambassador to Venice, he helped recruit several of the singers for whom Mozart would write his operatic masterpieces Le nozze di Figaro and Così fan tutte. And it was his herculean collecting endeavors in the area of graphic arts, on behalf of Albert, duke of Sachsen-Teschen, that laid the foundation for the modern Albertina.

Durazzo’s relations with Kaunitz dated back to the very start of his residence in Vienna; in 1754 the French ambassador reported to his government that

Monsieur Durazzo is extremely attached to Count Kaunitz. He owes him all the favors he has obtained from the empress, which consist of a pension of four thousand livres, an apartment at court, and a position as state councillor. In a word, it is Count Kaunitz who arranged his marriage and who established him in this country. They pass their lives together and almost never part from one another.

Kaunitz, who as Austria’s ambassador to France in the early 1750s helped bring about a renversement des alliances, would have recognized in Durazzo an ardent francophile like himself and a man with major cultural aspirations. (The count, in collaboration with his fellow Genoese Agostino Lomellino, had already begun work on an Italian adaptation of Quinault and Lully’s celebrated opera Armide; the work was eventually performed, with music by Tommaso Traetta, in Vienna in 1761.) As one of Genoa’s richest and most prominent families, which included several dogs (among them Giacomo’s brother Marcello), the Durazzos had a long history of commercial and political dealings with France; an Ippolito Durazzo had even had his portrait painted by Rigaud. But as a younger son, Giacomo had limited possibilities within his homeland, and so sought a career elsewhere.

Like Durazzo, Martin van Meytens had come to Vienna as a visitor and stayed on in the service of the court. His first sojourn in the Hapsburg capital in 1721 resulted in a request from Emperor Charles VI that he settle there permanently. “But Mr. de Meytens, not believing himself sufficiently skilled, implored His Imperial Majesty . . . to allow him to go work for some years in Italy, in order to make himself more worthy of this honor . . . ,” reported the artist’s anonymous biographer of 1755. (The year of Meytens’s probable return, 1730, was also that of the arrival in Vienna of the newly appointed court poet Pietro Metastasio, whose model of Italian serious opera Count Durazzo would later help to dethrone.) Birgitta Lisholm, the author of the sole monograph on Meytens, calls attention to the artist’s ability to assimilate himself to his new homeland, but it was just as much his cosmopolitanism—he spoke and wrote comfortably in six languages, according to his obituary—and a usefulness to his sovereigns that gained him an unusual degree of independence, including, for instance, the privilege of retaining his Protestant religion. Meytens’s large state portraits of Empress Maria Theresia played a not insignificant role in securing the loyalty of her subjects during the embattled early years of her reign. And it was not just the court that bought such pictures; nobles, too, ordered portraits of the imperial family, as well as individual and group portraits of themselves. Meytens’s sociability, much mentioned in biographical sources, and his talents with regard to languages, music, and dance no doubt helped smooth the way.
with his noble patrons. Yet there is a note of tension with his clientele in a posthumous report of 1774 by Franz Christoph von Scheyb (paraphrasing a second, published biographical account from 1755), to the effect that “the brilliance, majesty, and splendor of the garments were mostly in accordance with the taste of the court and the high nobility, which did not always correspond to that of the artist.”  

Virtuosic depiction of brocade, lace, and various other fabrics and materials is indeed conspicuous in the Durazzo portrait, reflecting a taste for luxury that is amply documented in the count’s correspondence with his Parisian theatrical agent, the playwright Charles-Simon Favart.  

Durazzo’s dealings with Favart and with his wife, Marie-Justine (whom he had first encountered in the theatrical troupe of the Maréchal de Saxe in Flanders, in 1748), were decisive for his management of Vienna’s theaters: Favart kept Durazzo up-to-date on Parisian spectacles and on developments in literature and the arts in general; Madame Favart served as a paragon in Durazzo’s efforts to recruit actresses for Vienna’s French troupe.

Meytens’s group portraits in particular seem to have impressed his contemporaries, and it is as one of these that the Metropolitan’s picture is mentioned in early accounts of the painter’s work. But in order to evaluate references to this portrait, one must also sort out the biographical notices themselves, which stand in a complicated relationship one to another. A fundamental source for Meytens’s biography is an anonymous manuscript entitled “La Vie de Mr de Meytens à Vienne communiquée par lui-même. Fait [sic] à Vienne 1 juillet 1755.” Although this is sometimes referred to as an “autobiography,” Lisholm rightly observes that the word “communiquée” implies no more than that Meytens was the source of the information; as we have seen, this account had already been attributed to a writer named Dunant several decades before it was published in 1797 (see note 3). Another Swedish art historian, Axel Gauffin, had surmised in 1920 that the “Vie” was prepared in connection with Hagedorn’s Lettres à un amateur de peinture... Ouvrage entremêlé de digressions sur la vie de plusieurs peintres modernes, published in Dresden in 1755.  

But the 1755 “Vie” is quite dissimilar to the much briefer treatment in Hagedorn’s Lettres of 1755, where Meytens’s biography (pp. 264–268) is appended to that of the Hungarian portraitist Adám Mányoki, along with that of Meytens’s cousin Georg De Marées, who was a fellow student of Meytens the Elder. There is little in the wording or content of Hagedorn’s biographical sketch to make one think that it derives from Dunant’s 1755 “Vie”; even Meytens’s birth year is different in the two sources. The Durazzo portrait is not discussed in either account, though each does mention works of the same type. Hagedorn says of Meytens (p. 267) that “he is currently busy painting two large pictures, one of which represents the entire imperial family, and the other that of the Prince of Liechtenstein,” while in his “Vie de Mr de Meytens” Dunant lists (in addition to imperial family portraits) “a picture that contains the entire family of the Princes of Liechtenstein in 15 figures, each larger than lifesize,” “one of Count Palff, containing six figures,” and “another of the family of Count Kuffstein in five figures.”  

The silence on the Durazzo portrait does not exclude its having been completed by 1755, but a slightly later date would be more consistent with the chronology of Durazzo’s rising status at court and international renown.

A “Leben Herrn Martin von Meytens . . .,” which appeared in the 1768 volume of the Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freyen Künste, derives in large part from Dunant’s “Vie,” which apparently had circulated in manuscript. This new biography mentions several further group portraits, including “a family group for the widowed Princess von Lobkowitz, lifesize, in 5 figures,” and “a family group of Count Buratro, lifesize.”  

That the latter is a garbled reference to the Durazzo portrait is confirmed by a footnote in the 1770 obituary, which again is based in part on Dunant’s “Vie” of 1755:

Thus [“Durazzo”] this count is called, who is named “Buratro” in the Biblioth[ek] der S[chönen] W[iiss]-

schaffen] u[n]d der freyen K[ünste]. Someone may have given the writers a not too faithful copy of the original of Herr Dünant; one must therefore excuse them. The copyist may not have understood French... In any case our biography is by no means a translation of Herr Dünant’s original, which served us only as a sketch, if I may speak in artistic terms.  

But as the Durazzo painting is not mentioned in Dunant’s 1755 biography, the reference in the 1768 article must have been added independently of that source. The author of the obituary singles out our portrait (along with that of Princess Lobkowitz and family) for special praise, saying, “One will always pay a silent tribute to the great Swedish portrait painter, if one has the luck to see his family groups, of which one, of five persons, lifesize, was done for the dowager Princess Lobkowitz, and the other for Count Durazzo.”  

Nothing is said concerning the painting’s whereabouts at that date—whether it stayed behind in Vienna or traveled with Durazzo to Venice—but the
author does write as if the two masterpieces were still accessible.

There is scarcely a trace of the Durazzo double portrait in the time between these brief notices and the painting’s acquisition by the Metropolitan in 1950. It is not likely to have remained in Durazzo’s official Venetian residence, the Palazzo Loredan (called “dell’Ambasciatore”), because that building was occupied first by Durazzo’s successors and then in the nineteenth century by a series of new owners. (In an 1824 guidebook by Antonio Quadri, *Otto giorni a Venezia*, not a single artwork in the Palazzo Loredan is said to merit the visitor’s particular attention.) Nor is there any mention in the guidebooks consulted of Durazzo’s works remaining in Padua, the city of his death, in 1794. Durazzo’s entire estate was inherited by his nephew Gerolamo (1739–1809), who in turn bequeathed his possessions to his nephew Marcello (1777–1826). The count’s library and print collection (the latter valued at “100,000 pezzi [di Spagna]”) were still intact in 1818, when an anonymous writer drew up detailed inventories of the family’s residences, as well as those of other Genoese patricians. Among the Durazzos’ vast collections of paintings in the Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini a strada Balbi some family portraits are mentioned, but none of Giacomo and his wife; the holdings of the family’s smaller dwellings and villas are not itemized. It is possible that the Metropolitan’s portrait had already been sold after 1809, when the death of Gerolamo Durazzo extinguished that branch of the family; the sale of the Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini a strada Balbi to the house of Savoy in 1824 might equally well have occasioned the sale of this or similar heirlooms.

Giacomo Durazzo’s magnificent collection of prints was finally sold at auction in 1872–75 by Marcello’s son Giuseppe Maria (1805–1893), whose two sons Flavio Ignazio (1849–1925) and Marcello (1842–1922) later divided Giacomo’s library between themselves. The latter donated it to the Collegio Salesiano San Carlo di Borgo San Martino, which in 1927 sold the musical items to the National Library of Turin. If Marcello had indeed inherited the Meytens portrait, it might well have entered the antiquarian market about this time, being of little interest to institutions such as these. (By this period the attribution of the unsigned portrait, and perhaps even the identities of the sitters, might easily have been forgotten.) Flavio Ignazio’s portion of the inheritance passed to his son Giuseppe Maria, who lived until 1960; the remaining Durazzos have not welcomed the inquiries of scholars. The main collecting activity of the donors of the painting to the Metropolitan Museum, the Spingolds, took place during the 1940s and 1950s, though they were selling some works as early as 1927; no record of the transaction by which they acquired the Meytens painting is known at present.

The Metropolitan’s portrait of the Durazzos is perhaps best described in tandem with the very similar painting by Meytens of Nikolaus, Count Pálffy von Erdőd, and his family, painted in 1755, and now in the Österreichische Galerie, Vienna (Figure 3). Not only are the two canvases alike in their hunting theme, with the subjects placed in a forest clearing, but Count Pálffy was also a first cousin of Ernestine Durazzo; the family connection may well explain the commission of the Durazzo portrait. Pálffy shared the Durazzos’ passion for music; in this he was like that other great Hungarian magnate and long-term employer of Joseph Haydn, Nikolaus, Prince Esterházy—whose wife Elisabeth, née Weissenwolf, was another first cousin of Ernestine Durazzo’s. (Nikolaus Esterházy succeeded his brother Paul Anton as prince in 1762.) As director of the imperial theaters, Durazzo had followed another Esterházy, Count Franz, known as “Quinquin”—the model for the like-named character in Hofmannsthal and Strauss’s opera *Der Rosenkavalier*.

Pálffy’s more numerous family, compared to that of the Durazzos (who would remain childless), dictated a different relationship of figures to landscape, but the similarities in the two paintings are many, nonetheless. The sandy soil, “interesting” trees, and framing intrusion of foliage into the picture are common to both canvases. (Whereas a mansion is barely visible in the far distance in the Pálffy portrait, Meytens’s depiction of the Durazzos includes no habitation, probably because the couple resided in Vienna.) Count Pálffy points at his dogs—as if to caution the viewer not to waken the one that is sleeping—while Durazzo gestures toward his hunting dog and the birds felled that day. (The presence of the latter in the picture is probably intended to show that Countess Durazzo was not squeamish about the carnage of hunting.) In both pictures one sees Meytens’s pride in the depiction of interesting or difficult hand gestures (note particularly the tender manner in which Durazzo’s fingers caress the dog’s ear—a gesture of conjugal affection by proxy), as well as the artist’s “typical rendering with strongly tapering fingertips and an elegant gesture of the little finger.” The burlwood gun and high boots—the latter elegantly presented—of the eldest Pálffy son, Carl (or Károly), both have counterparts in the Durazzo portrait. Meytens took particular care in highlighting the glass buttons on Durazzo’s boots, by means of diagonal cross-hatching in gray and white with dots of white, blue, and red. In both paintings the same minute attention—“conspicuous to the point of
The materials are all carefully differentiated as regards sheen, texture, and the fall of light across the surfaces, and in the gold brocade and white (or pink) lace one can even discern individual threads and knots. Such meticulousness in the finish of his paintings was reflected in the high prices that Meytens charged his clients.

In the handling of color, too, there are correspondences: Durazzo’s flowing red coat occupies nearly as much of the picture space as does the bright red baldachin in the Pálffy portrait, and the light shades of the women’s dresses are much the same in both paintings. The more diffuse light in the Metropolitan portrait helps create an atmosphere of greater intimacy, appropriate in the depiction of a couple. The choice of flowers and their colors in the picture are not likely to have been a matter of indifference. Most of the species depicted (e.g., the orange primulas at Count Durazzo’s feet) are spring-blooming, that season being symbolic of youth and also that during which the Hapsburg court habitually went on hunting parties at Laxenburg, south of Vienna. (The running stream in the foreground is likewise suggestive of the early part of the year.) There are several different types of flowers in Countess Durazzo’s hair, but three small white lilies call attention to themselves by their number and position; these Meytens likely included on account of the three fleurs-de-lis (representing the three branches of the Durazzo family then in existence) in Giacomo Durazzo’s coat of arms (see Figures 2 and 5).
That the Metropolitan’s picture was produced not long after the Pálffy family group is suggested by the paintings’ stylistic similarities and by the apparent ages of the sitters (Ernestine von Weissenwolf was eighteen when she married Count Durazzo on March 17, 1750; he was thirty-three). Further evidence is to be found in a pair of anonymous individual portraits of the Durazzos, of less fine workmanship, that were painted in 1756. Though these were badly damaged by fire during World War II, one can still see that the Durazzos are depicted at roughly the same age as in Meytens’s double portrait, with similar attitudes of head and body. Insofar as one can tell, their dress is likewise much the same; the count wears an identical collar band (solitaire), and the countess is coiffed as in the Metropolitan portrait, with a small bunch of flowers in her hair, and wears a dark cloak loosely around her shoulders. If, as seems possible, these bust-length portraits were “excerpted” from the larger painting, rather than painted from life, then the correspondences are not surprising. But such a procedure is likely to have been employed while the likenesses in the double portrait were still relatively up-to-date.

An interest in hunting was nothing out of the ordinary for members of the Austro-Hungarian high nobility, or for resident foreigners of a certain distinction. But the hunting theme in Martin van Meytens’s portrait of Count and Countess Durazzo had additional resonances with their lives and accomplishments. First of all, of the two Durazzos, it was the countess, rather than her husband, whose superior skills in shooting drew the praise of several of her contemporaries. In the summer of 1754, Johann Joseph von Khevenhüller-Metsch described an elaborate archery contest at the Esterházy estate at Kittsee (Köpczen), near Pressburg (present-day Bratislava), in which Countess Durazzo took part:

... and after we had strolled a while in the lower garden, we returned to Kittsee, where the prince had prepared for their highnesses and the more distinguished ladies a nighttime shooting contest with crossbows, with very delightful prizes. The only one[s] to hit the bull’s-eye [were] Countess Durazzo, and Prince von Auersperg, hence the skyrocket and little cannons that were thereby set off did not make especially much noise.

The illumination resulting from the skyrocket was evidently the reason for holding the contest at night. Countess Durazzo’s archery skills also figure in a fine late portrait of her (ca. 1775–80), where her attributes include a bow, and arrows in a quiver (Figure 4). Ernestine Durazzo was also proficient with a rifle, at least by 1761. On June 28 of that year, during a visit by the Durazzos and others to the primary estate of Paul Anton, Prince Esterházy, at Eisenstadt (Kismarton), Count Carl von Zinzendorf noted in his diary: “In the afternoon we went to shoot with dummy bullets; Madame Durazzo shot well, but the princess exploded the target four times.” Two days later he remarked, “In the evening Madame Durazzo showed off her long brown hair, which reaches to her knees; she looked charming like that, without a bonnet.” (During this stay at Eisenstadt, Count Durazzo was acting as a paid consultant to the prince on operatic preparations there, having temporarily resigned from his theatrical post at court because of disputes with Kapellmeister Georg von Reutter the Younger.) A much earlier shooting contest, held at Schönbrunn Palace in 1716, and wittily described by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, gives some idea of the tradition from which Countess Durazzo’s skills as a markswoman probably emerged. The contestants on that occasion were “two parties of [the empress’s] ladies of honour with other young ladies of quality, headed by the two young archduchesses, all dressed with their hair full of jewels,
with fine light guns in their hands”; they shot at painted allegorical targets, for prizes both rich and trifling. “This is the favourite pleasure of the emperor,” Lady Mary reported, “and there is rarely a week without some feast of this kind, which makes the young ladies skilful enough to defend a fort, and they laughed very much to see me afraid to handle a gun.” Whether or not Countess Durazzo actually felled game herself (and in the Meytens portrait she is certainly not in hunting attire), she was frequently present for Beitzé, or hawking, on the grounds of the court’s summer retreat at Laxenburg.75

Even aside from his wife’s shooting skills, huntresses were topical for Count Durazzo about the time Meytens likely painted his double portrait, for the count was the author of the libretto of a festa teatrale per musica called Le cacciatrici amanti (the amorous huntresses; Figure 5)—one of his several literary efforts in these years; the musical setting was by Christoph Georg Wagensel. The work was first performed at Laxenburg on June 25, 1755, and later also in Vienna’s court theater. Le cacciatrici amanti was wryly dismissed by the court poet Metastasio, who noted that “the versification is sufficiently facile, and appropriate to the music, which would have made for a reasonable enough composition, if the writer had set himself something to represent.” The poet admitted that “the lack of a subject is disguised somewhat by the frequency of the arias, the gracefulness of the dances, and by the magnificence of a successfully designed [stage] machinery.” The action in Le cacciatrici amanti is indeed slight: Dafne, “D’ogni altra cacciatrici / Maestra, e conduttrice [mistress and leader of every other huntress],” agonizes over her love for the shepherd Elpino, which Diana’s laws forbid; her companions seduce a band of shepherds in a central pantomime ballet, and at the end Diana relents, decreeing that henceforth Cupid will share in her rule over the forests. But in writing the work Durazzo was more interested in genre than plot; the heavy reliance in Le cacciatrici amanti on dance, chorus, and spectacle was in imitation of French opéras-ballets (such as he had witnessed during several visits to Paris), and an implicit criticism, as well, of the type of opera cultivated by Metastasio. In any case, it is tempting to think that the female courtiers who attended performances of Le cacciatrici amanti saw in the huntresses a reflection of their own traditional prowess at arms. It is likely that within the Durazzos’ circle of intimates the hunting portrait by Meytens was seen as alluding to the count’s authorship of the work—particularly as his feet are shown in a perfect fifth position (according to eighteenth-century ballet practice). Accustomed as he was, during his tenure as theater director, to providing scenarios for ballets, it is not difficult to imagine him offering suggestions to Meytens with regard to the program for the depiction of him and his wife on canvas.40

A dog as an emblem of fidelity prototypically appears in depictions of conjugal pairs such as Meytens’s of the Durazzos. It is ironic, then, that Giacomo Durazzo’s ouster in 1764 from his position as “Directeur des plaisirs” at court was largely due to his alleged involvement in an amorous affair with a star ballet dancer and singer, Louise Joffroy Bodin. Durazzo had already been chastised for holding rehearsals in the quarters of female singers, and at least one rehearsal “chez la Dlle [J]offroi” is recorded. In telling of Durazzo’s dismissal, Kehn-ühller-Metsch refers to an “anecdote très particuliè re,” “that cannot be entrusted to the pen,” and also to the intervention of Chancellor Kaunitz, in order to procure for Durazzo—“zur Indemnisation”—the position of ambassador to Venice.43 According to later reports by the Venetian inquisitor, “Durazzo [has made] himself known by his amorous relations with beautiful ballerinas or actresses and not only in Vienna, but also later in Venice”;4 his wife, too, was

Figure 5. Title page of Le cacciatrici amanti, 1756, from the library of Giacomo Durazzo. Genoa, Collection of A. Fabio Ivaldi (photo: A. Fabio Ivaldi)
said to have entertained a lover at the Palazzo Loredan.44

Whatever the causes of Durazzo’s disgrace, his change of occupation and departure from the capital directly affected the later history of the Meytens double portrait. Durazzo’s decision to commission a print of it very quickly—minus his wife’s image, and altered to reflect his new position45—was possibly an attempt to reassert his prestige, but it was also a chance to demonstrate his already well-developed interest in the art of engraving. Right from the start of his correspondence with Favart, Durazzo had evinced an interest in engraving, instructing his agent to send not only theater pieces, but also “all brochures that concern the fine arts, which I cultivate for pleasure and for my utility—such as painting, engraving, architecture and music &c.”46 Thus, for instance, Favart informed the count of “a superb Italian/French edition of the tales of Boccaccio, in Massieu’s translation, in ten volumes in-8°, on Dutch paper only; this work is enriched by 370 plates, vignettes and tailpieces, perfectly engraved after the drawings of Boucher and Cochin. . . . There are twenty-four prints that will be sold on the sly, because they are of a more than-cynical licentiousness.”47

Durazzo quickly added his name to the list of subscribers, remarking, “Of course, I will take all the prints, even those that will not be sold publicly.”48 In subsequent letters Favart informed him that Gravelot himself would select the proofs, and that the seizure of the engravings by the police would prevent neither their work on the project nor delivery of the prints.49 That Durazzo’s interest in the graphic arts at this early date was more than merely prurient is demonstrated by the wide variety of subjects and genres among the drawings, paintings, and prints that he received or discussed, and by his long exchanges with Favart concerning the engraved frontispiece for the Paris edition of Gluck’s Orfeo ed Euridice.50 The enormous size of Durazzo’s collection of prints (mostly amassed after his presentation of an earlier collection to Albert of Sachsen-Teschen in 1776) likewise demonstrates his passion for this artistic medium. But in Count Bartolommeo Benincasa’s published description, the collection’s principal utility is said to be as a sort of “storia universale della Pittura, e dei Pittori [universal history of painting, and of painters]”; Benincasa goes so far as to say that those who collect according to engraver rather than painter go against proper method.51 This method of organization (according to engraver) was found necessary, however, when Durazzo’s collection was auctioned off.

Whether or not the count foresaw that work on his engraved portrait could not be completed before his departure from Vienna, the choice of the engraver Jakob Schmutzer (1733–1811) had much to recommend it. One of Meytens’s self-portraits was engraved by Schmutzer in 1756,52 and Schmutzer had also studied at the Akademie headed (after 1759) by Meytens. About 1760 he engraved a portrait of the dancer Joffroy Bodin, a project of which one can be sure Count Durazzo was aware. In February of 1762 Schmutzer went to Paris for four years of advanced study with the expatriate German artist Johann Georg Wille (during which he also directed Wille’s “Teutsche Zeichnungsschule”),53 thanks to the patronage of Durazzo’s protector, Chancellor Kaunitz. Upon his return in 1766 he founded a “k. k. Kupferstecherkadémie” (later absorbed into the Akademie der bildenden Künste).54 The phrase “Commencé a Vienne par Schmutzer” in the finished engraving of Durazzo is problematic, as Schmutzer was still in Paris in 1764. On March 2 of that year Wille recorded in his journal that “Count Durazzo, director of the imperial court’s spectacles, having arrived in this city, came to see me,”55 but he makes no mention of discussions between Durazzo and Schmutzer on that occasion. Thus one must suppose that the two preliminary versions of Durazzo’s head and bust (Figures 6, 7) pre-dated Schmutzer’s Parisian sojourn; one wonders whether the count planned at that point to have Schmutzer engrave the entire painting. In any case, the similar depictions of the count’s left hand in both painting and engraving argue in favor of Schmutzer’s (or Wagner’s) having had direct access to the double portrait. The head itself is very finely done, accurately capturing the count’s physiognomy, with an only slightly less serene expression than in the painting.

It was likewise to be expected that once in Venice, Durazzo would turn to that city’s foremost engraver, the German-born Joseph Wagner (1706–1786). Having studied the engraver’s art under Laurent Cars in Paris, Wagner brought the technique of acquaforte to Venice, where (in applying for a privilege from the authorities) he claimed to have found engraving in a decadent state.56 Wagner’s skills are deployed to good effect in the portrait of Durazzo as imperial ambassador. The count’s coat is augmented by a rather amorphous cape, the better to exhibit Wagner’s talent for depicting drapery. The picture is filled out by an elaborate frame in imitation of carved stone and by the accoutrements of Durazzo’s office: books (untitled), writing implements, bundled dispatches, and a large portfolio of papers, all in an elegantly furnished interior. But there was a kind of empty show in all this, for the activities of ambassadors in Venice were severely circumscribed by a law forbidding local
nobiles, "under pain of death, to have dealings with foreign envoys or their staffs." This policy was quite strictly enforced even as Durazzo was taking up his post. The count performed his duties conscientiously, but his artistic pursuits claimed increasing amounts of his time and attention. Though he complained loudly to Favart that Venice was "a country from which one is unable to write anything interesting," he found at least some cultural occupation locally. He was helpful to the Mozarts (whom he had met in Vienna years earlier) when they came through Venice in March of 1771, dining with them and helping to arrange a concert of Wolfgang's music. Both Durazzos were active on the Venetian operatic scene. Ernestine had numerous opera librettos, both comic and serious, dedicated to her and apparently employed or patronized at least one singer; as mentioned above, her husband was able, through his contacts, to supply the Viennese court with the better part of an opera-buffa company in 1783. Well before that time he had been restored to imperial favor, thanks mainly to his services to Duke Albert, whose wife, Marie Christine, was the empress's favorite daughter. Durazzo ceased his diplomatic activities in 1783, the same year in which he was awarded the Order of Saint Stephen; Durazzo promptly incorporated its ceremonial chain into his family crest (see the library stamp on his copy of Le cacciatrici amanti; Figure 5).

In a late portrait of Giacomo Durazzo by Giovanni David (engraved by Giovanni Vitalba), which served as the frontispiece for Benincasa's Descrizione della raccolta di stampe di S. E. il Sig. Conte Jacopo Durazzo of 1784 (Figure 8), all the attributes now represent Durazzo's artistic and literary (as opposed to diplomatic) activities: a lyre and a sheet of music, a portfolio of prints, a pen and a book, a pair of calipers, and a palette with brushes. The inclusion of this last is more comprehensible now that we know that his involvement with painting was not limited to a "storia universale della Pittura" through the medium of prints or to the support of some "young protégés" during his time in Venice (see note 45), but that it also included the commissioning of a superb double portrait by the Viennese court painter Martin van Meytens. This is a
particularly fitting restoration to the artist’s oeuvre, as Meytens’s reputation has suffered because of the mannered figures in the crowd scenes of the large ceremonial paintings—which of which represent entertainments produced under Durazzo—that were executed principally by his assistants. At the Metropolitan Museum one can once again “pay a silent tribute” to Meytens’s superb portrait and to the legendary beauty of Ernestine von Weissenwolf and also admire (in the next gallery) a 1757 portrait by François-Hubert Drouais, said to depict one of Durazzo’s other muses, the actress Madame Favart.
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NOTES

1. Earlier members of this Dutch artistic dynasty, and also our artist’s father, Martin the Elder (established in Sweden since 1677), signed themselves “van Mytens” or “van Mijtens”; “van Meytens” was Martin the Younger’s preferred spelling, which he adopted after his move to Vienna. See Christian Ludwig von Hagedorn, Lettres à un amateur de la peinture avec des éclaircissements historiques sur un cabinet et les auteurs des tableaux qui le composent. Ouvrage entremêlé de digressions sur la vie de plusieurs peintres modernes (Dresden, 1755; facs. repr. Geneva, 1972) p. 265.


4. The spelling “Dünant” is probably an attempt to render in German the pronunciation of the French name “Dunant.”

5. “Leben Herrn Martin von Meytens dessen Tod wir im 16ten Stück der Zeitung angezeigt haben,” Kunstzeitung der Kaiserlichen Akademie zu Augsburg (1770); quoted in Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, p. 120.

6. By Aug. 7, 1764, some three months after his resignation in Frankfurt (to which he had traveled for the coronation of Archduke Joseph as King of the Romans), Durazzo had already sold his garden villa in the Viennese Landstrasse. The imperial family quickly arranged to have themselves invited there by its new owner, the marchese Francesco di Montecuccoli, having heard much of its “galant and delightful decoration and furnishings [. . . von der galant- und hertzen Zier und Einrichtung dises Gartens . . . ];” but they apparently had never sought such a visit while Durazzo occupied the property. See Rudolf, Graf Khevenhüller-Metsch, and Hanns Schlitter, eds., Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias: Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Joseph Khevenhüller-Metsch, kaiserlichen Obersthofmeisters 1742–1776, 7 vols. (Vienna/Leipzig/Berlin, 1907–25) VI, p. 89. On Kaunitz’s intervention, see the entry for April 30, 1764 (VI, p. 29).


les grâces qu’il a obtenues de l’Impératrice, qui consistent en quatre mille livres de pension, un logement de cour, et une place de conseiller d’État. En un mot c’est M. le Comte de Kaufnitz qui l’a marié et qui l’a fixé dans ce pays-ci. Ils passent leur vie ensemble et ne se quittent presque jamais.” Another bond between Durazzo and Kaufnitz—and also with Albert of Sachsen-Teschen—was their membership in the Masonic lodge “Zur wahren Eintracht” (True Concord); see Walter Koschatzky, Giacomo Conte Durazzo, 1717–1794. zum Jubiläum des Wiener Burgtheaters 1776–1976 (Vienna, 1976) p. 11.


10. Though Giacomo Durazzo was officially inscribed into the Genoese nobility in 1744, at the age of 27, and was referred to in government documents as “il magnifico Giacomo Durazzo” (see Ivaldi, Giacomo Durazzo da Genova a Vienna, pp. 13 and 37), his specific title of count seems first to have been used in the safe-conduct pass sent to Durazzo and his retinue by Emperor Francis Stephen in 1749 upon his appointment as “invitato straordinario” to the Hapsburg court. The title apparently was not attached to any particular territory but was meant to confer greater dignity on Durazzo as envoy. (Personal communication from A. Fabio Ivaldi, Nov. 11, 1996.)

11. “Mais Mr. de Meytens ne se croisant pas encore assez fort, supplia sa Maj. Imperiale… d’agréer qu’il allat travailler quelques années en Italie, pour s’y rendre plus digne de cette grace…”; [Dunant], “La Vie de Mr de Meytens,” in Baden, ed., Briefe über die Kunst, p. 216; quoted by Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, p. 22.

12. Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, pp. 88 and 123 (quoting the “Leben Herrn Martin von Meytens”).

13. Ibid., p. 134.

14. Franz Christoph von Scheyb, Von den drei Künstlern der Zeichnung (Vienna, 1774) p. 43: “Glanz, Majestät und Pracht in Kleidungen richteten sich meistens nach dem Geschmack des Hofs und hohen Adels, welcher nicht jederzeit mit der Gesinnung der Künstler übereinstimmt,” quoted in Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, p. 87; in the earlier source (Hagedorn, Lettres à un amateur, p. 266) one reads: “Un peu moins d’éclat & de richesse prodigués dans les vêtements, dont le choix n’est cependant pas toujours celui du Peintre, n’allerait que mieux quelques uns de ces beaux Portraits à ceux du siècle de van Dyck.”

15. In describing the goddess Aretea in Metastasio and Hasse’s festa teatrale Alcide al biscio—a work in which he seems to have had a major creative role—Durazzo noted that this character “doit… en imposer la volupté, la Galanterie jointes à la richesse et même au Luxe doivent parôître dans l’habit dela Deese des plaisirs,” adding, “Peut-être je me determinerai à faire travailler les habits à Paris…” (letter of March 8, 1760; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Opéra, Fonds Favart, Carton I, A, II).

16. Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, p. 9. Gauffin’s opinion is to be found in his study “Martin van Meytens d. y. och hans nyförvärvade arbeten i Statens konstsamlingar,” in the Nationalmuseums årsbok (1920).


21. See Poleggi, ed., Descrizione della città di Genova, p. 77. No portrait that can be identified as that by Meytens is mentioned in the descriptions of the Durazzo family’s properties in Federigo Alizieri’s Guida artistica per la città di Genova (Genoa, 1846–47) or Guida illustrativa del cittadino e del forestiero per la città di Genova (Genoa, 1875). But in the later edition Alizieri notes (p. 415) that the Durazzo-Pallavicini collection included paintings “of more than ordinary beauty,” secreted away in private rooms, that were not listed in the gallery’s published catalogue.

22. Personal communication from A. Fabio Ivaldi, Sept. 12, 1996.

23. I am grateful to Prof. Mercedes Viale Ferrero for much of this information; see also Alberto Basso, “I codici vitaldià di Torino, overo fatti e misfatti, avventure e disposizioni del collezionismo musicale,” Chigiana 41, n.s. 21 (1989) pp. 161–84.

24. Information on the Spingolds was kindly provided by Dr. Burton B. Fredericksen of the Art History Information Program, J. Paul Getty Center, Malibu (personal communication, Dec. 9, 1995).

25. Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, p. 64, dates the picture according to the ages of the children depicted, one of whom died later that year. The Pâlfy portrait is reproduced in color in Walter Koschatzky, ed., Maria Theresa et ihre Zeit (Salzburg / Vienna, 1979) p. 286.

26. Pâlfy had become a privy councillor in 1745 and would be named Hungarian palatin, or court chancellor, in 1758; see Constant von Wurzbach, Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich, 60 vols. (Vienna, 1856–91) XXI, p. 215. Ernestine’s mother, Maria Anna, a Pâlfy von Erdöd by birth, was Nikolaus’s aunt; see
ibid. (unpaginated genealogical table of the Pálfy dynasty). Ernestine’s father, Joseph Anton Ungnad von Weissenwolf, was president of the Upper Austrian Landtag.

27. See Lisholm, Martin van Meytens, pp. 53-54.

28. Ibid., p. 87.

29. I am grateful to Prof. Eric Haskell of Scripps College, Claremont, for much of the following information.

30. On the symbolism of the three heraldic fleurs-de-lis, see A. Fabio Ivaldi’s description of the funerary catafalque (1667) of Stefano Durazzo in Studi di Storia delle Arti 4 (1981/82) pp. 141-171, figs. 84, 85.

31. Shortly after her wedding, on May 3, 1750, Countess Durazzo was named to the Sternkreuz-Orden; see Robert Haas, Gluck und Durazzo im Burgtheater (Vienna/Leipzig, 1925) p. 7.

32. The paintings, which were “formerly in the possession of the Weissenwolf family,” are reproduced pls. 23 and 24 in vol. I of H. C. Robbins Landon, Haydn: Chronicle and Works, 5 vols. (Bloomington, Ind., 1976-80). They are currently at Schloss Steyereg, Upper Austria.


34. “Après-midi on alla tirer [à] feu blanc, M de Durazzo tira bien, mais la Princesse fit sauter 4 fois la bambe.”

35. Zinzendorf, entry for June 28, 1761, quoted in Landon, Haydn, I, p. 359: “Le soir la Durazzo montra ses brus cheueux longs, qui lui sont jusqu’aux genoux, elle etoit charmante dans cette figure, sans coffe.” The “Princesse” was Paul Anton Esterházy’s wife, Maria Anna, née Lunati-Visconti. On first meeting “M. de Durazzo Consellier privé et Directeur des plaisirs et M son Epouse,” at a soiree at the residence of Chancellor Kaunitz, Zinzendorf had noted, “Son Epouse, née Weissenwolf est grande et belle” (entry for Feb. 12, 1761).

36. Letter of Sept. 14, 1716 (O.S.), to Frances, Countess of Mar, in Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Letters, Ernest Rhys, ed., with an introduction by Clare Brant (New York, 1992) pp. 70-71. The empress herself, Elisabeth Christine, was a superb shot; one of the “two young archduchesses” mentioned here was Maria Theresa, whose children all received a thorough training in hunting. See Wilhelm Schlagg, “Jagdwesen,” and idem, “Jagdbilder der Kaiserfamilie,” in Koschatzky, Maria Theresia und ihre Zeit, pp. 549-555, esp. p. 550, and 572-573. Lady Mary later befriended Durazzo’s sister Clelia, conversing frequently “in many parties we had together”; see her letter from Turin of Oct. 2, 1741 (O.S.) to Henrietta Ferman, Countess of Pomfret (Letters, p. 317).

37. Khevenhüller-Metsch, Aus der Zeit, reports escorting her on May 22, 1756 (IV, p. 22), and May 20, 1759 (IV, p. 120), for instance.


39. Ibid., p. 1036: “Nulla di meno la mancanza di soggetto si nasconde tanto quanto nella frequenza delle arie, nella leggiadria de’ balli e nella magnificenza d’una macchina felicemente eseguita.” Metastasio was careful to disclaim paternity for the anonymously published work, saying that he had done no more than refashion a few disheveled verses (“... non ho altra parte che l’avere raffazzonato qualche verso scarmigliato”).


41. Other factors, as well, entered into Durazzo’s dismissal, including a scheme concocted by Favart and a playwright friend he had placed in Vienna; see Brown, Gluck and the French Theatre, pp. 425-428.

42. Khevenhüller-Metsch, Aus der Zeit, entries for April 30 and Feb. 6, 1765 (VI, p. 83, and VI, p. 29, respectively).

43. Marina Varagnolo, “Giacomo Durazzo” (diss., University of Padua, 1964/65) n. 19; cited in Koschatzky, Giacomo Conte Durazzo, p. 15: “Anche il Durazzo spesso si farà notare per le sue relazioni amorose con belle ballerine o attrici di prosa e non solo a Vienna, ma anche poi a Venezia.”

44. Koschatzky, Giacomo Conte Durazzo, pp. 28-29, citing Pompeo Molmenti, La storia di Venezia nella vita privata (Bergamo, 1926) III, pp. 493ff.

45. This was not the only time that Durazzo would arrange for the alteration of an existing portrait. In a letter of Oct. 26, 1773, Christoph Gluck told Padre Giovanni Battista Martini in Bologna of Durazzo’s having procured a copy of a portrait of Gluck painted in 1766 in Rome and of his having it altered, “by one of his young protégés,” so as to show the composer’s current physiognomy; see Patricia Howard, Gluck: An Eighteenth-Century Portrait in Letters and Documents (Oxford, 1995) p. 107.

46. Unpublished letter of July 9, 1760, in Fonds Favart, Carton I, A, II: “toutes les Brochures qui traitent des beaux arts, que je cultive par goût, et pour mon utilité, tels sont la peinture, la gravure, l’architecture et la Musique &c.”

47. Letter of May 1, 1761, in Favart, Mémoires et correspondances littéraires, dramatiques et anecdotiques, A-P-C, Favart, ed., 3 vols. (Paris, 1808) I, pp. 149-150: “une superbe édition italienne et française des Contes de Boccace, traduction de Massieu, en dix volumes in-8°, sur papier de Hollande simplement; cet ouvrage est enrichi de 370 figures, vignettes et culs-de-lampe parfaitement gravés d’après les dessins de Boucher et de Cochin... Il y a vingt-quatre estampes qui se distribueront sous le manteau, parce qu’elles sont d’une liberté plus que cynique.”

48. Letter of May 14, 1760, in Fonds Favart, Carton I, A, I: “... bien entendu, que j’aurai toutes les estampes, même celles, qu’on ne vendra pas publiquement.”

49. Letters of June 20, 1761, and May 7, 1762, respectively, in Favart, Mémoires et correspondances, I, p. 157, and II, p. 271.


51. See Benincasa, Descritzione della raccolta di stampe di S. E. il Sig. Conte Jacopo Durazzo esposta in una dissertazione sull’arte dell’intaglio a stampa (Parma, 1784) pp. 8 and 24.
52. The engraving of the self-portrait (after the original in the Akademie der bildende Künste, Vienna) is no. 208 in Lisholm’s catalogue; see Lisholm, Martin van Meyten, p. 128.


54. See Peter Pötschner, Wien und die Wiener Landschaft: Spätbarocke und beidermeierliche Landschaftskunst in Wien (Salzburg, 1978) pp. 21 and 302. In Durazzo’s collection of graphic arts there were a dozen engravings by Schmutzer, including two portraits of Kaunitz and one of his chalk drawings; see the Catalog der kostbaren und altberühmten Kupferstich-Sammlung des Marchese Jacopo Durazzo . . ., 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1872–73) I, p. 375, and II, p. 239.

55. Mémoires et journal de J.-G. Wille, Graveur du Roi, 2 vols. (Paris, 1857) I, p. 249: "M. le comte de Durazzo, directeur des spectacles de la cour impériale, étant arrivé en cette ville, m’est venu voir.” From this source (I, p. 117) one also learns that Kaunitz (through his secretary, Wächter) had inquired as early as 1759 regarding the possibility of sending Schmutzer to work in Wille’s studio.


58. Letter of Dec. 9, 1767; Favart, Mémoires et correspondances, II, p. 233: "un pays d’où on ne saurait rien écrire d’intéressant.”

59. This is implied in a letter of April 8, 1779, from Joseph II to his brother Leopold, in which mention is made of “a better soprano from Venice [named Romani], who is now in the house of la Durazzo” (personal communication from Prof. John A. Rice).

60. The engraving was likely produced ca. 1775–80, during which time David was working in Venice under the patronage of Count Durazzo, with some of the remaining copies later being used as frontispieces in Benincasa’s Descrizione; see Ivaldi, “Genova e il teatro, fra Seicento e primo Ottocento,” in Ida Maria Botto, ed., Il Teatro Carlo Felice di Genova: Storia e progetti (Genoa, 1986) pp. 7–46, esp. p. 28.

61. See Lisholm, Martin van Meyten, p. 87.

62. MMA, Gift of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1917 (17.120.210). The painting is reproduced in MMAB 30 (Aug. 1971) p. 28.