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TUSCAN SCHOOL: XIV CENTURY

TINO DA CAMAINO

Sienese, Pisan and Neapolitan School. Sculptor and architect, born in Siena c. 1285, died in Naples 1337. Son of the architect and sculptor Camaino di Crescentino (d. 1338). Active in Pisa (1311–13), Siena (till 1320), Florence (1321–2) and Naples (from 1323 till his death). At times he was working with his father and since we do not know any of the latter’s work, we cannot tell how much Tino might have owed him. Decisive for him must have been the encounter with Giovanni Pisano, who was the architect of the cathedral of Siena from 1284 till 1299, and whom he may have followed to Pisa. Tino’s later style, however, reverted to certain Sienese habits. In Naples he must have headed a large workshop.

Follower of TINO DA CAMAINO

KI1386 : Figure I

MADONNA AND CHILD WITH ST CLARE, ST FRANCIS, QUEEN SANCIA OF NAPLES AND FOUR ANGELS. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (1156), since 1945.1 White marble2 relief, 20¼ x 14½ x 3¾ in. (51·4 x 37·8 x 8·5 cm.). The back has bevelled edges. Broken in two pieces diagonally from the wrist of St Clare to the upper right corner, and put together with minor losses and replacements along the break: a patch above the right hand of St Clare, the right thumb of the Virgin, a piece of the curtain held by the upper right angel. The marble has a warm yellowish patina and some brownish stains. Traces of the bolus preparation for the gilding on the angels’ wings. Removed from an alabaster frame, repaired and cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: A. Sambon, Paris.3 Contini-Bonacossi, Rome.4 Henry Goldman, New York.5 Duveen’s, New York.6 Kress acquisition 1944.7 Exhibited: Detroit Institute of Art, Detroit, Mich., 1938.4

When the relief appeared in the market, it was described simply as of the fourteenth century.3 The attribution to Tino da Camaino and the identification of Sancia of Majorca, the Queen of King Robert the Wise of Naples, were proposed by Valentine.8 The identification is probable, but difficult to prove, because the known portraits of the Queen never show her in the veils of a nun, and the features are always too generalized for a resemblance to be established. Consequently the identification has been accepted with some reservations.10 We know that, like her husband and other members of her family, Sancia had been a devoted adherent and most generous benefactress of the Franciscan order and that of St Clare. Tradition had it that she often exchanged her regal garments for those of a nun. After the death of her husband in 1343 she took the veil and retired into the convent of S. Chiara, where she died in 1345.11 Thus it could be imagined that in an intimate object like this relief she should be represented in the veils of a nun, being recommended to the Virgin, in the presence of St Francis, by a Saint who would logically be St Clare. The attribution of the relief to Tino has been more generally accepted.12 It ranges stylistically with works from Tino’s last years, so that a proposed dating around 1335 might be defended.13 Its closest associates would be the relief of Cava dei Tirreni,14 the tomb of Charles of Calabria (1323/3),15 and the dispersed tomb of Giovanni of Durazzo (d. 1333).16 The small size of the relief makes a comparison with these monumental works difficult. This and the fact that Tino at that time must have employed many helpers makes Ragghianti’s doubts, whether the relief might not be a school work,12 understandable. The representation of the Queen alone, without the King and in nun’s garb, particularly with the crown carried on her arm, would be much more logical after 1343 when she had retired as a dowager into the convent. Such a late date would exclude Tino himself as the author. There is nothing to suggest that the relief originally was the centre of a triptych17 unless it was housed, as is possible, in a wooden case with folding doors. The resemblance to the small domestic painted altars of the period is evident.

The history of this chasse is complicated. Apparently there existed two almost contemporary chasses of the Saint. The one of which our piece was part has an inscription:

\begin{verbatim}
A.D.D. CCCXXX: FACTA: FUIT: TRANSTATIO [sic]: octaviani: delico: I(s): Q(u): Mi-
gravit: ad: Urbe(m): Antonia(m): F(ER): EP(is-
copu)m: ANDREAM:
\end{verbatim}

and

\begin{verbatim}
octaviani(s): adest: Pugil: Volterre: be(a)-
\end{verbatim}

Unfortunately this inscription, which runs across one side of the chasse above and below the grating, refers only to some facts of the life of the Saint and to the transfer of his relics in the year 820. We are badly informed about the fate of the chasse; possibly it was already dismantled by the early sixteenth century when Raffaele di Giovanni Cioli made the present one. A \textit{terminus post factum} for it may be supplied by a will of Guglielmio di Ranieri of Belforte of 14 Jan. 1372, in which he bequeathes the endowment of an altar of the Saint. The fragments of an almost identical chasse, four holy bishops in similar roundels, of lesser quality but more ornate, with the spandrels patterned in marble inlay, are let into a wall of S. Agostino in S. Gimignano. For these a date can be proposed, which may help towards a more precise dating of the chasse of St Octavianus. They may have been part of a chasse of St Bartolus, which preceded the present altar and chasse by Benedetto da Maiano (1492–4). In 1327 work on it seems to have been in progress; in 1488 it is mentioned as \textit{in mezzo} of the church, that is free-standing and visible from all sides, like the tomb in Volterra or the contemporary \textit{Arca di S. Cerbone} by Goro di Gregorio (1324) in Massa Marittima. The interpretation of each of these dates is hypothetical, but they fit so well together that a date in the early 1320s for the chasse in Volterra becomes plausible.

The frame with dentils has parallels in the Acciaiuolo tomb (1335) in S. Apostoli in Florence, the Pazzi tomb in S. Croce, the pulpit by Giovanni di Baldaccio in San Casciano, a roundel with St Catherine in the National Gallery of Art, and one privately owned in France. With this group belong two others, in the Hyde Collection in Glen Falls, N.Y., and in the Berlin Museum, and a triptych in the Borletti Collection in Milan. They are of varying quality and obviously belong to different hands and times. They all have traditionally been attributed to Tino, and dated into his Neapolitan period, after 1323. The provenance of our piece from Volterra would place it before this date, about the time of the Della Torre tomb (d. 1318) in S. Croce and the Orsi tomb (d. 1320) in the cathedral of Florence. In fact it compares fairly well with them, but neither our Madonna nor the four Saints in Volterra have quite the

\textit{Workshop of Tino da Camaino (?)}

\textbf{K1022 : Figure 2}

\textbf{Madonna and Child}

Raleigh, N.C., North Carolina Museum of Art, since 1960. Marble tondo, diameter 16\frac{1}{2} in. (42.5 cm.) in a rectangular slab, 18\times 19\frac{1}{2} \times 4 in. (45.7 \times 49.5 \times 10.2 cm.). The marble has a greyish cast; it is highly polished. The relief was probably at one time painted or parcel gilt; but there is no indication that its background was ever decorated with mosaic, as has been said. The nose of the Virgin and the foot of the Child are damaged. Otherwise the condition is good.


The relief has been ascribed to Tino da Camaino and usually dated in his Neapolitan period. It has been assumed that it came from the gable of a large architectural tomb. It belongs, however, with four roundels of the same size and character representing the Saints Octavianus, Victor, Justus and Clemens, and a slab containing an opening for a grating, in the museum of the cathedral of Volterra. A. Garzelli has correctly suggested that those five elements originally formed the two long sides of a chasse of St Octavianus.
same quality. Their drapery is harshly angular and lacks Tino’s fluency. But the difference is not so great as to warrant the attribution of the Volterra chasse to another artist, even a helper of Tino, such as the nebulos Agnolo (di Ventura) di Siena, who has been suggested by A. Garzelli.28 The bishops of the chasse in S. Gimignano are somewhat more conventionally Sienese in character; they are apparently slightly later, 1327 if our conjectures are correct, and still further removed from Tino.


GIOVANNI DI BALDUCCIO ALBONETO

Pisan and Milanese School. Giovanni di Balducci Alboneto’s4 activity is documented from 1318/19 till 1349. In the inscriptions on his works he signs himself as Pisano. He worked in and around Pisa, in and around Florence, and in Milan, where his major works were done. He went there around 1335 and was called back to Pisa in 1349. After this date nothing more is known about him. He is usually counted among the closer followers of Giovanni Pisano. His style, however, has a strong Sienese component.

K1977: Figure 3

CHARITY. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A 1643), since 1954.2 High relief in white marble, 17 3/4 x 13 1/2 in. (45.1 x 35.2 x 7 cm.). The half-figure is contained in an elongated quatrefoil, which is set in a profiled frame with dentils at the inner side. The eyes of the main figure have the pupils inlaid with lead. The marble has a brownish patina, which is worn away for the greater part. Some niches in the frame. The tip of the nose of the main figure and the tip of the finger of the right hand are damaged. Otherwise well preserved. Cleaned 1935 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: Prince Liechtenstein (since Johannes II).3 J. Seligmann and Co., New York.3 Kress acquisition 1933.4

This relief is one of a set of sixteen; thirteen of them, representing the twelve Apostles and the allegory of Veritas, are let into the outside of the walls which close the original openings of Orsanmichele in Florence; one, the allegory of Obedience, is inside this church.5 Another, the allegory of Paupertas, is privately owned.6 To these must be added a much later relief of the same kind, representing a Saint, which is correctly attributed to Nanni di Banco.7 While
the earlier reliefs are basically uniform in style, they differ in format; the reliefs of the Apostles are square, those of the Virtues oblong. There are slight differences in execution which, however, are the same in both groups and thus cannot serve to separate them from each other. Nanni di Banco's relief has the same proportions as the Virtues. The reliefs on Orsanmichele obviously are not in their original place and may have been let into the walls at a very late date. We do not know whether the set is complete; the series of Virtues could have been more comprehensive. Their choice is odd and might point to a mendicant order. At any rate, two of them have been separated from the others. Obviously the reliefs were part of a large scheme, but it is impossible to establish its nature and original location. As Nanni di Banco later supplemented the series, it must have been expandable. The association with Orsanmichele may be fortuitous.  

W. R. Valentiner was the first to propose the attribution to Giovanni di Balduccio, 10 which has been retained by the later critics. 11 The date 1328/1338 for Giovanni di Balduccio's stay in Florence is plausible, but conjectural. 12 The strange conceit of the Caritas with two children sucking her flaming heart seems to be the artist's syncretization of earlier motifs. 13


Contemporary Copy after a PISAN ARTIST:  
Second Quarter of the XIV Century  

k600, k601 : Figures 4–9  

THE ANNUNCIATION. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1632, 1633), since 1952. 1 Full round, polychromed wooden statues. Without bases: k600: 62 f. x 18 f. x 14 f. in. (159.4 x 47.3 x 36 cm.). k601: 63 f. x 21 f. x 15 f. in. (160.3 x 53.8 x 39.9 cm.). The wood has been identified as poplar. The technique of these statues is interesting; the back is not hollowed out and closed with another piece, as was usual, but the figures have been hollowed out to look like gun barrels. To facilitate this work three small windows were cut into each back, and have been closed up by wooden blocks. There are round holes with removable plugs in the tops of the heads. The octagonal bases, according to the evidence of photographs taken before the restoration, 2 originally had a very simple profile. The present facings are new. The figures are intact, except for the book in the hand of the Virgin, which was separately worked; this was lost and has been replaced. The old photographs show the statues covered by recent pigments and the colours discovered underneath are badly worn and damaged in many places. 3 The damaged parts have been painted in. What is left is mainly the white priming. The tunics were red, of which little is left; the upper garment of the Virgin was white, edged with a gold pattern, of which a little remains on the back of the figure. The lining was blue. On the upper garment of the angel there are faint traces of green; it also is lined with blue. The lips are red, the eyes have faded white eyeballs with faded brown irises and faded blue pupils; the hair is a worn gold on a brown base. 4 Cleaned and restored by M. Modestini.

Provenance: Contini-Bonacossi, Florence. 5 Rush H. Kress, New York. 5 Kress acquisition, 1950. 6

The statues are exact copies of two well-known marbles in the church of S. Caterina in Pisa, which since Vasari's time have been taken for works by Nino Pisano. 7 Consequently our statues, too, have been attributed to him. 8 There is, however, every reason to doubt the relevancy of two rather contradictory inscriptions which Vasari claims to have seen underneath the figures, one naming Nino as the author and the other a date of 1370, two years after Nino's death. 9 The attribution of the group to Nino Pisano is unconvincing also for reasons of style. 10 A whole group of sculptures
which can be assembled around the Annunciation in S. Caterina as more or less closely related to it seems to be from the workshop of an independent master contemporary with Andrea Pisano, a sculptor of strongly French tendencies, whose work parallels the pictures of Simone Martini. The earlier date for the Annunciation, implied in this, has already been proposed by others. It would dovetail with the whole development of Pisan sculpture.

The Pisan Annunciation, or a lost work of similar character, must have been very famous and has often been copied more or less faithfully. Our copy is a literal one and the only case of such a close copy after a marble original known in Italian wood-sculpture of this period. Such statues apparently were housed in wooden tabernacles, as is known from an example formerly in the cathedral of Siena. The technical examination of the figures by M. Modestini has shown the copies to be contemporary with the originals.


PISTAN SCHOOL: Second Half (?) of the XIV Century

K1915, K1916: Figures 10-13

GROUP OF THE ANNUNCIATION. Columbia, S.C. Columbia Museum of Art (8, 19), since 1962. Full round polychromed wooden statues, hallowed out from the back the opening covered by a board which continues the modelling of the drapery. The Angel: 50 x 15 x 11 in. (127 x 38.7 x 29.2 cm.). Tunic blue, the upper garment red, lined with green; hair dark, flesh colour darkened, the diadem yellow. The polychromy is in poor condition. The wings are wrought iron, old, and probably the original ones; at one time gilt. Base old, with recent inscription Ave gratia plena. The Virgin: 48 x 15 x 11 in. (122 x 38.1 x 29.2 cm.). Tunic red, upper garment blue, lined green(?). The polychromy shows remains of various overpaintings. The base is new. Various cracks and smaller damages at the bottom end of the figure.


The two statues have been attributed to a Florentine sculptor of the second half of the fourteenth century. It has
been pointed out that they recall the art of Andrea Pisano. In Florence no woodcarvings of this style are known, but similar groups of the Annunciation are frequent in Siena and Pisa. Our statues correspond closely to examples of the latter, such as those in the Museo Nazionale in Pisa, in S. Stefano in Pescia, in the Louvre, in the church of Castelfranco di Sotto, in S. Maria Assunta in Montefoscolo and a Madonna in Budapest. These are of varying quality and usually inferior to the marble group in S. Caterina in Pisa from which they all seem to stem. Our group ranks with the more modest ones in Castelfranco di Sotto and the Madonna in Budapest. A related statue of the Virgin and Child was in Palazzo Davanzati in Florence.


**TUSCAN SCHOOL:**

**Third Quarter of the XIV Century**

K1978, K1979: Figures 14, 15

Angel with Tambourine and Angel with Hurdy-gurdy. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1660, 1659), since 1954.¹ Statuettes in darkish marble, with brown stains, 21⅔×8⅓×8⅓ in. (54×21⅔×22½ cm.) and 21⅔×8⅓×7 in. (53⅔×21⅔×17⅔ cm.). Well preserved. K1979 has a nick in one of the folds hanging in front. A small hole in the bottom of each, which could be used for a support, may be of recent date. Cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.


An attribution to Andrea Orcagna has been proposed by W. R. Valentiner,⁵ who groups the two angels together with three others⁶ and a statuette of a standing Madonna.⁷ The two sets of angels, however, are quite different from each other and both differ from the Madonna, so that it is hard to imagine them as originally part of the same monument, unless it was the product of the collaboration of a very heterogeneous group of sculptors. None of the three styles agrees in the least with that of Orcagna and the quality falls short of that of his work. A certain parallel seems to offer itself in four reliefs which are connected with the chapel of the Cintola in the cathedral of Prato,⁸ particularly that of the Assumption of the Virgin. They date from the late fifities of the fourteenth century and are the work of two Siene sculptors, Niccolò di Cocco del Mercia,⁹ and a certain Sano, either his son or pupil,¹⁰ possibly with the collaboration of a Florentine Giovanni di Francesco Fetti.¹¹ They share with the angels the incoherent draperies and the facial types. Technically they are different, in so far as they rely heavily on drill holes for the shadows in hair etc., in the Sienese manner. Their figures move with a Sienese liveliness, while our angels have a Florentine solidity. The lack of real bases and the great depth of the statuettes seems to indicate that they probably stood on top of columnnet or finials of a large decorative complex.¹² The two Angels have a certain interest for the history of musical instruments, particularly of the hurdy-gurdy (ghiordana, organistrum).¹³


NORTH ITALIAN SCHOOLS: XIV CENTURY

BONINO DA CAMPIONE

Lombard School. One of a group of sculptors from Campione (Lake of Lugano) who worked mainly in the various centres of Lombardy. He must have been active mainly in Milan, where he is said to have died in 1379. In 1357 he signed two tombs in Cremona, of which one is preserved. Between 1370 and 1376 he was engaged on the monumental tomb of Canzignorio della Scala in Verona. His style is difficult to define, because he seems to have employed a host of helpers.¹

XII80, XII81: Figures 16-19

JUSTICE AND PRUDENCE. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1647, 1648), since 1954.² Two statuettes in white marble. Dull patina; the surface seems highly waxed. Justice: 25½ x 7½ x 5½ in. (64.7 x 19.7 x 13.9 cm.). Except for damages on the base well preserved. The blade of the sword is missing; it may have been of metal. There is a hole where it was attached. Prudence: 26½ x 7½ x 6 in. (67.7 x 19.5 x 15.2 cm.). The head was broken off and has been reattached. The same is true of the corner of the book. The left forearm has been damaged and repaired and the thumb replaced. Small chips in the folds and the base. Cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.


At one time assigned to the Neapolitan school of the fourteenth century,⁶ they were correctly attributed to Bonino da Campione by Valentiner,⁶ who pointed to the similarities with Bonino's tomb of Folchino degli Schizzi (d. 1357) in S. Agostino da Cremona, which are most persuasive.⁷ On this tomb there are figures of Virtues which correspond iconographically to ours.⁸ The Justice with sword and scales is self-explanatory and there are many parallels for the two- or even three-headed Prudence.⁹

PADUAN (?) SCHOOL: 1321

X1380: Figure 24

MADONNA AND CHILD AND TWO ANGELS. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A 154), since 1945. Marble statue, 33⅓ x 18⅓ x 15⅓ in. (89·5 x 46·6 x 38·8 cm.). Eyes inlaid with lead and the patterned hems of the garments with gilt. On the book the inscription: CONTINENT IN GERMIO (for gremio) CELV(M) TERRA(M) Q(U)RE GENT(E)M VIRGO DEI GENERI TRIX MMCXXXI. (The Virgin, mother of God, holds in her lap Him Who rules heaven and earth, 1321.) The statue is well preserved except that the left back foot of the throne, the angel on the same side and the tip of the curtain held by the other angel have been broken off and put back again, without loss of substance. The crowns had metal fleurons, the holes for which are still extant, and the Child’s crown has two stumps still in place. Exhibited at the National Gallery of Art from January to July 1935 only.


Like some other notable works of art this piece must have come into the chapel of one of the palaces of the Lazara in Padua from one of their chapels in some Paduan church. It bore totally erroneous attributions to the Cosmati or the phantomatic Comacini. Voltenier recognized its North Italian character, pointing, on the other hand, to a strong Central Italian, Pisian influence. A Paduan origin is confirmed by the close similarities between our piece and the central support of the sarcophagus of S. Luca in S. Giustina in Padua of 1316, in which its turn has always been recognized as basically Tuscan in style and belonging to a follower of Nicola Pisano. An attempt to connect the piece with contemporary sculptures in Verona is not convincing. The only real link would be an iconographical detail – the motif of the two angels raising the curtain behind the head of the Madonna – which occurs on a statue of a saint in the museum of Verona and in two fragments in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The size, the full-roundness, the formalism of the representation, the careful, almost precise execution, and the excellent preservation suggest that this statue probably was placed on the altar of a chapel.


VENETIAN SCHOOL: Middle of the XIV Century

X1982 A, B, C, D: Figures 20–23

FOUR FIGURES FROM A TOMB. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1654 to 1657), since 1954. Angle of the Annunciation: 24½ x 9 x 7½ in. (61·6 x 22·8 x 18·1 cm.). Rounded back, plain plinth, marble heavily veined with black. The head, the tips of the wings, the right hand were broken and have been joined again. The halo was damaged; it has been repaired and one piece on top replaced. Virgin of the Annunciation: 24¼ x 8½ x 6 in. (61·9 x 21·3 x 15·3 cm.). Rounded back, plinth with profile. No dark veins in the marble. Thumb and fingertips of left hand lost. A piece of the base with the tip of the left foot broken; rejoined with loss of marble in back. The halo was shattered and has been recomposed; a third at the left is a replacement. Minor damage to the drapery. St Peter: 24½ x 8 x 3¼ in. (61·8 x 21·8 x 8 cm.). Cut out of a marble slab ⅓–1 in. (2·5 cm.) thick. The head and the shoulder were broken and have been carefully fitted together. Slight damage to right hand and to drapery. St Paul: 23½ x 8½ x 3½ in. (60·2 x 21·8 x 8·8 cm.). Cut out of a marble slab, 3–1 in. (2·5 cm.) thick. Uncancelled drill holes in hair and drapery (unlike the other three). The sword is missing; there is a hole where it was inserted. Cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.

many Venetian tombs of the Trecento, with two figures of the Annunciation in niches at the corner of the sarcophagus, two Saints at the sides of a seated Madonna or Christ, sometimes in a niche, which occupied the centre of the long side of the sarcophagus. They have been correctly dated to the fourteenth century. The closest parallel is the tomb of the doge Bartolomeo Gradenigo (d. 1342) in St Mark's in Venice. Slightly earlier are the tomb of Marsilio da Carrara (d. 1338) in S. Stefano in Carrara, Padua and an Annunciation in the Cappella di S. Isidoro in St Mark's. Announcement groups like ours exist in great numbers. The case of our figures would be simple, if Planiscig had not attributed first the angel and then the whole group to his problematical 'Master of the Mascoli Altar', whose oeuvre has been scraped together from various Venetian sculptors of the first half of the fifteenth century; this attribution has since been followed, but cannot be upheld in view of the similarities of our figures to those of the earlier monuments; the great fluency of the drapery is found in the tomb of Guardagnino Avoscan (d. 1335) in the cathedral of Belluno. The figures, which belong to the best of their kind, differ in material and technique and so reveal themselves as products of a vast industry, which furnished such tombs and related monuments.


FLORENTINE SCHOOL: XV-XVI CENTURY

FLORENTINE SCHOOL:
Second Quarter of the XV Century

K1278 : Figures 25-27

MADONNA AND CHILD. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A147), since 1944. Half-length figure in polychromed terracotta, 401/2 x 241/2 x 11 1/2 in. (102.5 x 62.2 x 28.3 cm.). Inscribed on the base: AVES MARIA GRATIA PLENA. The back is formed by a thick wooden plank. The garment of the Virgin is gold with tooled border lined with blue. Underneath the golden sleeves red ones are visible. Hair is gold; the flesh colour and eyes are natural. A ring is painted on the small finger of her left hand. Base:

gold; the inscription tooled on red ground. Condition: fairly well preserved. In some places the colour is missing, e.g. in the fold over the Virgin's right arm. The flesh colour has been renewed at some early time.

it is probably a secondary work, derived from a better one. The proof for this is furnished by a version in stucco, not quite of the same quality, in the Los Angeles Museum. It differs in some motifs: the head of the Child is turned in another direction–not an improvement on our relief; but, more important, the right hand of the Child seize the Virgin's veil, while the same gesture in our relief has no purpose. There must have been a common prototype for both reliefs, more logical and coherent than either. Moreover, there is general disagreement about the attribution of these reliefs; some give them more or less confidently to Ghiberti, others to Quercia, or to Nanni di Bartolfo, the Rosso,10 and recently even to Antonio Federighi,11 while more cautious critics waver12 and seem inclined toward a looser definition, such as the one proposed here.13 Actually its style seems to fit one of the Florentine terracotta workshops better than Siena, where apparently this kind of production was either not practised at all, or only so rarely that almost no examples have survived. A few other such half-length figures have been grouped with our relief, the Berlin Madonna with the sleeping Child being the nearest.14 Next might follow a Madonna in the Museo Bardini.15 To me, a closer parallel seems to be the enthroned Madonna in Detroit,16 and a Madonna from the Volpi, later in the Contini Collection.17 The same style occurs, emaciated and emptied of all grace, in a seated Madonna in Magdeburg.18 The motif is freely imitated in a terracotta formerly in the Lanza Collection.19 Numerous slightly later half-length figures of the Madonna seem to be more or less indebted to the type of our relief.20 Parallels from contemporary painting are Masolino's Madonna in Bremen (1423), Filippo Lippi's Madonna from Tarquinia (1437) and paintings by Francesco d'Antonio, Domenico Veneziano and others.21 It is difficult to tell by which of the two arts this type and similar ones first were formulated. The painter's style is usually more advanced and only that of Francesco d'Antonio can be compared to that of our sculpture.

FLORENTINE SCHOOL:
Second Quarter of the XV Century

K1832 : Figure 28

HALF-LENGTH MADONNA AND CHILD. Tulsa, Okla., Philbrook Art Center, since 1953.4 Terracotta, 28\% x 20 in. (75 x 58 cm.). Polychromy, described in 1910 as well preserved; cloak and veil of Madonna are blue, with golden stars and edge. Dress of Madonna red and golden stars, onto other Madonna types, e.g., the most popular one,9 or has been renewed.2 Base is marbled in purple. Field blue with gold inscription: AVE MARIA (later).

Provenance: E. Volpi, Florence, sold 1897 to Baron Heinrich Tucher, Vienna, Munich.3 Kress acquisition, 1950.

This relief, one of a number of almost identical replicas in terracotta and stucco,4 belongs to a group of Madonna reliefs variously attributed to the 'Master of the Pellegrini Chapel', to Jacopo della Quercia and to Lorenzo Ghiberti. Its closest associate is a similar relief also known in a number of specimens.6 Except for some replicas of well-known marbles,6 no such Madonna reliefs by Quercia are known; the attribution to the Pellegrini Master is long obsolete and that to Ghiberti has gradually been abandoned,7 though these works undeniably betray his influence. An attempt to group around our relief the oeuvre of a 'Master of the Pellegrini Chapel' is unconvincing. Strangely enough the tabernacle in Berlin (Schottmüller, 1st ed., 1913, p. 88 n. 215); The Detroit Institute of Arts (O. Wulff, Berliner Musenm, xxxii, 1922, p. 101, fig. 86); Bologna, Casa Accademici (Venturi, x, 1, p. 146, fig. 113); formerly Carpi, Foresti Collection (Sale Milan, Gal. Pesaro, 12-17, May 1913, n. 606, pl. xxxiii); formerly Bologna, Private Collection (F. Malaguzzi Valeri, Dedalo, iii, 1923/2, p. 362 ill.). Slightly varied: Baiso (Reggio), Scaluccia (A. Venturi, L'Arte, x, 1908, p. 298); Bologna, Museo Industriale (Malaguzzi Valeri, i.e., pp. 346 f. ill.).


References: (1) (W. E. Suida), Paintings and Sculpture of the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, 1953, pp. 68 f.; Donald G. Humphrey, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., s.a., p. 15 (as Ghiberti). (2) For the description of the polychromy see E. W. Braun, Mittheilungen der Bildenden Kunst, v, 1910, pp. 185 ff., fig. 10. (3) C. v. Fabriczy, J.F.K., xxx, 1909, Beilheft, pp. 14 n. 48, 55, 72, fig. 13 (as one of the artists grouped under the name of Master of the Pellegrini Chapel group iv); E. W. Braun, i.e. (same attribution); Not in the catalogue of the Tucher Sale (Berlin, Casriner and Helbling, 8 Dec. 1927); W. v. Bode, Florentiner Bildhauer, 4th ed., Berlin, 1921, p. 55, fig. 16 (as Ghiberti); Schottmüller, 1933, p. 4 n. 134, indicates erroneously Bardini, Florence as provenance. Mentioned by W. R. Valentiner, The Rita Lydig Collection, New York, 1913, p. 27 n. 21, in connection with an unrelated piece. (4) Berlin (Schottmüller, i.e.); Paris, Louvre (G.A.B.A.-, 1903, 1, p. 373); New York, Metropolitan Museum (J. Breck, Catalogue of Romanesque, Gothic and Renaissance Sculpture (The Metropolitan Museum of Art), New York, 1913, p. 14 n. 11); Cleveland, Ohio, Museum of Art (Bulletin, xxvi, 1939, p. 93), formerly Bardini, Florence (Catalogue of the sale, New York, American Art Galleries, 23-27 April 1918, n. 334); formerly Munich, Kronprinz Rupprecht (Phot. K.I.F.); Siena, S. Cristoforo (Phot. K.I.F.); two pieces, whereabouts unknown (Phot. K.I.F.). (5) Berlin (Schottmüller, 1st ed., 1913, p. 88 n. 215); The Detroit Institute of Arts (O. Wulff, Berliner Museen, xxxiii, 1922, p. 101, fig. 86); Bologna, Casa Accademici (Venturi, x, 1, p. 146, fig. 113); formerly Carpi, Foresti Collection (Sale Milan, Gal. Pesaro, 12-17, May 1913, n. 606, pl. xxxiii); formerly Bologna, Private Collection (F. Malaguzzi Valeri, Dedalo, iii, 1923/2, p. 362 ill.). Slightly varied: Baiso (Reggio), Scaluccia (A. Venturi, L'Arte, x, 1908, p. 298); Bologna, Museo Industriale (Malaguzzi Valeri, i.e., pp. 346 f. ill.).

TUSCAN SCHOOL:
Second Quarter of the XV Century

K1934 : Figure 29

MADONNA AND CHILD IN A TABERNACLE. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1665), since 1952.1 Polychromed terracotta relief in wooden tabernacle frame. The relief: 26 x 18 in. (66 x 45.7 cm.), the tabernacle:
Florentine School. Born in Settignano between 1428 and 1431, died in Florence, 16 January 1464, he was the son of a stonemason, Bartolommeo di Francesco, called Ferro. Two of his brothers, Francesco (b. 1413) and Geri (b. 1424), were also sculptors. For a while Desiderio shared a workshop with Geri (before 1458 till 1461?). Desiderio matriculated in the sculptor's guild in 1453, Geri in 1447, Francesco in 1451. It is unknown what the relationship between the brothers actually was. The only one to gain a reputation in his lifetime was Desiderio. The work of the others escapes us, though it presumably must be sought among the many sculptures of heterogeneous style which can be loosely associated with Desiderio's work. It is to be assumed that the two brothers helped Desiderio in the execution of his larger commissions which show discrepancies of style. Nothing is known about Desiderio's training as a sculptor. Vasari called him a pupil of Donatello, whose rilievo schiacciato seems to have been the source for his own relief style. But Donatello was absent in the crucial years. It is possible that Desiderio worked with Bernardo Rossellino. From contemporary sources we learn that Desiderio's works were popularized through painted stucco and probably also terracotta reproductions. He was the most gifted and appealing of the prominent marble sculptors of the fifteenth century in Florence.

**DESIDERIO DA SETTIGNANO**

**KI851 : Figures 30–33**

**TABERNACLE FOR THE SACRAMENT.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1624), since 1952.1 Hexagonal structure on a round pedestal and square base. White marble. Height: 126$\frac{1}{2}$ in. (3217 cm); width: original square base: 18$\frac{1}{2}$ in. (48 cm). For the length of each side of the base of the hexagonal tabernacle (upper moulding of the platform) see fig. 1.
The piece is composed of six elements: (1) The lower base with rosettes; (2) a similarly shaped block decorated on all four sides with heads of cherubim above fruit garlands, to which is attached the chalice-shaped, ornamental stem up to and including the plain abacus; (3) the pedestal, composed of a decorated ovolo moulding and a frieze formed by mouldings; (4) the tabernacle itself up to and including the frieze of the entablature; (5) the dome, including the cornice of the tabernacle's entablature; (6) the lantern. The tabernacle is not of one piece (see fig. 2).

The sides AB and AF of the tabernacle, including the pair of pilasters at A, but excluding the corresponding pilasters at B and F (fig. 3), are worked from a separate piece, carefully joined to the rest. The architrave at the sides FA, AB and BC is worked in separate pieces. The joints between the various parts are well concealed on the outside, yet clearly visible on the inside. The reason for this is clear: it would have been extremely difficult to hollow out a monolithic block so as to obtain an evenly shaped interior. The larger opening for the door seems not to have been planned at the outset and seems to have been achieved by simply taking away the decorated parts which support the coffered arch.

The workmanship is uneven and shows different hands, particularly in the panels with the heads of cherubim. The egg-and-dart moulding of the circular part of the pedestal is smoothly worked on one side – the present front, which is shown here – while on the other there are drill holes. The capitals of the pilasters of the tabernacle proper at D, E and F are of fair quality, while those at B and C are poor; those at A similar to the latter are not much better.

Condition: The lower part of the base seems modern in style and in workmanship. The lantern at least is suspect. The whole structure shows many breaks, which have been mended, and quite a few replacements, which are easily recognizable, e.g. the bases of two pilasters on the corner A. Projecting parts in particular have been broken and nicked; bits of the foliage on the base and the corners of the entablature. All the openings of the tabernacle show multiple breaks, except that between A and B, which has remained intact. The dome is old and almost undamaged. At the time when the piece was recomposed and repaired, it must have undergone a thorough cleaning, so that today it shows a fairly even surface without a real patina. But the sculptural substance does not appear to have been altered. The gilt metal gratings of the openings and the door are modern.2

Provenance: Florence, S. Pier Maggiore3 till 1783, the year in which the church partly collapsed and was pulled down but for the entrance hall.4 A marble worker's shop in Piazza della Madonna, Florence.5 T. Gagliardi, via della Scala, Florence.6 Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna.7 Alphonse de Rothschild, Vienna.8 Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Storeroom.9 Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York. Kress acquisition, 1951.10

The identity of our piece with that formerly in S. Pier Maggiore has always been taken for granted and, though there is no proof for it, it is most probable; such tabernacles were rare and it would be strange if, besides that in S. Pier Maggiore, there had been another one in Florence.11 The attribution to Desiderio da Settignano has been generally accepted, though it rests merely on a passage in Albertini's (not always trustworthy) guide to Florence of 1510,12 from whom Vasari must have taken it.13 C. Baroni has suggested that the piece might be identical with one mentioned in the inventory of Benedetto de Maiano's estate,14 but the size of 3 braccio (68 1/2 in.; 1.74 m.) indicated there contradicts such an identification. Lately Ida Cardellini has expressed strong doubts not only about the attribution but even about the authenticity of the piece.15 It is true that the detailed description given by Bocchi16 and reprinted by Cardellini does not completely tally with our tabernacle. It makes fair sense, however, when we consider that two parts of the original base which must have had the dimensions and the general character of that of Benedetto da Maiano's tabernacle in Siena17 are lost,18 that the present square base is new and that the present lantern on the dome looks like an awkward version of a simpler one, probably also corresponding to that of Benedetto's.19 There is no doubt that the tabernacle was badly damaged,20 and has been recomposed; it is possible that irreparably damaged parts were replaced and that its whole surface must have been thoroughly gone over. However, the fundamental character of the motives and the carving seems to be preserved, and it is hard to see in it a complete later replacement based on fragments like that formerly in the Sambon Collection.20 What could have led a stonemason of the later eighteenth or the nineteenth century to undertake such a surprising reconstruction? The descriptions of the piece after its rediscovery20 vary. A photograph taken by C. Kennedy in 1931 in the Rothschild house in Vienna, and those taken in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna21 prove that at that time the piece was in the same condition as it is now, except for a certain bleaching of the surface. The tabernacle may have been the first of its type and may have initiated a small series of related works,22 depending...
on its authorship and date. The attribution to Desiderio da Settignano cannot completely be trusted\(^{23}\) and it has been set aside in favour of one to Benedetto da Maiano.\(^{24}\) Actually there is little in the general scheme and the ornaments which lends itself to an individual definition. The obvious similarities with Benedetto’s ornaments are explained by the fact that he was not uninfluenced by Desiderio. The relation with Desiderio’s works is difficult to define. To begin with, what was Desiderio’s personal style in ornamental carving, and how can it be separated from that of his numerous helpers whose participation is evident in his major decorative creations? The scale of the ornament on the tabernacle is so much smaller that similar motifs in Desiderio’s larger works, e.g. capitals, are hard to compare. The ornament of the Marsuppini monument is quite different. It is therefore hard to understand how Planiscig\(^{25}\) could have dated the tabernacle before 1453/4, even if he assumed that the tomb was done immediately after Marsuppini’s death in 1453, for which there is no proof. Our piece can more easily be associated with a presumably later work, such as the tabernacle in S. Lorenzo, or rather with work from Desiderio’s wider circle. One might think of the stonemasons who, probably under his guidance, between 1456 and 1467 decorated the building of the Badia in Fiesole,\(^{26}\) among them the young Francesco di Simone Ferrucci.\(^{27}\) Is it really a misreading when Cambiagi in 1765\(^{28}\) names a Gregorio di Settignano as the author of the tabernacle? Or did he know from some source about Gregorio di Lorenzo di Jacopo, who participated in the work at the Badia? He is documented between 1461 and 1473 as an apparently distinguished sculptor.\(^{29}\) His lavabo in the Badia\(^{30}\) is not incompatible with our tabernacle. Even if it is inferior in quality, its decorative detail is comparable. It shows the combination of white and red marble, which Bocchi describes as part of the lost base. Since it is difficult to recognize Desiderio’s own hand in the tabernacle it seems wiser to ascribe it to one of his helpers, though it is not improbable that he furnished the design, though even for that no stylistic comparison can provide conclusive evidence.

Murray, An Index of Attribution Made in Tuscan Sources before Vasari, Florence, 1959, p. 53. (14) C. Baroni, op. cit., p. 94, the inventory printed on p. lxxiii; Milanesi in Vasari, iii, 1878, p. 338. (15) L. Cardellini, Desiderio da Settignano, Milan, 1962, pp. 252 ff., figs. 312-19. In a previous article, Critica d'Arte, iii, 1956, p. 71 she still refers to the tabernacle as a work by Desiderio. The doubt to some extent is shared by Caspary, op. cit., p. 54. The authenticity of the piece, except for the replacements described below, is defended by A. Markham, A.B., xvi, 1964, pp. 242 f. in a review of Cardellini's book. However, A. Markham, on her part, wrongly doubts the authenticity of the dome and the entablature attached to it. (16) L. Dussler, Benedetto da Maiano, Munich, 1924, fig. 17. (17) The parts lost are a square base of white and red marble, two parts of another base in three tiers, which decreased in size from bottom to top, namely, at the bottom, a vessel filled with fruit and with a garland somewhere; the next one with the symbols of the four Evangelists at the corners. The third one with cherubim head is the one preserved. The description is not very clear. The vessel with the fruit and the garland might have resembled one of his most attractive works. It is more difficult, however, to speculate how they found their way into the Vanchettoni Oratory, which was not founded till 1602. (18) As usually assumed, the bust is probably the portrait of a Florentine child. That it was intended also to represent Christ as a child cannot be proved. The drill hole in the crown of the head, which was to hold a halo, may have been made when the bust was paired with Rossellino's bust of St John (K1252). Both busts are not of the same date and they differ in size. It is idle to speculate how they found their way into the Vanchettoni Oratory, which was not founded till 1602. The mutilation of their backs is an indication of how unsuitable they were for their eventual location. They probably come from some private house.


Attributed to

Desiderio da Settignano

(Andrea del Verrocchio ?)

**كسفى** : Figures 36-40

**BUST OF A LADY (SIMONETTA VESPUCCI?)**. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A29), since 1941.1 White marble, 26\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 19\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 7\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. \((66.2 \times 50.8 \times 18.3)\) cm. Good condition; the marble slightly pockmarked; the marks filled in. A chip at the bottom in front. The surface has been smoothed over. Cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.
Provenance: Alessandro Castellani, Rome; Baron Arthur de Schickler, Martinvast, Normandy; Count Hubert de Pourtales, Paris; Duveen’s, New York; C. H. Mackay, Roslyn, Long Island, N.Y.; Duveen’s, New York; Kress acquisition, 1936.

The authorship of the bust is in dispute: it has generally been attributed to Desiderio da Settignano, then tentatively to Verrocchio or even Leonardo da Vinci, and to Benedetto da Maiano, while some critics have preferred simply to express doubts regarding these attributions.

The identity of the sitter is as uncertain, and with it the date of the bust. Isotta da Rimini died in 1470; but the identification of the bust as her portrait has never been fully accepted and the bust really does not look much like her. Suida identified the lady with Simonetta Vespucci and at first dated the bust shortly before her death in 1476 and eventually before the death of Giuliano de’ Medici in 1478. The similarity with the presumed portrait of Simonetta by Ghirlandaio in Ognissanti in Florence is striking, and if the identification could be proved, the bust could not have been done in Desiderio’s lifetime; he died in 1464, when the fashion of the hair, which seems to be that of the fifties and sixties is against this identification, while the lady in the fresco shows a fashion characteristic of a younger generation. But fashions are not a very safe guide to dating. Among the various painted profiles of young ladies with similar features are two which greatly resemble this bust, also in the same fashion: one in the National Gallery in London and a very similar one in the Fisher Collection in Detroit. Their authors, dates and sitters are unknown. The bust is of such quality that the temptation is great to identify the sitter in the circle of the Medici but there is no way of proving her to be one of the more likely candidates.

The style of the bust seems to exclude Desiderio da Settignano as its author. It is difficult to find a parallel for it in the known work of Benedetto da Maiano. The sturdy solidarity of construction of face, body etc. is found rather in certain sculptures by Verrocchio – not the Lady with the Primroses in the Bargello, with which Suida rightly contrasted our bust, but some heads in the Forteguerri monument in Pistoia. The date of the bust in the Bargello is unknown, that of the tomb in Pistoia is 1478. This would tally with the dates for Simonetta Vespucci. Still there is no argument in favour of an identification or attribution which could not be challenged by a valid contradiction.


ANTONIO ROSELLINO

Florentine School. Antonio di Matteo di Domenico Gambrelli, called Bora, was born in Settignano in 1427 and died in 1479 in Florence. Next to his elder brother

References:
Bernardo, who trained him and with whom he shared a workshop, he was the most prominent member of a family of sculptors which included three other brothers, Domenico, Giovanni and Tommaso. His activity, first in co-operation with his brothers, can be followed from 1449 till his death. His first known independent and signed work dates from 1456. He was entrusted with monumental projects first as a member, later as the leader, of the workshop in Florence, and farther afield, in Pistoia, Forli, Empoli, Faenza, Prato, Ferrara, Venice and Naples. He also produced smaller sculptures such as portrait busts and Madonna reliefs. The latter enjoyed great popularity and were widely diffused in replicas in terracotta, stucco, cartapesta and even leather. Rossellino also was greatly indebted to Desiderio da Settignano, whose place he took as the leading marble sculptor in Florence.

**References:**
ANTONIO ROSSELLINO

K1252: Figures 43, 44

ST JOHN THE BAPTIST AS BOY. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A34), since 1941. 1 Marble bust, 13% × 113% × 6 in. (34.7 × 29.8 × 16.1 cm.). In general well preserved despite some damage. Parts of the hair at the back and the shoulders, including the back of the arms, had been mutilated and have been replaced. As in the bust of the Christ Child by Desiderio da Settignano (k1309) an iron loop was cemented into the back, so that the bust could be fastened to a background. 2 Puzzling is the fact that the base is not level, but slightly bevelled towards the child's left. 3 Restored and cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: The same as the bust by Desiderio da Settignano (k1309). 4 Kress acquisition, 1941. 5

At first the bust was regarded as the companion to that by Desiderio da Settignano (k1309) 6 and was attributed to Donatello 7 and later to Desiderio. 8 Fairly early, however, it was realized that the two were not created as a pair and that they might be by different hands and of different dates. Soon the name of Antonio was proposed. 9 These attributions continued for a long time side by side, but it seems that the latter is the prevailing one. Of other attributions, one to G. F. Rustici, under the inspiration of Leonardo da Vinci, 10 is hard to understand; the other, to Benedetto da Maiano, 11 could more easily be reconciled with its style and date. The bust is very close to Rossellino's later work, from the seventies. The head of the statue of St John in the Bargello 12 and such related works as the Morgan bust 13 or the Nori Madonna 14 are similar but heavier and more monumental, and may be later. The Martelli–Widener bust 15 and that in Faenza, 16 if they really are by Rossellino, are more Desideriesque and should be earlier. One of the Bargello busts 17 might be of the same period. Among other comparable works are the Madonna in Sociana, 18 that in Vienna, 19 and the statue of St Sebastian in Empoli, 20 which latter may be somewhat earlier. The mannered hair finds its parallel in the Gulbenkian Madonna in Lisbon, 21 which seems to belong to Rossellino's later period. Of all these works only the Bargello statue of 1477 is securely dated. Their relative order and even the attributions of some of them are conjectural and even controversial. Thus, even if our bust seems to be firmly rooted in Rossellino's oeuvre, its place in his career is uncertain.

After ANTONIO ROSSELLINO

KI251 : Figure 45

**MADONNA AND CHILD, TWO ADORING ANGELS IN THE BACKGROUND.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A53), since 1941.1 Gypsum-plaster based stucco, 27½ x 21½ in. (69.8 x 55.2 cm.). The relief was originally polychromed. An old photograph2 shows it covered with a thick coat of paint, probably the result of many overpaintings, which has been completely removed. The present surface is uneven, in some parts over-smooth, in others time-worn, and in places too precisely contoured by a cutting tool.

In storage at the Gallery since July 1955.


Old stucco squeeze of Antonio Rossellino’s marble in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna,6 which can be dated around 1470. Other replicas are known.7


**Manner of ANTONIO ROSSELLINO (copy)**

KI253 : Figures 46-48

**ST JOHN THE BAPTIST.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A58), since 1941.1 Half-length figure in terracotta, 19¼ x 15½ in. (50.5 x 38.4 cm.). No traces of polychromy; the surface completely rubbed down with the result of a total loss of character. The X-rays show clamps inside.

In storage at the Gallery since July 1955.

**Provenance:** Emile Gavet, Paris.2 William K. Vanderbilt, New York.2 Oliver H. P. Belmont, Newport, Rhode Island.2 Duveen’s, New York.2 Kress acquisition, 1941.3 Exhibited: Baltimore Museum of Art, Baltimore, Md., 1940.4 Boston, Institute of Modern Art, 1941.4

The terracotta corresponds exactly with a marble in the Louvre6 ascribed to Donatello,6 to Desiderio da Settignano,7 Minio da Fiesole,9 and to Antonio Rossellino,9 to whom it seems to be closest, even if probably not by his own hand. There are other similar replicas, a polychromed stucco formerly in the Clarence H. Mackay Collection, now in the Metropolitan Museum,10 a polychrome terracotta in S. Donato a Torri,11 and a terracotta sold in a sale in Rome in 1951.12 The relation of the replicas to the marble is puzzling. If they were taken from the marble, as is generally assumed, at least the terracottas should be smaller by the amount of the shrinkage in baking, while, in fact, all the replicas seem to be slightly larger than the marble. There may have been a lost larger prototype from which the marble as well as the various specimens in stucco and terracotta are derived. Our bust has been taken to be contemporary with the marble,13 but it might be later and perhaps even modern. Two thermoluminescence tests have proved inconclusive.

MINO DA FIESOLE

Florentine School. Mino di Giovanni di Mino was born at Papiano (Casentino) in 1420 and died in Florence in 1484. We do not know who his teacher was. Inspired by the late works of Ghiberti, he developed an independent, often classicizing style parallel to those of Desiderio da Settignano, Rossellino and, later, Benedetto da Maiano, competing with them but never quite equaling them. His earliest known work dates from 1453. He was active off and on in Florence, Naples, Rome and Siena, often engaged in important projects. He employed many helpers and at times collaborated with others, so that his production varies in style and quality, though a certain dryness of design and hardness of execution always characterizes his work. Some scholars, following a hint by Vasari, have even taken a group of works in Rome to be by a sculptor of the same name from Naples, Mino del Reame, whose existence, however, cannot be proved. ¹ Mino's work, scattered over all of Central Italy, includes monumental tombs, altars, tabernacles, small Madonna reliefs and a number of excellent portrait busts and reliefs.

BUST OF THE VIRGIN MARY. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (446), since 1941.² Contoured high relief in marble, 20 × 14 × 5 ½ in. (50.8 × 36.9 × 13.6 cm.). On the base faint traces of the inscription: AVE MARIA GRATIA PLENA. The back at one time had been completed by plaster, so as to render the bust almost full round;³ today it is, as it was originally, flat but not so even that it could easily be set against a flat background. In the back of the head there are remains of an iron loop(?). The right shoulder is turned back, the left one pushed forward, so that the sleeve projects over the base and the relief is much less deep on one side than on the other. This corresponds to the turning of the head. The bust originally may have been a relief of rectangular shape, the whole background of which was taken away, leaving a pseudo free-standing sculpture. A rough edge running around the whole figure would support this view. Such a transformation would have happened very early, as the numerous, almost contemporary copies and imitations all show the bust in its present condition.¹⁰ The marble is without a fault; it has yellowed unevenly and shows some of the usual brownish stains. The piece is well preserved, but for a few nicks at the tip of the nose and on the cheek. No trace of polychromy except the pupils of the eyes and the shadow of the inscription on the base, which must have stood out in colour or gold against the white ground.⁴ Cleared 1956 by J. Ternbach.


This must have been a famous piece, judging from the number of old reproductions in stucco and terracotta which have been preserved.¹⁰ It presents various problems. Its place of origin and an old engraving⁴ have suggested it to be a representation of St. Catherine of Siena (d. 1380). Though numerous critics have endorsed this identification, it is untenable, because the Saint was never represented in ordinary dress but always in the garb of a Dominican nun.¹¹ Others have believed it to be a secular female portrait;¹² this is scarcely possible as the inscription AVE MARIA GRATIA PLENA seems to be old. This inscription,
however, does not necessarily make the bust that of a Virgin of the Annunciation, as is often said; it occurs under innumerable representations of the Madonna and Child. There seems to be no reason to assume that the Virgin occur in so many replicas? The most probable interpretation so far proposed is that of a Madonna Addolorata. There are half-length figures of her in relief, with the bust of a Man of Sorrows as companion, by the Master of the Marble Madonnas. The motif is not without Northern parallels and inspirations.

The inscription of the old engraving says that the bust was carved by Jacopo della Quercia after a deathmask of St Catherine, which he had taken in Rome in 1380. L. Courajod has disposed of this legend and has proposed an attribution to the school of Mino da Fiesole. Bode and others follow him more or less conditionally. Other attributions proposed are those to Neroccio di Bartolomeo Landi and to Giovanni di Stefano. The ambiguous character of the piece, as neither entirely Florentine nor entirely Sienese, has often been pointed out; it has led to suspended judgements, to proposals that the bust is the work of a Sienese follower of Mino, and to the more acceptable suggestion that Mino worked here in the spirit of a Sienese tradition. Indeed, Mino probably fairly early in his career must have been active in Siena, possibly only for a short time. Already Courajod noticed striking similarities between the Kress bust and a Madonna relief in the Louvre. The latter is most likely a copy by Mino of a now lost Madonna which Donatello had done in Siena. Mino could have worked there after or on his return from an early stay in Naples. Donatello’s Madonna must have been done between 1457 and 1459. Around 1455, certainly before 1458, Mino had done a portrait relief of King Alphonso of Aragon, now in the Louvre, which is very much in the style of our bust and that of the Madonna in the Louvre. Thus the evidence seems to indicate in our bust a work by Mino done in Siena in the late fifties. A female bust in marble in the museum of Lyon almost looks like a companion to ours, but it differs in style. It seems to be a slightly later work inspired by it.

as evidence. (12) P. Misciatelli, La Diana, II, 1927, pp. 228 f. (13) It occurs on a reliquary of the Virgin, by Cristoforo de Rocchi of 1403 in Zara (C. Cecchelli, Zara (Catalogo delle cose d'arte e di antichità d'Italia), Rome, 1932, p. 77). (14) Pietro Rossi, Rassegna Nazionale, 1904, offprint, p. 7. The isolated half-figures of the Annunciate, pointed out by M. Baxandall, Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy, Oxford, 1972, p. 53 have quite a different character. (15) U. Middeldorf, in Album Anonimo J. E. Van Gelder, The Hague, 1973, p. 235 n. 4. (16) K. Smits, De Iconografie van de Nederlandse Primitieven, Amsterdam, 1933, p. 157 f. (17) Courajod, loc., pp. 10 ff. (18) W. v. Bode, Italianische Bildhauer der Renaissance, Berlin, 1887, p. 185 quotes Courajod without mentioning the attribution; the same, Denkmalä, 1882-95, p. 121, pl. 395a (reproduction of the stucco in the Louvre with caption: Bust in marble, as St Catherine). (19) Mostra dell'antica arte sensese, 1904, l.c. (with question mark as Madonna Addolorata or St Catherine); Corrado Ricci, l.c. (with question mark as St Catherine or the Virgin); A. J. Rusconi, Revue de l'Art, xvi, 1904, pp. 143 f. (not St Catherine); A. Prétat, Les Arts, iii, 1904, n. 34, p. 20, manner of Mino (the Virgin); D. Angeli, Mino da Fiesole, Florence, 1905, pp. 65, 146 n. 31 (St Catherine); W. v. Bode, Letter of 1913, in: W. R. Valentiner, The C. H. Mackay Collection, l.c. (Virgin of Annunciation and probably had a companion piece); P. Vitry, l.c., workshop of Mino (female bust); R. Corrisotto, The Painter's Craft, New York, 1931, pp. 463, 472; F. Rossi, Museo dei calechi in gesso, R. Intituto d'Arte in Firenze, Catalogo, Florence, 1933, p. 43 n. 1241, follower of Mino (St Catherine; the 1953/56 edition of this catalogue, p. 72 n. 1159 has the same); N.G. Prelin. Cat., 1941, p. 299 (St Catherine); G. Swarzenski, 1943, p. 194 (Mino after a Sienese model [St Catherine]); Duvene Sculpture, 1944, n. 123 ff (Virgin of the Annunciation); B. Berenson, quoted in Duvene Sculpture, n. 125, has revised a former opinion (see below); R. Julian, La sculpture du moyen-âge et de la Renaissance, Catalogue du Musée de Lyon, Lyon, 1945, p. 152, manner of Mino (une Ste. Catherine mondanisée); R. L. Douglas, B.M., lxxxvii/viii, 1945, p. 223 (Virgin of Annunciation); Kress Coll. Cat., 1945 (1949), p. 183 and 1939, p. 407 (Virgin of the Annunciation); J. B. Eggen, Mouseion, vol. lVII/VIII, n. III-IV, 1946, p. 80; G. Galassi, La scultura fiorentina del Quattrocento, Milan, 1949, p. 186, pl. 236b (so-called St Catherine); C. Seymour, Masterpieces, 1949, pp. 16, 95-7, 177 (Virgin of Annunciation, possible with a companion piece); J. Pope-Hennessy, B.M., xcix, 1957, p. 98 (so-called Virgin Annunciate, ascribed to Mino); G. Coor, Neroccio di Landi, Princeton, 1961, p. 208 (St Catherine); G. C. Sciolla, Critica d'Arte, xv, fasc. 96, 1968, pp. 39 f. (St Catherine); G. C. Sciolla, La scultura di Mino da Fiesole, Turin, 1970, pp. 51, 116, 132 (St Catherine); G. Fioceo, ms. opinion, R. Longhi, ms. opinion (a female saint); W. Suida, ms. opinion (Madonna); A. Venturi, ms. opinion (St Catherine). (20) Mary Logan, G.d.B.-A., xxxii, 1904, 2, pp. 202 ff. (Virgin of Annunciation); F. Mason Perkins, B.M., v, 1904, p. 581 (St Catherine); B. Berenson as quoted by Perkins and R. L. Douglas, The Nineteenth Century, Nov. 1904; P. Rossi, l.c. (Madonna Addolorata); the same, Rassegna d'Arte Sensese, v, fasc. 12/2, 1909, p. 32 n. 1 (St Catherine); L. Ferretti, l.c., p. 12 n. 8 (St Catherine); P. Misciatelli, l.c. (portrait of a lady); W. R. Valentiner, see note 7 (Neroccio under the influence of Mino, as Virgin of the Annunciation); L. Mallé, l.c. (St Catherine). (21) P. Schubring, Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft, xxvII, 1904, p. 474 (St Catherine); the same, Die Plastik Siens im Quattrocento, Berlin, 1907, p. 149 (St Catherine); Julius Rodenberg, Die heilige Katharina von Siena und ihre Darstellung in der Sienesischen Kunst, Bremen, 1910, p. 54; A. Pit, Münchner Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst, vii, 1912, p. 54; P. Schubring, Die Italianische Plastik des Quattrocento, Berlin, 1919, p. 185 (St Catherine); Schottmüller, 1933, pp. 88 f. n. 185 (Female bust). (22) G. Poggi, Emporium, xx, 1904, pp. 34, 41 (as Madonna or St Catherine); R. L. Douglas, The Nineteenth Century, l.c.; L. M. Richter, Zeitchrift für Bildende Kunst, xvi, 1905, pp. 100 ff., 106 (Madonna); B.C.K. in Th.B., xiv, 1921, p. 145 (St Catherine); H. Lange, Mino da Fiesole, Greifswald, 1928, p. 112 (St Catherine); W. R. Valentiner (see note 7) heads his entry 'Mino da Fiesole' with his biography and in the text pleads for an attribution to Neroccio under Mino's influence. The opinions of A. Santangelo, Catalogo delle sculture (Museo di Palazzo Venezia), Rome, 1954, p. 13 (Virgin of the Annunciation) with attribution to the master of the tomb of Pius II, and of E. Rhumer, Pantheon, l.c., p. 202 (St Catherine) to Antonio di Gregorio (an artist active in Ferrara) are erratic. (23) Venturi, vi, 1908, pp. 666 f. (St Catherine); F. F. Mason Perkins, in a ms. opinion, revising his earlier attribution to Neroccio (St Catherine). (24) Swarzenski, 1943, p. 294; C. Seymour, l.c., p. 177; G. C. Sciolla, l.l.c. (25) l.c., pp. 11 f. (26) See the text for x8590. This type of the Madonna is found also later in Mino's workshop: the Strozzino Madonna in Cleveland (Selected works, The Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 1966, n. 122); R. L. Douglas, B.M., lxxxvii/viii, 1945, p. 222 and a Madonna formerly in the A. Sambon Collection (Sale, Paris, Petit, 25-28 May 1914, n. 402). A provincial derivation is a relief in Hartford (Wadsworth Athenæum Bulletin, Spring 1957, pp. 10 ff); C. Seymour, as quoted in the article had already noticed the similarity of its ear with that of our bust. (27) W. R. Valentiner, Art Quarterly, 1, 1938, pp. 77 ff. and vii, 1944, pp. 154 ff; the same, Studies of Italian Renaissance Sculpture, London, 1950, pp. 73 ff. (28) E. Carli, Donatello a Siena, Rome, 1967, pp. 25 ff.; V. Herzner, Mitteilungen des K.I.F., xv, 1971, pp. 161 ff. (29) W. R. Valentiner, Art Quarterly, 1, p. 69, fig. 4; G. C. Sciolla, La scultura, l.c., p. 84, fig. 4. (30) Courajod, l.c., p. 13; R. Jullian, l.c. From the collection of Charles Stein. Against the suggested Sienese origin of the bust speaks the fact that a replica or cast exists in Florence, in the entrance of a Strozzi palace, via Ghibellina 102 (W. v. Bode, Italianische Portraitsculpturen, op. cit., pp. 32 f).
Workshop of MINO DA FIESOLE
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ARCH. Coral Gables, Fla., Joe and Emily Lowe Art Gallery, University of Miami, since 1961.1 Marble, 43\frac{3}{8} \times 81\frac{1}{2} \text{ in.} (110 \times 208 \text{ cm}). The arch is composed of two pieces, which meet at the top. It is decorated with cusps, the top two of which were broken and have been put back. The framing cyma turns at a right angle at the bottom. There is probably one cusp missing at each side at the bottom; and the arch originally was a full half-circle. In the spandrels the half-figures of the Annunciation in medallions. The back is flat but left rough. The marble has a dark grey patina.

Provenance: S. Maria Maggiore in Rome.2 Alfredo Barsanti, Rome.1 Jacob Hirsch, New York. Kress acquisition, 1952.1

The arch was part of the sumptuous altarpiece ciborium which Mino da Fiesole erected in S. Maria Maggiore in Rome for the Cardinal Guillaume d'Estouteville, archbishop of Rouen and archpriest of S. Maria Maggiore.3 A print in which the appearance of the now dismantled structure has been preserved shows clearly at the front towards the nave our arch with its roundels of the Annunciation.4 The draughtsman has reduced the number of the cusps. It is unlikely that any other monument of the period had similar arches. They are such an exception in Rome that E. Lavagnino even has doubted the Roman origin of the piece and placed it in the north of Italy.5 The idea of connecting the arch with the altars of Guillaume des Perriers1 must be the result of a confusion between the two French cardinals. The ciborium was dismantled towards the middle of the eighteenth century. Some of its reliefs are still in the church, a beautiful Madonna relief is in the Cleveland Museum.6 Ours is the only decorative element which it has been possible to identify so far. The ciborium was signed on the entablature opus MINI KI255 : Figure 53

RINALDO DELLA LUNA. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (155), since 1941. Bust solidly cast in cement on a wooden base. Bust alone: 14\frac{3}{4} \times 16 \times 7\frac{1}{8} \text{ in.} (36\times40\frac{7}{8} \times 18\frac{1}{8} \text{ cm}). Base alone: 4\frac{1}{8} \times 17\frac{1}{8} \times 7\frac{1}{8} \text{ in.} (11\frac{7}{8} \times 45\frac{1}{4} \times 19\frac{7}{8} \text{ cm}). Combined height 18 in. (45\frac{7}{8} \text{ cm}). The receding strip at the bottom, which in the Bargello marble carries the inscription, is let into the base. The surface is finished to imitate terracotta or a darkened stucco. Excellent condition. In storage at the Gallery since July 1955.

Provenance: Ugo Jandolo, Rome.1 Duveen's, New York.1 Kress acquisition, 1941.2

The close relation of the bust with the marble of 1461 in the Bargello3 is evident, but has been variously interpreted: the bust has been taken to be a model for the marble,4 or a contemporary replica5 or a modern forgery.6 The material and the fact that the bust shows traces of the break which goes across the left shoulder of the marble seem to speak in favour of the latter view.

The Bargello bust has found other recent imitators. There is a marble copy in a private collection in Germany;7 a suspicious-looking terracotta has been published as its model.8 Rinaldo della Luna is sometimes styled Count, but he belonged to a Florentine patrician family, members of which were priori and gonfalonieri; one was an architect.9 They seem to have belonged to the guild of the speziali. At one time the chapel in S. Maria Novella which later belonged to the Gondi was theirs.10 Our bust can furnish new arguments for the debate whether the inscription of the marble is genuine.11 Probably the marble originally had a wooden base; the recessed strip at the bottom would probably have been inserted therein; such a base would have given the bust a more normal proportion than it has now. The inscription, the lettering of which is in perfect character with the period, would thus have been hidden but this is quite in keeping with the fact that all inscriptions on Renaissance busts are hidden inside or underneath.

References: (1) The Samuel H. Kress Collection. A catalogue of European painting and sculpture. (The Joe and Emily Lowe Art Gallery of the University of Miami), Coral Gables, Fla., 1961, pp. 95 f. (as A Bregno). (2) See below. (3) D. Gnoli, Archivio Storico dell'Arte, III, 1890, pp. 89 ff; G. Biasotti, Rassegna d'Arte, V, 1918, pp. 52 ff; S. A. Callisen, A.B., XVIII, 1936, pp. 401 ff; G. C. Sciolla, La scultura di Mino da Fiesole, Turin, 1970, pp. 23 ff. (4) Gnoli, l.c., fig. 1; Biasotti, l.c., fig. 10; Sciolla, op. cit., fig. 14. (5) Ms. opinion. Indeed such cusped arches are found in Genoa and Liguria, but they are different in character. (6) Selected Works (The Cleveland Museum of Art), 1966, pl. 122. (7) Biasotti, l.c., p. 54. (8) This is not the place to enter the discussion about the phantom Mino del Reame. It is puzzling that F. Schottmiller (Th.B., xxiv, 1930, p. 580) could deny Mino's authorship of the ciborium. See U. Middeldorf, Art Bulletin, xx, 1938, p. 115 n. 15. Recently Jacopo della Pila has been proposed, though unconvincingly, as helper on Mino's ciborium (Sciolla, op. cit., p. 25).

Copy after MINO DA FIESOLE
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**MASTER OF THE MARBLE MADONNAS**

Florentine School. Conventional name introduced by W. v. Bode\(^1\) under which is gathered a group of sculptures, mainly reliefs of the Madonna, busts of children and heads of Christ Crowned with Thorns, which are not all by the same hand. They are found in Tuscany and Urbino and betray the influence of Desiderio da Settignano, Antonio Rossellino and Mino da Fiesole. They resemble the latter's work in technique, character and quality. Whoever the leader of this group of sculptors was, his career must have been parallel to that of Domenico Rosselli (1439-1497)? In 1922 De Nicola\(^2\) proposed to identify him with Tommaso Fiamberti, a Lombard active in Cesena, Forlì and Ravenna between 1498 and 1524/25. In 1933 J. Balogh\(^3\) proposed instead the name of Giovanni Ricci, another Lombard, who was active in the same towns between 1470 and 1535, and who is known to have done together with Fiamberti the tomb of Luffo Numai (d. 1502) in S. Pellegrino (Chiesa de’ Servi) in Forlì. However, no connection can be traced except that the sculptures of the Numai tomb resemble some of the more debased and probably latest productions of this workshop. Another work that is similarly on the fringe is a Madonna relief in Hungary.\(^4\) The workshop must have operated between 1470 and 1500.\(^5\)


**MADONNA AND CHILD with four cherubim heads in the background.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1652), since 1954.\(^6\) Marble relief, 34\(\frac{3}{4}\) × 25\(\frac{3}{4}\) × 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (88 × 64\(\frac{3}{4}\) × 21\(\frac{3}{4}\) cm.). The surface has lost its precision through overcleaning. Some damage on the right knee of the Child, in the folds over the upper arm of the Virgin, to the face of the Cherub at the left; cleaned 1955 by J. Tembach.

**Provenance:** Conte Bombicci-Pontelli, Florence.\(^7\) Conti-
must belong to its outmost fringe. It has been said that the composition is influenced by Antonio Rossellino. In the last analysis it is derived from Desiderio’s Madonna on the Marsuppini tomb. Reversed, it corresponds not badly with a marble in the Bargello and a corresponding stucco in Palazzo Davanzati, with Antonio Rossellino’s Madonna, Kress 1936, and that by Benedetto da Maiano, Kress 1976.


FRANCESCO DI SIMONE FERRUCCI

Florentine School. Born 1437 in Fiesole; died on 27 March 1493 in Florence. Member of a family of sculptors and stonemasons which was active from the fifteenth till the eighteenth century. He may have learned the elements of his craft from his father Simone di Nanni; however, the main influence on his art were first Desiderio da Settignano and later Verrocchio. His style is eclectic and not stable; and it has to be assumed that in the larger decorative enterprises he worked together with others, such as his brother Bernardo, of whom no independent work is known. Francesco eventually became wealthy as the head of a shop which turned out figural and decorative work, and probably also dealt in stone. He became more popular outside of Florence and worked in or for Prato, Bologna, Forlì, Montefiorentino (Pesaro), Perugia etc.
cessed in a moulded border, with concave ground; the back is correspondingly convex. Diameter 24 1/2 in. (62.2 cm.). Condition: fair; too well cleaned.


The relief by common agreement is by Francesco di Simone Ferrucci,3 on the strength of its close relationship with the tomb of Alessandro Tartagni (d. 1477) in S. Domenico in Bologna, which is signed by the artist. The pose and the head of the Madonna, her drapery and in the main also the Child correspond to those of the figure of Charity on the tomb.4 Another version of the Charity is the so-called Madonna Bianca in Ancarano.5 A third, smaller (55 cm. high) and clumsier version of the Charity figures occur as Fortitude among four statuettes of Virtues in the Musée Jacquemart-André in Paris (n. 850). W. R. Valentiner6 suggested that our Madonna, the statuettes in Paris and a relief of a woman dying in childbirth in the Bargello are fragments of a tomb which Verrocchio made for Francesca Tornabuoni.7 Dario Covi questioned this with good reasons, to which may be added: a full-length seated Madonna in a tondo would be most unusual in a Florentine tomb of the period; the size is considerably less than that of the usual Madonna tondi (that of the Tartagni tomb has a diameter of 90 cm.)6 the marble is rather thin (11 cm.) and smoothed at the back, which makes it unsuitable for insertion into a large complex; it would be strange if in one monument the same figure had occurred twice in different functions. Our piece - like the stucco replicas9 of it, which seem to be as frequent as those of the Tartagni Madonna - must have served for private devotions. The four marble versions differ in details and were probably all carved independently from the same clay model (by Verrocchio?). The stuccos are taken from our specimen.


Benedetto da Maiano

Florentine School. Benedetto di Leonardo d'Antonio was born in 1442, probably in Maiano, as the son of a woodworker and stone-mason, and died in Florence in 1497. With his brothers, Giuliano, the famous architect, and Giovanni (d. 1478), he probably was brought up in the workshop of his father. He may have had some training under Antonio Rossellino and he finished Desiderio's wood statue of St Mary Magdalen in S. Trinita. At first he was active in the family business of precious carved and inlaid furniture. This had its effect on his exquisite decorative taste, which the association with his brother Giuliano must have confirmed. As a marble sculptor, he was the successful rival and eventually heir of Antonio Rossellino, executing large commissions in Florence, Arezzo, Siena, Prato, Loreto, S. Gimignano, and Naples, where he completed work begun by Rossellino. He carved portrait busts and smaller sculpture, of which the Madonna reliefs were most popular, judging from the great number of surviving replicas in terracotta, stucco, and cartapesta. Benedetto was the leading marble sculptor of his generation in Florence. Two of his sons, Giovanni and Giuliano, also were sculptors, but were too young at the time of his death to have shared in his work.

MADONNA AND CHILD. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1661), since 1954.1 Marble relief, 22 1/2 x 15 1/2 x 3 1/2 in. (58.2 x 38.7 x 9.8 cm.). The marble has the typical brown stains found also in other marbles of the Quattrocento. Excellent condition. Cleaned and mounted in a new marble frame with base in 1956 by J. Ternbach.


The relief has been attributed to Antonio Rossellino5, 4, 6 from whose style it is obviously derived, and to Benedetto da Maiano,5, 7 an early work of whom it might easily be. The relation with 5156 is quite obvious. On the other hand
the greater weight of the figures, their plumper forms and bulging surfaces, their greater intimacy and the mellowness of the design are characteristic of Benedetto's art. The closest parallel, though slightly matuer, is his Madonna over the altar of the Chapel of S. Fina in the Collegiata in San Gimignano (1475). A great many replicas exist in various techniques, even in maiolica; a free version in terracotta, extended at the bottom, was in the Lippmann Collection.


After Benedetto da Maiano

Madonna and Child. Madison, Wis., the Elvehjem Art Center, University of Wisconsin Kress Study Collection (accession number 61.4.12), since 1961. Marble relief, tondo. Diameter 26 in. (67.7 cm.). Condition: good except for some small damage at the edge and the missing tips of three fingers of the Child's right hand.

Provenance: A convent in Gubbio(?). 2 Max Lyon, Paris 2 Duveen's, New York. 3 Kress acquisition, 1942. 4 Exhibited: National Gallery of Art (1419), Washington, D.C., 1943-1960. 5 An attribution to Antonio Rossellino has been replaced by one to Benedetto da Maiano on the strength of the correspondence of the piece with the tondo on the tomb of Filippo Strozzi in S. Maria Novella in Florence (still unfinished in 1491). 6 The correspondence is very close; there are some slight variations, but these are barely noticeable. A marble of the same Madonna in Scarperia shows greater differences and does not follow the style of the original of the Strozzi tomb so closely. There are replicas in various materials of the Strozzi tondo 6 and of the Scarperia tondo; there are also replicas which reproduce the composition only in a generalized way. 7 But there do not seem to be any replicas of our relief, which could be an indication of a comparatively late date for it, 8 when the fashion for such reproductions was over, possibly the early sixteenth century, in which the slightly Nazarene reduction of the style of the original would be possible. 9 An origin in the nineteenth century could not be excluded either, 10 and indeed, has been suggested, though it would then be hard to account for the liveliness and quality of the piece.

Certain small holes on various parts of the surface might be an indication that a pointing apparatus has been used.

ANTONIO POLLAIUOLO

Florentine School. Antonio di Jacopo d'Antonio Benci (del Pollaiuolo) born in Florence 1431/32, died in Rome 1498. Apparently he had his first training as a goldsmith; as a painter he was influenced by Andrea del Castagno. He worked with his younger brother Piero and a number of other masters. He was active practically in all branches of art. His chief claim to fame, besides his paintings and drawings, are the few surviving goldsmith works, the monumental bronze tombs in St Peter's in Rome and a few outstanding bronze statuettes. He excelled in the drawing of the nude, particularly in movement, and showed great mastery in his meticulous metal technique.

In the style of ANTONIO POLLAIUOLO: XIX century

K1307: Figure 54

BUST OF A WARRIOR. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A49), since 1941. Terracotta, $24\frac{3}{4} \times 21\frac{3}{8}$ in. (62.4 X 55.4 cm.). In storage at the Gallery since July 1955.

Provenance: L. C. Timbal, Paris.2 Count E. de Pourtales, France.2 Baron Arthur de Schickler, Martinvast, Normandy.2 C. H. Mackay Collection, Roslyn, Long Island, N.Y.3 Duveen's, New York.3 Kress acquisition, 1939.4

Traditionally the bust has been ascribed to Antonio Pollaiuolo and identified occasionally as the portrait of a mythical Ugolino della Gherardesca or as a model for a portrait of Virginio Orsini, which was planned in 1494.7 There is no foundation for either assumption. Recent opinion is inclined to consider the bust a modern forgery.5 Indeed the armour is neither that of the period nor the idealized, classical one occasionally used for Quattrocento portraits. The small figure of a nude woman on the breastplate looks particularly out of place. The expression of the face has the forced quality introduced by G. Bastianini. Despite its inconsistencies this is a creditable piece of historicizing sculpture of the nineteenth century. A similar bust, equally suspect, seems to be by a different hand.8


FLORENTINE SCHOOL:

Late XV Century

K602: Figure 61

STANDING PUTTO HOLDING A SHIELD. New York, N.Y., Mrs Rush H. Kress. Polychromed stucco, 20½ in. high (52.7 cm.). Naturalistically painted. Hair is brown; flesh tones natural. Frame of the shield is dark green, ground under the feet the same. The branch is dark green with red fruit. Condition: the polychromy partly worn, partly chipped, partly gone over. The coat of arms in the shield has been removed.


The original attribution was to Antonio Rossellino. To be compared with a glazed terracotta putto in Berlin which differs only in the movement of the left arm. Both hold a shield in one hand and in the other fruit, which is difficult to identify. Child figures of this type, either standing, also to be identified. The so-called sketch book of Verrocchio, which must be by an imitator of his, possibly Francesco di Simone Ferrucci, shows two such putti holding shields, one of whom is placed on a cornice of a piece of furniture. Such putti must have been fairly common; they were made.
for newel posts of staircases,6 in pairs probably on top of mantelpieces, etc. In church furniture they are placed on railings, as in the Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini, and on tombs.7 A pair of similar statuettes, holding a garland, is included in an elaborate ensemble with the Annunciation in Robbia technique in S. Frediano in Lucca.8

References: (1) Photograph in the archive of the palazzo. (2) Schottmüller, 1933, p. 80 n. 2433. (3) Berenson, 2783. G. Passavant, *Verrocchio*, London, 1969, p. 193, Cat. D 10, figs. 98, 99. (4) Two sheets in the Louvre (Archives Photographiques 7554+7245). On the problem of these drawings see A. E. Popham and P. Pouncey, *Italian Drawings . . . in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, London, 1950, pp. 38 ff. (5) See J.P.H., Cat. V.A.M., pp. 171 ff. n. 145. (6) As in two pictures in the Uffizi, attributed to Sellaio (Alinari 30716/17), one of which is reproduced in P. Schubring, *Cassone*, Leipzig, 1923, pl. lxxxvi, n. 370. (7) Desiderio’s tomb of Marsuppini seems to offer the first example, even if the *putti* there are added as an afterthought and might originally have been employed for some domestic decorative purpose. (8) Alinari 8209. A. Marquand, *The Brothers of Giovanni della Robbia*, Princeton, 1928, pp. 181 ff. says that they are partly in plaster, that is, probably heavily restored.

**LUCA DELLA ROBBIA**

Florentine School. Luca di Simone di Marco was born 1399 or 1400 in Florence and died there on 23 February 1482. One of the leading sculptors of the century, he began working in marble and bronze and developed eventually as a speciality the coloured and glazed terracotta sculpture, which was to become highly successful and was practised till the middle of the sixteenth century by him, his family and immediate successors. He sided with Ghiberti and Michelozzo rather than with Donatello, with whom he was in open competition—in various works for the cathedral in Florence. He developed a classical style, which changed very little during his life-time and which lent itself well to commercial workshop production. Except in the most prominent works, it is almost impossible to separate his contribution from that of his helpers. Some of his most charming creations must have been in demand for a long time. Contrary to common opinion, his ‘secret’ was never lost, but was later imitated in pottery centres like Faenza and has been used sporadically in Florence up to the present.

**Workshop of LUCA DELLA ROBBIA**

**K42 : Figure 62**

**MADONNA AND CHILD. Tulsa, Okla., Philbrook Art Center, since 1953.**1 Glazed terracotta roundel. The back is typical for a squeeze. Diameter 12½ in. (32 cm.). The richly carved and gilt wood frame might be the original one. The half-length figure of the Madonna glazed in white stands against an opaque pale-blue ground. An earlier photograph shows that a piece of the veil over the Virgin’s head was missing; this has been replaced. The background has been retouched to conceal a number of cracks visible in the old photograph. Restored are: the halo and most of the hair of the Virgin, the halo of the Child, left side of the throat of the Virgin, the veil seized by the Child up to the large fold which sweeps down from the Virgin’s head; right toe of the Child, the noses of the Virgin and the Child; the background behind the heads. The damages must have been superficial, perhaps only affecting the glaze, as the back shows no evidence of restoration.

**Provenance:** S. Bardini, Florence.2 Unknown owner.3 Contini-Bonacossi, Rome. Kress acquisition, 1929. Exhibited: Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A34), 1941.4

This composition exists in a number of replicas, the best known of which is in Palazzo Corsini in Florence.5 The type has been attributed to Luca della Robbia himself, by M. Reymond,6 P. Schubring,7 W. v. Bode,8 O. Wulf,9 A. Foratti,10 to the workshop of Luca by A. Marquand.3 Our piece has been ascribed to Luca himself, by R. Longhi, G. Fiocco, R. Van Marle, W. Suida and A. Venturi,11 to his workshop by F. F. Mason Perkins and G. Swarzenski.11 There is no certainty about the date. Reymond sets it at about 1470; Foratti points to a certain weakness which he ascribes to the decline of the artist’s powers; however, it may equally well be the sign of a workshop production. Bode6 and Suida1 proposed an earlier date, before or around 1450. Actually it seems that the general motif is still close to the Florentine Madonnas in terracotta, which are generally dated in the second quarter of the century, so that the presumed original might well have represented Luca’s style at an early stage, while its execution, particularly in its present commercialized shape, certainly is later and virtually undatable.


Workshop of LUCA DELLA ROBBIA
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THE NATIVITY. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A162) since 1946. Relief in glazed terracotta, 224 × 183\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (56.5 × 47.9 cm). Set into a modern (?) stone tabernacle. The figures are glazed in white, the eyes blue and manganese, the ground opaque blue; the clouds shaded in blue and white, the crib manganese; the earth greyish green. The straw in the crib and the vegetation in front are green. The relief has been broken into many pieces and put together again with much repainting. The breaks affect mainly the draperies of Joseph and Mary. Some parts, such as the upper right corner and the manger with the Child, seem to have been completely broken off. The heads and hands, the Child and the animals seem to be mainly intact. Restored 1956 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: Art Market, Paris.\(^2\) Otto H. Kahn, New York.\(^3\) Duveen's, New York. Kress acquisition, 1946.\(^5\) The relief has been associated with three others of the same subject, and of similar size and style, in the National Museum in Munich,\(^4\) in the Kaiser Wilhelm Museum in Krefeld (from the Beckerath Collection)\(^5\) and in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, Mass. (from the Quincy Adams Shaw Collection).\(^6\) The group has been ascribed to Luca della Robbia and variously dated.\(^7\) Marquand considers the relief to be the work of pupils.\(^8\) Maud Cruttwell listed them as by Andrea della Robbia and his workshop.\(^9\) Considering that our group of reliefs is inseparable from another, which is given by Marquand to a pupil of Luca to whom he ascribes the relief in Boston,\(^10\) that these representations find their immediate echo in Andrea della Robbia,\(^11\) and that in two of them the Virgin is turned towards the left, as was Andrea's habit,\(^12\) Marquand's suggestion still seems to be the most acceptable one, and need not exclude the participation of Andrea. The uncertainty of the dating also indicates that the reliefs do not fit unequivocally into Luca’s oeuvre. Our relief shows weaknesses of composition: the awkward position of St Joseph, the unskilful placing of the flying angels in the background, one of whom points, as if talking to the shepherds; these are incongruities which characterize a secondary, eclectic work. Our relief and that in Munich, to judge from their original frames,\(^2,4\) must have served for private devotion.

References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 167; Ill. 1968, p. 146 (as Luca della Robbia). (2) Bode, Denkmäler, pp. 177, 228; pl. 548b; the same, Zeit­schrift für Bildende Kunst, 1909/10, pp. 306 f., fig. 3, reproduces and describes a gilt wood carved tabernacle 'Similar to Michelozzo' which he considers the original frame. (3) A. Marquand, Della Robbia in America, Princeton, 1912, p. 16 n. 5, fig. 7; W. v. Bode, Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz, II, 1912, p. 75; A. Marquand, Luca della Robbia, Princeton, 1914, pp. 221 f. n. 62, fig. 145. (3a) Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 408 (as Luca della Robbia). (4) Bode, Denkmäler, p. 78, pl. 193a (with a contemporary gilt wooden frame). (5) Zweiter Bericht des Städtischen Kaiser Wilhelm Museums in Krefeld, Krefeld, 1904, p. 14. pl. 1; A. Marquand, Luca della Robbia, pp. 219 f. n. 61, fig. 144. (6) Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin, XVI, Boston, April 1918, n. 94, pp. 22 ff.; A. Marquand, Luca della Robbia, pp. 268 f. n. 122, fig. 182. (7) Bode, Ill.c. (early; middle period; late); the same, Florentiner Bildhauer, 4th ed. Berlin, 1921, p. 156 (forties and fifties); P. Schubring, Luca della Robbia, Bielefeld, 1905, pp. 86 f., figs. 94, 95 (Munich: early; Krefeld: later); J. B. Eggen, Museion, 57/8, nos. III–IV, 1940, p. 98; G. Galassi, La scultura del fiorentino del Quattrocento, Milan, 1949, p. 123, pl. 145; L. Douglas, B.M., LXXXVIII, 1946, p. 82, the same, in ms. opinion (c. 1440–50); G. Swarzenski, ms. opinion (early); L. Venturi, ms. opinion (1440–50). (8) Ill.c. (9) M. Cruttwell, Luca and Andrea della Robbia, London, 1902, pp. 164 ff., 335, 349 (Krefeld: early Andrea della Robbia, under Luca’s influence, possibly not the original, but a replica; the others workshop). (10) A. Marquand, Luca della Robbia, pp. 269 ff. n. 123–26, figs. 183–85. (11) E.g. Brizi Adoration in La Verna (Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, Princeton, 1922, t. p. 52 n. 37, fig. 41); the predellas of the altars in S. Maria degli Angeli in Assisi (ibid., pp. 39 ff. n. 27, fig. 35) in the Osservanza in Siena (ibid., pp. 61 ff. n. 42, fig. 45) and in the museum in Montepulciano (ibid., pp. 69 f. n. 47, figs. 51–53). (12) See our remarks on KI403 (Nat. Gal. A159).

ANDREA DELLA ROBBIA

Florentine School. Andrea di Marco di Simone della Robbia was born in 1435 in Florence and died there in 1525. He was the nephew, pupil, and successor of Luca della Robbia as head of the family enterprise, in which his brothers and later his sons were also active. He was accepted in the sculptor's guild in 1458; but, as his earliest known
works date from the seventies, it may be assumed that at first he acted mainly as assistant to his uncle. A date in the sixties proposed for the medallions of the Foundlings' Hospital is uncertain. The later output of his shop is enormous and uneven in quality and style. At present it is impossible to distinguish the work of the various members of the shop; sometimes, even documented works do not seem worthy of Andrea himself. He softened the monumentality of Luca's style into a gentle gracefulness, with a greater play of detail and texture. He is not untouched by the new styles of Desiderio da Settignano, Antonio Rossellino and, above all, Verrocchio.

Workshop of ANDREA DELLA ROBBIA

KI403: Figure 64

THE ADORATION OF THE CHILD. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (4139), since 1945. Glazed terracotta relief with rounded top in a frame composed of an egg-and-dart moulding and a fruit garland and two cherub's heads at the bottom, supported by an ornamental bracket, which contains the marriage coat of arms of the Donati (dexter) and the Girolami (sinister). Composed of separate pieces: the relief itself, the frame (five pieces) and the bracket. The bracket is wider than the frame and, to make up for the difference, a later wood frame has been laid around the relief. The figures, the lilies, the crown and the mouldings are glazed white, the eyes dark manganese and blue, the stems of the lilies and the ground are two different shades of green, the crown has green, yellow and blue stones; background of the frame and predella are lighter blue, the fruit and foliage yellow, green, lighter and darker manganese purple and the ribbons dark blue. The background of the bracket is deep blue. The scrolls white, the wreath green, the ribbons yellow. The tincture of the arms: white, dark reddish manganese and dark blue. Probably some gilding.

The idea for this composition originally is Luca's, who had developed a standard type, which was spread by his workshop. Andrea della Robbia revised this and made it one of the most popular productions of his workshop. It exists in a number of variants. Of our type Marquand lists twelve, of the whole group nearly eighty pieces. The variants differ in the number of cherubim or angels, the presence of the half-length figure of God the Father etc., and in the ornamental frames, garlands, brackets etc., but the main components are identical. A careful study might possibly yield insights into the semi-mechanical production of such reliefs. The secondary character of our relief becomes evident in the meaningless gesture of the Child, which is derived from the gesture of blessing with the right hand in the primary versions by Luca della Robbia, in which the Child was on the right and the Virgin turned the other way. In other specimens the left arm of the Child is more sensibly resting on his body. Probably the earliest and certainly the most lavish version is Andrea della Robbia's altar of 1479 in the Brizi Chapel in La Verna, of which all the others seem to be reductions. A date after 1479 is confirmed by marriage coats of arms on some of the figures, the lilies except for the figure of the Virgin; a piece with the lilies except for the topmost ones; a piece with the head of the Virgin and part of the left arm; the upper part of the body of the Virgin, with arms and hands; the top with the crown and the head of the right angel. The repairs and the repainting have been so extensive that it is difficult to describe the true state of the piece. Restored in 1956 by Joseph Ternbach.


References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 166; Ill., 1968, p. 146 (as Andrea della Robbia). (2) The Works of John Ruskin, ed. by
E. T. Cook and A. Wedderburn, London and New York, 1903–12; XXXIII, p. 313; XXXIV, p. 666, pl. 71; J. S. Deardon, The Connoisseur, Sept. 1971, pp. 29 f. Ruskin’s attribution was to Luca della Robbia, Fairfax Murray’s to Andrea. (3) A. Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, Princeton, 1922, II, p. 39 n. 140, 6. (4) B.M., LVIII, 1931, p. LXV (Sale, London, Sotheby’s, 8 May 1931, n. 66). (5) Valentiner, 1938, n. 62. (6) Kress Coll. Cat., 1939, p. 409 (as Andrea della Robbia). (7) E.g. A. Marquand, Luca della Robbia, Princeton, 1914, p. 51 n. 10, fig. 33, p. 170 n. 51, fig. 112, and, above all, pp. 269 f. n. 123, fig. 183, pp. 272 f. n. 126, fig. 183. (8) One of the main changes is that Andrea, but for few exceptions (Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, op. cit., II, pp. 19 ff. n. 125, 1, 129, 130) had the Madonna facing left instead of right as in Luca’s reliefs. This shows the same pattern which made him place the Child on the left arm of his Madonnas instead of on the right one, as Luca had done, most unorthodoxly. (9) A. Marquand, ibid., II, p. 37 ff. n. 140. (10) Ibid., II, pp. 19 ff. n. 122-142; the same, Della Robbias in America, Princeton, 1912, pp. 67 ff. These lists are by no means complete. For the whole group see also J. P.-H., V.A.M. Cat., I, p. 220 n. 209, fig. 219. (11) A. Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, I, pp. 52 ff. n. 37, fig. 41. (12) A. Marquand, Robbia Heraldy, Princeton, 1919, p. 39 n. 36. (13) A. Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, op. cit., II, p. 37 f., n. 140, 1, fig. 156; id., Robbia Heraldy, op. cit., p. 37 n. 35, fig. 34 with another interpretation of the coat of arms. (14) A. Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, op. cit., II, p. 38 n. 140, 2; the same, Robbia Heraldy, op. cit., p. 60 f. n. 67, fig. 59. (15) A. Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, op. cit., II, p. 29 n. 134, fig. 152. (16) W. R. Valentiner and M. Weinberger in ms. opinions; J. B. Eggen, Mouseion, 57/58, nos. iii–iv, p. 98; G. Galassi, La scultura fiorentina del Quattrocento, Milan, 1949, pl. 146, by mistake reproduces the version from the Mellon Collection in the National Gallery (A13) as our piece.

Workshop of ANDREA DELLA ROBbia

K92 : Figure 65

MADONNA AND CHILD. New York, N.Y., Samuel H. Kress Foundation, since 1963. Glazed terracotta tondo. Diameter 11⅜ in. (29.2 cm.). The figures glazed white are set against a blue background. The eyes dark blue, manganese? The halo, now truncated, at one time was complete. The parcel gilt wood-carved frame (30×19 in.; 76×24.8 cm.) probably is not the original one. Its ornaments stand out against a blue ground. The aperture was larger than the terracotta and had to be reduced by the curiously eccentric inset. It bears a marriage coat of arms: dexter, probably Albizzi; or two concentric bands sable. Sinister: difficult to identify. Sable, a bend sinister or (?). Condition: besides the truncation of the halo, minor surface damages which have been repaired.


The relief is attributed to Andrea della Robbia himself by Bode, to his workshop by M. Cruttwell and A. Marquand. An untrustworthy half-glazed variant is in the Este Collection in the museum in Vienna. The composition seems to date from the nineties of the fifteenth century, to judge from its similarities with the altars in the Medici chapel in S. Croce in Florence and in Camaldoli, thus dated by Marquand. Comparable are also the medallions of the Evangelists in S. Maria delle Carceri in Prato, of 1491. The execution of our piece might, however, be later. A Madonna in the Bargello, which is our tondo expanded to full length, is dated by Marquand around 1520. The wooden frame must be from the thirties of the sixteenth century, because of the similarity of its ornament with that of the stalls in the Palazzo Comunale in Pistoia, made by Giovanni di Pietro and Bartolomeo di Giovanni Mati in 1534/5.

References: (1) A. Marquand, Andrea della Robbia, Princeton, 1922, II, pp. 165 ff. n. 301, fig. 240. (2) The Albizzi coat of arms usually is sable, two concentric bands or; but the present variant also occurs. (3) Ms. statement by W. v. Bode. (4) Ibid., and Bode, Denkmäler, p. 83, pl. 268b; in the index the location is given as: Schloss Friedrichshof, bei Cronberg, Sammlung der Prinzessin von Hessen. (5) M. Cruttwell, Luca and Andrea della Robbia, London, 1902, p. 344. (6) L. Planiscig, Die Estenische Kunstsammlung (Kunsthistorisches Museum in Wien), Vienna, 1919, p. 76 n. 121. Unlike most of the other pieces from the Catajo, this one cannot be traced further back than 1806, and might well have been a recent acquisition. Planiscig tries to explain its odd character by classifying it as by a North-Italian follower of the Robbias, a category which must be accepted with misgivings. (7) Marquand, l.c., I, pp. 118 f. n. 79, fig. 86; II, pp. 133 ff. n. 262, fig. 217. (8) Ibid., I, pp. 109 ff. n. 74, figs. 77–80. (9) A. Marquand, Robbia Heraldy, Princeton, 1919, pp. 247 ff. n. 317, fig. 228. (10) Giulio Ferrari, Il legno nell’arte italiana, Milan, s.a., pls. lxxiii ff.

GIOVANNI DELLA ROBbia

Florentine School. Giovanni di Andrea di Marco della Robbia, born in 1469 in Florence, died 1529/30 in Florence. Pupil, collaborator and, together with his brothers Luca and Girolamo, heir of the workshop of his father, Andrea, whom he survived only by a few years. His first work is of 1497. His documented activity falls mainly into the second and third decades of the sixteenth century. With him the activity of the workshop seems to have expanded greatly; its style became more colourful and varied but the quality was very uneven. Apparently a great many modellers were
employed or much work made by others was glazed. It is not possible to separate Giovanni’s autograph work from that of his brothers and many helpers as there is no guarantee that even the work ordered from him and paid to him was done by his own hand.

Workshop of
GIOVANNI DELLA ROBBIA

K1280 : Figure 67

PIETÀ. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A45), since 1941.1 Polychrome glazed terracotta group. 28 1/4 x 17 1/2 in. (72 x 44.4 cm.). The robe of the Virgin is a dark plum purple, her veil off-white, her mantle opaque blue, her shoes blackish. Christ’s loincloth is white with blue and yellow stripes. The base is white; the flesh and Christ’s hair unglazed. Their original naturalistic painted polychromy has completely disappeared. Condition: good. The Virgin repaired.


The statuette has traditionally been ascribed to Giovanni della Robbia2 and its indebtedness to Verrocchio has been stressed.3 Indeed, the angular drapery with its zigzagging folds resembles that of the figures of Christ and St Thomas and of Christ and the Magdalene in two lunettes in the Conservatorio delle Quiete (near Florence),4 which heavily depend on Verrocchio’s St Thomas group on Orsanmichele.5 Whether the modeller of these figures was Giovanni della Robbia is hard to tell; they differ considerably from his documented works, even if many details, the polychromy etc. are in accord with them. This style continues in the workshop, particularly in the hands of Benedetto Buglioni and, above all, Santi Buglioni.6 An altar with the figures of Christ and Saint Thomas in Montebottolino,6 and one with the figures of Christ and the Baptist in the Madonna del Sasso (Bibbiena),7 and the Virtues on the façade of the Ospedale del Ceppo in Pistoia,8 all connected with Santi Buglioni, should be compared. But an attribution to Santi Buglioni himself would be hazardous. It is doubtful that our statuette has formed part of a larger group, as has been suggested,9 though there are examples of such groups.10 The square base, with only a projection at the right for Christ’s foot, and glazed on all sides, seems to be self-sufficient.


Workshop of the DELLA ROBBIA

K26 : Figure 66

SAINT PETER. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A33), since 1941.1 Half-length figure glazed terracotta, 37 1/4 x 21 1/4 in. (94.5 x 54.6 cm.). White glaze, eyes manganese. The top of the key is modern. Frame: convex golden coloured moulding with two garlands of fruit. The foliage is bright green, the fruit, identical on both sides, is yellow, ochre, brown, purple, greenish.


Attributed to the workshop of Luca della Robbia2 and to Andrea della Robbia.3 The angular, lean style might conceivably be a derivation from that of some latish and tired works from Luca’s workshop.4 The treatment of the hair with the ‘drill-holes’ is found in two medallions of 1487/8 in S. Pietro in Perugia, which probably are by Benedetto Buglioni,4 with whose style, however, our figure has little in common. Parallels in Andrea’s work are missing; the figure remains isolated among the Robbia material. Even its purpose is unclear, unless it was once fitted in a medallion like those in Perugia. The frame originally must have served another purpose. It does not fit in size and scale and seems later in style.

References: (1) N.G. Prelim. Cat., I, 1941, p. 231; II, 1941, p. 233; III, p. 227; N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 166; III, 1968, p. 146 (as Andrea della Robbia). (2) G. Swarzenski, 1943, p. 299 and in ms. opinion. (3) G. De Nicola, G. Fiocco, R. Longhi, R. Van Marle, W. Suida, A. Venturi, F. F. Mason Perkins, who adds, that the tabernacle frame probably is by Giovanni della Robbia, in ms. opinions. (4) E.g. the medallions in the pendentives of the cupola of the Pazzi Chapel (A. Marquand, Luca della Robbia, Princeton, 1914, pp. 251 ff. n. 104, figs. 170–173; their attribution to Brunelleschi by P. Sanpaolesi, Boll. d’Arte, xxxvii, 1953, pp. 228 ff. is hard to maintain); some Adorations of the Child (Marquand, Lc., pp. 269 ff. n. 123, 124, 125, 126). (5) A. Marquand, Benedetto and Santi Buglioni, Princeton, 1921, pp. 13 ff. n. 6, 8, figs. 6, 8.
Workshop of the DELLA ROBBIA?

X181, X182: Figures 71, 72

BUSTS OF CHRIST AND OF SAINT JOHN THE BAPTIST AS CHILDREN. Coral Gables, Fla., Joe and Emily Lowe Art Gallery, since 1961.1 Polychrome glazed terracotta. Christ: 14½ x 12½ in. (36·2 x 32·7 cm.). The hair and flesh white; eyes and eyebrows dark blue and manganese purple; the robe purple, edged with yellow ornamental border; the mantle blue, lined with green. St John the Baptist: 14⅞ x 13 in. (37·3 x 33·6 cm.). The hair, flesh and eyes as in the other; hair-shirt brown; mantle blue, lined with yellow. The bases are separate; white moldings with blue frieze; unglazed top. Condition: good. The glaze of the robe of the Christ Child badly blistered in baking. The unglazed parts, of course, must have been painted.


At one time attributed to Luca della Robbia.⁵ A later attribution to Andrea¹⁰ or his workshop¹¹ is based on the fact that the busts ultimately derive from the heads of the babies of the Foundling Hospital,⁶ or from such attributed works as a child's bust in the Bargello,⁹ and another in the Cluny Museum in Paris¹⁰ or two putti holding a garland in the Pinacoteca di Città di Castello.¹¹ Similar heads also occur on coats of arms, two of them dated 1498/9 and 1507.¹² Our busts seem to belong on a more commercialized level. They are representative of a group of often officina children's busts in fully glazed,¹³ parcel glazed¹⁴ or painted terracotta or stucco,¹⁵ variously ascribed to the Robbias, A. Rossellino or to the Florentine school in general. The drapery of the Christ Child occurs in a bust in the Metropolitan Museum,¹⁶ the head of St John as that of a statuette in the Blumenthal Collection.¹⁷ The number of these replicas and the fact that they were adaptable to various purposes seem to mark them as productions of a flourishing workshop. Whether it was that of the Robbias themselves or another, which had its productions glazed by it,¹⁸ cannot be decided. The existence of such independent workshops is proved by the innumerable busts of Christ, which continue a type created by Verrocchio, and which at times, particularly when they are parcel glazed, are not unrelated to our busts.¹⁹ One of them, alas, of different style, in the Liceo Forteguerri in Pistoia is documented for Agnolo di Polo, who, according to Vasari, must have run such a workshop.²⁰

Florence Blumenthal Collection, New York, vol. ii, Paris, 1926, pl. xxxvib. (18) That this did happen is proved not only by a great number of works by different hands glazed by the Robbias—probably already since Luca’s time—but by a document, which proves that a lunette in the Certosa in Val d’Ema which is glazed by the Robbias was modelled by Benedetto da Maiano, whose unmistakable style it shows (A. Marquand, B.M., xi, 1922, pp. 128 ff.). (19) E.g. Victoria and Albert Museum, n. 197 (J.P.-H., Cat., pp. 209 ff., fig. 202) or glazed bust in the Count Pepoli Sale, New York, Am. Art Assoc., 18–19 Jan. 1929, pp. 5 f. n. 113) and in the R. Tolentino Sale, New York, Am. Art Assoc., 8–11 Dec. 1926, p. 261 n. 720. (20) Vasari, iii, pp. 371, 372 n. 1; P. Bacci, Rivista d’Arte, iii, 1905, pp. 159 ff.

Workshop of the DELLA ROBBIA

K109 : Figure 73

MADONNA AND CHILD. Tucson, Ariz., University of Arizona, Kress Study Collection, since 1962. Terracotta tondo in one piece with a frame containing twelve cherubim heads between decorative mouldings. The terracotta is set into a grey stone, which supplies the outer mould of the frame. Diameter 20⅞ in. (52.9 cm.). The presumable original polychromy is completely lost.


Indifferent squeeze of uncertain age of a composition frequently found in the workshop of Andrea della Robbia. The best version is that in the Pinacoteca di Città di Castello.1 Our version corresponds to others in the Bargello,2 in the collection of Robert S. Mintum, New York,3 and possibly many more.4 This type of Madonna, also in small size, often forms the centrepiece of the predella of altars from the Robbia workshop.5 The cherubim heads in the frieze of an entablature or in a curvilinear frame are frequent.6 Surprising is the substitution of a heavy architectural moulding for the customary outer garland.


SANTI BUGLIONI

Florentine School. Santi di Michele di Santi, called Buglioni after his relative and teacher Benedetto Buglioni, was born in Florence in 1494 and died there in 1576. He is the last who, in nearly direct line, continued the production of polychrome glazed terracottas begun by Luca della Robbia. Eventually he was in contact with the young generation of sculptors such as Tribolo and devoted himself to decorative work such as the terracotta floors in Palazzo Vecchio and the Biblioteca Laurenziana.

Manner of SANTI BUGLIONI

K154, K155 : Figures 68, 69

TWO ANGELS IN ADORATION. Tulsa, Okla., Philbrook Art Center, since 1953.1 Polychrome terracotta reliefs, 48⅛ × 15 in. (122.3 × 28 cm.) each. Tunes bright green; wings rainbow colour; faces, hair, hands and feet white; eyes dark manganese; halos and collars yellow; clouds blue.


The reliefs have been attributed to Giovanni della Robbia2 or to his workshop.3 The bulging and billowing draperies however, the slender proportions, with heads almost too small, and the irregular, fluid modelling of surfaces occur in Santi Buglioni’s documented work of 1522 in Badia Tedalda, an altar with Saints and the Annunciation and a group of the Annunciation.4 Similar in style are an altar with the Madonna and two Saints in the Bargello,5 an altar with the ‘Ecce Agnus Dei’ in Bibbiena6 and, above all, the figures of the Virtues in the frieze of the Ospedale del Ceppo in Pistoia (1526–8).7 The authorship of the medallions underneath the frieze is controversial.8 Giovanni della Robbia and Benedetto Buglioni are involved, but there is a resemblance between that of the Assumption and our figures.9 With them can also be associated the Madonna of Agnolo Serragli of 1528 in the Bargello10 and a Pietà in the museum in Berlin.11 This latter documents Santi Buglioni’s connection with other sculptors of his time. The authors of the Berlin catalogue see in it the influence of Tribolo; actually it was done after a drawing by Bandinelli.12 The purpose of our figures is unclear. The only comparable ones that seem to have survived are on an altar in S. Giovanni in Sugana (S. Casciano);13 but they are no longer in their original context.

References: (1) (W. E. Suida), Paintings and Sculpture of the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1953, pp. 76 f. (as by Giovanni della Robbia, or a younger member of the Robbia family, or by one of Giovanni’s studio assistants). (2) R. Longhi, A. Venturi, G. Fiocco, R. Van Marle in ms. opinions. (3) F. F. Mason Perkins, W. E. Suida in ms. opinions. (4) A. Marquand, Benedetto e Santi Buglioni, Princeton, 1921, pp. 156 ff. n. 179,
FLORENTINE SCHOOL: XV–XVI CENTURY


FLORENTINE SCHOOL: c. 1500

THE ADORATION OF THE SHEPHERDS. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A427), since 1941.1 Terracotta, 31 1/2 x 25 1/2 in. (81 x 65 cm.). The surface, which in older photographs looks uneven, was thoroughly cleaned in 1956 by J. Ternbach.


Tradiitinally3 attributed to Verrocchio but apparently a cleverly contrived pastiche of motifs taken from Verrocchio, Rossellino etc., as they are frequently found in the later Robbia workshops. Compare such altars as those in the Bargello,6 in S. Lorenzo in Bibbiena,7 the collegiata in Casole,8 S. Chiara in Montesansovino,9 S. Chiara in S. Sepolcro,10 in S. Agostino in Anghiari,11 most of which are datable in the first two decades of the sixteenth century. The Madonna resembles that in Verrocchio’s picture in the Sheffield Art Galleries;12 the scenic effects and the shepherds seem to be borrowed from Antonio Rossellino’s Nativities.13 The Verrocchiesque drapery of the Madonna is found in a Robbiesquesque Adoration in Providence, R.I.,14 the elaborate head-dress in some Verrocchiesque Madonna reliefs.15 An attribution to the Robbia and Buglione workshops16 cannot be justified, not only because of the lack of glazing. I know no other work which I would give to the same hand.17


FLORENTINE SCHOOL: Early XVI Century

BUST OF A YOUTH. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A428), since 1941.1 Terracotta, once polychromed, 14 1/2 x 14 1/2 in. (37.6 x 37 cm.). Condition: No trace of colour left; surface completely gone over. In storage at the Gallery since July 1955.

Provenance: Infanta Beatrix of Spain.1 Duveen’s, New York.2 Kress acquisition, 1940. Exhibited: Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich., 1938.3

Formerly given to Andrea della Robbia,4 then, almost unanimously, to Giovanni della Robbia.5, 6 However, the references to certain figures of the Magdalen by Giovanni are not convincing. The Verrocchiesque character of the bust has always been noticed; and indeed, it seems to belong to one of the terracotta workshops which even in the sixteenth century continued to imitate types created by Verrocchio and his close followers. A similar bust is in the
Metropolitan Museum in New York. Related are also certain terracotta busts of Christ. The subject sometimes is taken to be the young St John, but erroneously, as his hair-shirt is missing, or the young Christ. Probably it is an idealized portrait of a Florentine child under the guise of a saint not any longer identifiable.


FLORENTINE SCHOOL: Early XVI Century

KI250 : Figure 74

DAVID. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A56), since 1941. Statuette, said to be terracotta; but technical examination has shown the material to be cement or gypsum plaster covered by recent paint. The statuette must be a comparatively new cast from an old original. 19 1/4 X 6 1/2 in. (49 X 17.4 cm). From an old illustration it seems that the statuette once was polychromed. Cleaning has revealed details of the modelling formerly not visible, e.g. the hatchings at the base. The right arm was broken and has been reattached with a metal dowel, which shows on an X-ray photograph. The blade of the dagger is a replacement.

In storage at the Gallery since February 1936.


The motif of the statuette corresponds to that of Verrocchio’s David in the Bargello. Therefore the statuette has sometimes been considered to be by Verrocchio himself and even to be a preliminary study for the statue in the Bargello. However, the piece is more likely to be the work of a later Florentine imitator close to the ‘Master of the statuettes of St John’, to whom under the name of the ‘Master of the David and St John Statuettes’ this piece has also been given. Almost identical statuettes exist in Berlin and in London, and similar ones, one partly glazed, in Berlin, and one in London. By the same hand may be two terracotta statuettes of kneeling angels formerly in the Tucher Collection.


FLORENTINE SCHOOL: Early XVI Century

KI308 : Figure 76

BUST OF A MIDDLE-AGED MAN. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A30), since 1941. Terracotta, 22 3/4 X 25 1/2 in. (57 X 65.8 cm). Condition: good. The surface, probably once polychromed, is of an uneven, patchy brown.


Said to represent a member of the Ginori Family. First attributed to Antonio Rossellino, later unanimously to Benedetto da Maiano. The often repeated comparison with his bust of Pietro Mellini in the Bargello (1474) does not lend any comfort to this thesis. In contrast to the clear sculptural articulation of the Mellini bust and of Benedetto’s other marble portraits, ours shows the indifference towards basic forms and the attention rather to the surfaces, the neglect of the individual shaping of the skull, characteristic of a great number of terracotta portrait busts produced at the time with the help of life- and death-masks. Occasionally, as in our piece, or in the Rucellai bust in Berlin, the result is most impressive and even monumental. Other such busts have been associated with ours.
and attributed to Benedetto da Maiano, but their true character was described long ago with an abundance of comparative material. To consider our bust a model for a marble would be risky. The so-called model in Berlin for the bust of Filippo Strozzi (1492) in Paris, the only one to be taken as such, is not above suspicion. A technical test suggests c. 1510 as the earliest possible date.


Florentine School: c. 1525–1550

LAZIO DE’ MEDICI, IL MAGNIFICO. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (1446), since 1941.1 Poly-chromed terracotta bust, 25⅝×23⅜×12⅝ in. (65.8×59.1×32.7 cm). The colour has darkened and has certainly been renewed some time ago. The sleeves are an indefinite brown, the upper garment dark blue; scarf and head-gear dark plum red, hair repainted; fleshcolour darkened. There are patches of old colour under the present coat of colour. The ‘mazzocchio’ on his right side was broken and has been joined again.2 Pieces of the scarf on his right shoulder have been broken and put back. The tip of the head-gear at the back has been neatly cut off a long time ago, as if it had been in the way of the bust being put against a background. Restored and cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: Emilio Santarelli, Florence.3 Edward Nicholls Dennys.4 Henry Labouchere, first Baron Taunton, Overstowey, Somersetshire.5 Edward James Stanley, Quantock Lodge, Bridgewater, Somersetshire.4 Edward Arthur Vesy Stanley, ibid.5 Clarence H. Mackay, Roslyn, Long Island, N.Y.6 Duveen’s, New York.4 Kress acquisition, 1941.6 Exhibited: Royal Society of Arts, London, 1850.7 Special Loan Exhibition of Works of Art, South Kensington Museum, 1862.8

This bust, perhaps the most popular piece in the Kress Collection, has given rise to much controversy; it even has been taken to be a forgery.4 It must be considered together with some other specimens: a larger and more powerful, though damaged one, which at one time was owned by the art dealer Volpi in Florence,10 a stucco closely corresponding to our bust, in the Berlin Museum,11 two copies, one in painted plaster, the other in white marble, signed Costoli fecit Firenze, 1837 in Corsham Court, Wiltshire, Sanford, now the Methuen Collection,12 and a few untraced specimens: formerly Count Suboff, Peters burg;13 Forlì, Museum;14 Paris, and Italy.15 The Volpi bust seems to be the primary one; it is squarely set up; its shoulders and arms reach out and are not skimmed as in our bust; it is carefully modelled and has every detail sharply defined; the drapery is richer, particularly that of the sleeves; the hair is livelier, with two strands falling over the forehead; the head-gear is more complete, having the becchettio at the right, which strangely enough is missing in our bust. The other specimens, like the Berlin one, seem to be reproductions of ours.
There is no doubt as to the identity of the sitter. The attribution of these busts has varied. Initially ours was considered to be by Michelangelo, later by Pollaiuolo till an attribution to Verrocchio has become the conventional one. Sometimes even the name of Leonardo has been mentioned. There have, however, always been critics who have preferred to leave the bust anonymous and to assign it to a follower of Verrocchio. The suggestion has been made that our busts might be connected with the wax ex-votos which Lorenzo, after the Pazzi conspiracy, had had made by Ugolino Benintendi, apparently under the supervision of Verrocchio. An attribution would depend on the date of the bust. Verrocchio died in 1488; given the presumable age of Lorenzo (1449-92) as shown in the bust, it would have to be a very late work of the artist, or be by a follower. But if it should be derived from Lorenzo's death-mask in the museum of Palazzo Medici in Florence, as has been thought with good reason, any reference to Verrocchio would have to be dropped altogether, also because the bust resembles his work very little, if at all. A comparatively late date, in the second third of the sixteenth century, has been suggested for stylistic and historical reasons. Montorsoli repaired, shortly after 1530, some of the Medici ex-votos in the SS. Annunziata in Florence, therefore his name has been suggested. But we know of no work of his which would warrant the attribution to him of our busts. On the other hand, they were known in Florence in these years. Bronzino copied one of them and slightly later there are some other reflections of them in historicizing portraiture. It is possible that a bust like ours was identical with one mentioned in the inventory of the Guardaroba of Cosimo I of 1533. A historicizing portrait of the Magnifico would fit well with the political thought of the new rulers of Florence. There are some portraits akin to ours, whose relationship is difficult to define. One, a profile in high relief in the J. B. Speed Museum in Louisville, Kentucky, cannot be a later derivation from our busts. The much discussed, puzzling bust of the Quincy Shaw Collection in Boston, which has also been attributed to Verrocchio and with better reasons denied him, shows Lorenzo at a younger age and thus is not quite comparable. In the case of a bust of Lorenzo in Prague published as by Benedetto da Maiano the situation is different. The attribution has no foundation, the bust is faintly Verrocchiesque and apparently still dates from the lifetime of Lorenzo. It seems to be the prototype of a whole series of portraits of Lorenzo. Since its features closely resemble those of our busts, it could almost have served better than they as the prototype for certain posthumous portraits, such as those by Vasari. It might even have been an additional source for our busts.

A drawing by Leonardo da Vinci in Windsor, representing a young man with a head-gear like that of our busts has been connected with our busts and used to prove an early date for them. The similarity is accidental and due mainly to the identity of the head-gear. The hair is differently cut and, moreover, the date of the drawing is quite uncertain.

The thermoluminescence testing would seem to indicate a dating within Lorenzo's lifetime. According to Dr S. J. Fleming in Oxford those findings, however, are not so rigid as to exclude the dating proposed here.

TUSCAN SCHOOLS: SIENA, LUCCA XV–XVI CENTURY

JACOPO DELLA QUERCIA

Sienese School. Born between 1371 and 1374 in Siena(?), died 1438 in Siena. Son of the goldsmith, sculptor and painter Pietro di Angelo di Guarnieri. Spent some of his childhood with his family in Lucca. According to Ghiberti, participated in the competition for the second door of the Baptistry in Florence, which the latter eventually won. Active in Lucca, Ferrara, Siena and Bologna, going from place to place, particularly in his later years between Siena and Bologna. Greatly honoured by monumenTor commissions like that of the Fonte Gaia in Siena and the main door of S. Petronio, Bologna, and with public offices, such as that of prioré and head of the Opera del Duomo in Siena, he was one of the leading sculptors of his time and had numerous helpers, pupils, and imitators.

After JACOPO DELLA QUERCIA

K2079 : Figure 81

BUST OF A WOMAN. Washington, D.C., Howard University, Kress Study Collection, since 1961. Polychromed stucco, 17½ × 16 × 6 in. (44.4 × 40.6 × 15.2 cm.). Half of the colouring is gone; what is preserved seems to be the original one. The garment is red, lined with blue and edged with gold. Face and eyes are a natural colour, well preserved; hair brown.


This and another, better preserved stucco bust,3 are casts from the head of the figure of Sapiencia on Jacopo della Quercia’s Fonte Gaia in the city square of Siena, created between 1408 and 1419.4 There are similar stuccoes of the head of the Justitia, in the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam,5 of that of the Fides in the Liechtenstein collection in Vaduz,6 of the half-length figure of Acta Larentia7 and a number of stuccoes of the Madonna as half-length figures.8 Together with stuccoes of the Expulsion from Paradise9 and some casts of the Fonte Gaia taken in the nineteenth century10 they help to give us an idea of what the originals, which are dreadfully damaged, were like. A small bronze bust in the Louvre seems to bear a slight resemblance to those of the Sapiencia.11 The suggestion by A. Pit that these busts were original models3 is invalidated by the existence of more than one example of the head of the Sapiencia. These stuccoes can be dated in the fifteenth century by their polychromy.

SIENENSE SCHOOL(?) : End of the XV Century

KSF5D : Figure 82

MADONNA AND CHILD. Madison, Wis., the Elvehjem Art Center, University of Wisconsin Kress Study Collection (accession number 61.4.1), since 1961.2 Marble relief, 20×16 in. (50.8×40.6 cm.). Good condition. No polychromy left. Two small holes on left arm and breast of the Virgin.


The relief has been attributed to a 'Master of the Piccolomini Madonna',2 a hypothetical artist constructed around the work from which his name is derived.3 Closer examination confirmed a lingering suspicion that the works gathered under this name are actually copies by different, more or less competent hands of a lost original by Donatello, which presumably existed in Siena.4 This is confirmed by the fact that even more considerable artists, like Mino da Fiesole5 and two contemporary unknown Roman sculptors6 imitated the same original. The ease of our relief is parallel. A similar small Madonna in Terenzano (Siena) was originally attributed to the 'Master of the Piccolomini Madonna'.7 A number of other versions, mostly of similar size, by different hands, have become known: Berlin, Private Collection;8 Hearst Collection;9 Florence, 1961, Art Market (Phot. Ulrich Middeldorf); Rome, Palazzo Venezia;10 formerly London, Heseltine Collection.11 The last named is particularly interesting as it is a stucco after a work probably by Mino da Fiesole. A large stone tabernacle with a Madonna of the same type, in the Liechtenstein Collection in Vaduz,12 is dated 1498. It is difficult to hazard a guess as to the original of all these repetitions; but the affinity with some of the copies of Donatello's lost Madonna and the ubication of one of the reliefs near Siena, may lead to the conclusion that the original was located in Siena. This would be confirmed by a terracotta relief of uncertain attribution in the Oratorio della Contrada della Selva in Siena13 which has a Child in the same unusual pose. That Mino stayed in Siena is probable because of his copy of the Donatello composition and his bust of the Virgin (k1304). The various attempts to identify the 'Master of the Piccolomini Madonna' with one of the better known Sienese sculptors, or to attribute individual works of this group to them, seem to be useless. They certainly can have no bearing on our relief. Equally futile seem to be attempts to connect our composition with a definite artist in Rome.14 A Madonna in S. Luigi dei Franzesi is a full-figure version,15 the Child of the Madonna on the tomb of Pio II (1470-5) in S. Andrea della Valle has a similar pose.16 However, the affinity is not close and the attribution of these Roman works is quite uncertain, and it is doubtful that they are central to our problem. The same is true of the Madon­na della Speranza in the cathedral of Modena, which seems to be derived from the same type as ours.17 Neither in sculpture nor in painting has this curious composition so far found a parallel which could explain it.

MATTEO CIVITALI

School of Lucca. Matteo di Giovanni Civitali was born in Lucca in 1436 and died there in 1501. He must have been trained first in workshops like that of Andrea di Francesco Guardi in Pisa and the Riccomanni family in Pietrasanta and Sarzana. Despite Florentine influences, which are particularly noticeable in his architectural decorations, he preserved throughout his whole life a distinctive local style. Almost the equal of his Florentine contemporaries and apparently recognized as such by them, he was the leading sculptor of his town and also received outside commissions, in Pisa and Genoa for example. Born into a family of artisans of all kinds, he also was an architect. A son of his, Niccolò, and a number of his nephews continued his activities.

MATTEO CIVITALI (?)

K1243 : Figure 84

ST SEBASTIAN. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A57), since 1941.1 Terracotta statuette, 23½×6½×3½ in. (69.3×17.7×9.7 cm.). In an old photograph2 the statue appears completely covered by a glossy dark varnish. Today it is a buff colour, with exception of the hair and the tree, which are brown. The colouring cannot be original, because it conceals some breaks: the right leg and both feet were broken; the trunk of the tree has had two branches added. Originally the figure must have been pierced by arrows. The holes, which must have been filled in, are invisible under the colour.


Always attributed to Matteo Civitali and set in relation to the marble statue of the templietto in the Cathedral of Lucca (1481 ff.),8 the piece has been questioned a few times.9 The figure is not much like the marble10 but resembles the terracotta, which seems to be the one M. Civitali bequeathed in 1492 to the church of Monte San Quirico near Lucca,11 and closely resembles a much repainted statue carved in wood in S. Maria dell’Annunziata de’ Servi in Lucca.12 The condition of our terracotta as well as that of the statue in Lucca makes it impossible to tell how close to Civitali’s own works the two may have been. What seems to be certain is their Lucchese origin, and probably a date within the fifteenth century, in Civitali’s own lifetime.13 Our statue does not look like a model, but like a smaller version for domestic use.


In the Style of the LUCCHESE SCHOOL: around 1900 (?)

K1254 : Figure 83

THE VIRGIN IN ADORATION AND THE CHRIST CHILD LYING ON A PILLOW. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A57), since 1941. Terracotta statues. The Group: 47½×44½×23½ in. (120.3×138.1 cm.). The Child alone: 26×10½×6½ in. (66.3×27.3×16.3 cm.) At one time the figures were coloured.1 This polychromy may not have been the original one. It has been removed except for a very few traces. The surface of the terracotta has been thoroughly reworked and smoothed, so that all finer modelling has gone and only the crudest basic shapes are recognizable. An X-ray photograph of the Child shows that it was completely in pieces and has been patched together with the help of metal dowels. The pillow of the Child is modern.

In storage at the Gallery since July 1955.

Provenance: A church in Lucca(?).2 E. Volpi, Palazzo Davanzati, Florence.3 The Virgin: Duveen’s, New York.3
The Child: Thomas Fortune Ryan, New York.\textsuperscript{4} Duveen's, New York.\textsuperscript{5} Exhibited: Detroit Institute of Art, Detroit, Mich., 1938.\textsuperscript{6}

It seems that the two figures originally formed a group including a seated Joseph, which like the Child was formerly in the Thomas Fortune Ryan Collection,\textsuperscript{7} and is now in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore.\textsuperscript{8} Why the Virgin was separated from the two other figures and later reunited only with the Child, without St Joseph, is hard to understand.\textsuperscript{9} The unanimous attribution to Matteo Civitali\textsuperscript{10} which had replaced an earlier one to Laurana,\textsuperscript{11} has been contested twice.\textsuperscript{12} The poor condition of the figures makes any attribution hazardous. But the weak construction of the statue of the Virgin seems to exclude Civitali. Thermoluminescence testing has shown the group to be a modern imitation, dating from between 1890 and 1910. Actually its known history cannot be traced further back than 1913.\textsuperscript{13}


\textbf{LUCCHESSE SCHOOL:}
\textbf{Early XVI Century}

\textbf{K2080 : Figure 85}

\textbf{THE VIRGIN IN ADORATION.} Columbia, S.C., Columbia Museum of Art, since 1962.\textsuperscript{1} Polychromed full-round statue in terracotta, \(34\frac{1}{4}\times12\frac{1}{4}\times13\frac{1}{4}\) in. \((87\times31.7\times34.3\) cm.). The polychromy is fairly well preserved, but for some blistering. It was cleaned and consolidated in 1955 by M. Modestini. The dress is a crimson glaze over gold, the edge of the neck gold. The sleeves and the belt are cinnabar with a gold pattern. The short sleeves are white; the ground green. The flesh colour is well preserved; the hair light brown. There is a hole on either side of the neck, for fastening a necklace.


One of a number of similar figures, which originally must have been part of crèche-like arrangements,\textsuperscript{2} of which the best one, that in the Gardner Museum\textsuperscript{3} in Boston can be ascribed to Matteo Civitali, while some of the others seem to belong to minor artists working at the time in the same neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{4} Given the artless character of these figures it is impossible to identify the workshop which produced them. A comparatively late date for our figure is suggested by the full, broad face which is similar to that of the \textit{Virgin of the Annunciation} of 1516 by Niccolò Civitali formerly in S. Maria dei Servi in Lucca, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum.\textsuperscript{5}

LOBMARD AND GENOISE SCHOOLS
XV-XVI CENTURY

MILANESE SCHOOL:
Second Half of the XV Century

K1248: Figure 86

FILOPPO MARIA VISCONTI. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A52), since 1941.1 White marble relief, profile to the right. Present overall size: 194 x 14 in. (48.7 x 35.8 cm.). The original part: 113 x 64 x 1/2 in. (29 x 21 x 7.9 cm.). (Only the head down to the "break" in the neck is old. Photographs² show that the "break" has been evened out, so as to form a line which is easily mistaken for a fold of the skin. The relief is flat at the back and was meant to be attached to a background, as it is today, but probably of a different colour. The top of the cap is new; the earlobe is damaged. The whole surface has been gone over. Cleaned 1935 by J. Ternbach.


Filippo Maria, the last Visconti duke of Milan (1392-1447), seems to have been so little proud of his appearance that, as Decembrio⁹ tells, he did not want his portrait taken. Indeed, the only likeness from his lifetime seems to be a medal by Pisanello,¹ from which nearly all other portraits, most of them posthumous, and belonging to series of portraits of ancestors such as those in the Certosa di Pavia, are derived.¹ Our relief, too, may ultimately be based on Pisanello's medal; but it differs from it and its derivations: the cap has another shape and the hair is dressed differently; the modelling is bolder and more voluminous; the proportions are squatter. Although the similarity of the type to that of the medallions in the Certosa di Pavia has led to an attribution of our relief to Amadeo,¹ the earlier attribution to an unknown artist of the Lombard school¹ is more correct. For one, the medallions in the Certosa are not by Amadeo;¹ besides, they are different in style. Our relief seems to be earlier, but our ignorance of Lombard sculpture immediately before Amadeo makes such a suggestion tentative. Perhaps there is a parallel in an oval profile portrait of Archbishop Giovanni Visconti (d. 1354) in the Castello in Milan.¹² The wavyness of its truncaion suggests that the former truncation of the neck of our head, which looks much too neat to be the result of a break, may have been the original one.


GIOVANNI ANTONIO AMADEO

Lombard School. Born in Pavia around 1447,1 died in Milan in 1522. Son of Aloso di Giovanni Amadeo. He was associated at times with a brother Protasio, a painter. The leading sculptor in Lombardy, he worked in Milan, Pavia, Bergamo and for other towns. Starting from an indigenous style, represented by the sculptures of Castiglione d'Olona etc., he developed a very personal style, totally unlike that of the early Renaissance in Central Italy, which was influential in all Lombardy. Eventually he seems to have turned toward a kind of classical manner, but comparable to certain phenomena north of the Alps, seems to have turned toward a kind of classical manner, as it had evolved throughout Italy. From the outset he must have had a large workshop. In accordance with Lombard practice he co-operated with similar enterprises, those of the Mantegazza, the Cazzaniga and the Brioschi. He is found in company with architect Dolcibuono; in his wake follow the Rodari in Como, Giovanni Antonio Piatti, Giovanni Pietro da Rhô and many others. Throughout his life he was connected with such co-operative projects as the building and decorating of the Certosa of Pavia and of the cathedral of Milan, so that at present it is impossible to obtain a clear idea of his personal share in the immense production of sculpture of this period in Lombardy. Wherever we can suspect his own hand, he shows himself as not only technically most accomplished, but also as an artist of rare intelligence, imagination and sensitivity.2

GIOVANNI ANTONIO AMADEO
and Collaborators

madonna on a throne with two adoring angels.
Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame, Kress Study Collection (61.47.1), since 1961.3 White marble, 13⅝×12⅝×6½ in. (39.3×30.9×17 cm.). Put onto a plaster background which backs the top of the relief. The angels do not hold the garland behind the Madonna, and possibly never did. The tips of the angels' wings are broken and replaced in plaster. The little finger of the Virgin's right hand is missing; small damage to the drapery on the left. Otherwise in good condition.


The relief has generally been ascribed to Amadeo and by some considered an early work of his.5 It has indeed much in common with the signed Madonna in the Misericordia in Florence6 and particularly with the signed lunette over the door in the Chiostro Piccolo of the Certosa (after 1460). It has, however, a different surface and lacks the crispness characteristic of Amadeo. This cannot be due to the small format, as the Florentine Madonna is even smaller. Still, the piece is original and fine enough to be possibly by Amadeo's own hand, or at least by a helper who was very close to him during the work on the door in Pavia. The combination of figures of different scale is not rare in Lombardy, as K1260 shows. It still occurs very similarly in the Madonna of the tomb of S. Apollonio in the Cathedral of Brescia (1504–10).8

References: (1) The date is badly documented. We only know that in 1450 he was a minor, and that he was said to have been seventy-five years old when he died in 1522 (R. Maiocchi, Bollettino della Società Pavesa di Storia Patria, III, fasc. 1, March 1903, offprint, p. 5). (2) An up-to-date biography by E. Arslan is found in the Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, Rome, II, 1960, pp. 604 ff. (3) The Kress Study Collection at Notre Dame (1961); A. J. Lauck, Steps through the history of Sculpture, Notre Dame, 1968, n. 106; Notre Dame, Insight, Fall, 1966, p. 17, fig. 3 (as Amadeo). (4) N.G. Prelim. Cat., 1, 1941, pp. 218 f.; II, 1941, pp. 220 f. (as Amadeo with reservations); J. B. Eggen, Mouseion, vol. 57/58, nos. III–IV, 1936, p. 95. (5) See preceding notes. W. V. Bode (1924), G. Fiocco, R. Van Marle, F. F. Mason Perkins, W. Suida, A. Venturi, G. Swarzenski, R. Longhi (as an early work) in ms. opinions; G. Swarzenski, 1943, p. 153, ill., retains the attribution, but questions its validity. (6) U. Middeldorf, in Kunstgeschichtliche Studien für Haus Kauffmann, Berlin, 1936, pp. 136 ff., fig. 1. (7) Ibid., fig. 2; C. Angelini ed., La Certosa di Pavia, Milan, 1968, figs. 429, 430; R. Longhi, ms. opinion. (8) Storia di Brescia, II, Brescia, 1963, p. 810 ill. The attribution is uncertain. Probably it belongs to the circle of B. Briosco.

GIOVANNI ANTONIO AMADEO
and Collaborators

K2094 to k2099 : Figures 88–93

SIX RELIEFS WITH NEW TESTAMENT SCENES FROM THE ANNUNCIATION TO THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT.
Tucson, Arizona, Saint Philip's-in-the-Hills (Kress Study Collection), since 1956.1

White marble; well preserved but for a few damages to the moulded frames. K2094: Annunciation, 19⅞×38⅝ in. (48.2×97.9 cm.). Inscribed fit devs homo vt homo fiat devs
(God became man that man may become God). On the scroll in the hand of the Angel: AVE MARIA GRATIA (Hail Maria . . . Grace). K2095: Visitation, 19 x 38 in. (48 x 97.9 cm). Inscribed: GVAVDET VTRARUB, QUIA LATET VTERQUE (Both [women] are happy, as both [the children] are hidden). K2096: Nativity, 19 x 38 in. (49.5 x 97.9 cm). Inscribed: INVIDEANT PALES GEMAE, PRASEPIS PVS AVLAE (The splendid slabs shall envy the manger of straw). K2097: Adoration of the Magi, 19 x 38½ in. (48.9 x 97.9 cm). Inscribed: ADHV CVCTE NVNC DIEM STELLA NVNCIAT (The star in the past heralded the night and now the day). K2098: Presentation in the Temple, 19 x 38½ in. (48.9 x 97.9 cm). Inscribed: PATRI QVID AMPLIVS NATE (What is more important to the Father than the Child). K2099: Flight into Egypt, 19 x 38½ in. (48.9 x 97.9 cm). Inscribed: SI VENISTI CVR FVGIS SI VENISTI (If thou camest, why fleest thou; if thou fleest, why camest thou). The thickness of the slabs, c. 4-5 in. (10-13 cm), cannot be ascertained, because the reliefs are let into a wall; the thickness given is as remembered.


The extraordinary series of reliefs might help to throw some light on to the problem of the early Amadeo. It is unknown from where they come and what purpose they served. Their total length is 19 feet 9 inches (5.87 m), excluding any architectural elements which must have separated them from each other. Another series is known of similar character and proportion, representing similar scenes, but of smaller size (total length 14 feet 7½ inches; 3.96 m) and in the style of a younger generation of Milanese sculptors; its provenance and purpose are equally unknown. It proves that our series was not unique. The two places for which such series of reliefs can be imagined are a choir or chapel screen or an altar. Similar subjects in similar shape occur much later on the choir screen of the cathedral of Milan. Rich altars like that of Donatello in Padua or the ambitious projects by Bambaia for Milan would well fit into such a setting, and its possible presence in the large Cloister of the Certosa of Pavia from the early sixties and to the lunette by Cristoforo Luoni in the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan, of 1465. One might even discover parallels in the sculptural decoration of the Portinari Chapel in S. Eustorgio in Milan (1462-8), which may be the earliest work by Amadeo which we know. A comparatively early date is suggested by the affinities of the two or three best reliefs with some of Amadeo’s other early works, such as the tomb of Medea Colleoni (1470 ft) and the Madona in the Misericordia in Florence. Amadeo may be identified with the main master, but this is hard to prove, as both the signed tomb of Medea Colleoni and the signed doorway of the small Cloister of the Certosa in Pavia (after 1460) are superior to our reliefs in quality, though there occur in them details which may be by such helpers as those who assisted in our reliefs. Of course, the different scale and purpose make comparisons hazardous. And the signed relief in the Misericordia in Florence is not quite coherent in style or on the level of the more important works, either. It would be simple to consign the series of reliefs to a hitherto little known earliest phase of Amadeo’s career, if it were not tempting to connect it with a vast enterprise in which Amadeo and others were engaged for many years, beginning in 1471, the Altar of St Joseph in the Cathedral of Milan, a favourite project of Galeazzo Maria Sforza. It was planned in 1471, designed by Dolcebunoi in 1472 and executed by Amadeo and many others, till the work slowed down on account of the death of the Duke in 1476. Work was not resumed till 1492 and eventually it was brought to a conclusion by Amadeo in 1493/4. This is the only really great project of the time about which we learn from the fairly complete documentation which has survived. Our good-sized series of reliefs would well fit into such a setting, and its possible presence in Milan Cathedral could account for the popularity of its compositions and their influence on the later choir screen. In this case the reliefs would be later than the doorway in the Certosa (1466 ft) and the tomb of Medea Colleoni (1470 ft) and they would have been mainly executed, probably from Amadeo’s designs, by some of his collaborators who still adhered to an earlier style of his. Possibly the inscriptions under the scenes might furnish a clue to their date. They are remarkably individual and rely neither on biblical nor liturgical language nor on that of the
References: (1) Saint Philip's-in-the-Hills, Tucson, Arizona, s.a., p. 8 ill. (as Amadeo). (2) Annunciation in Berlin (Schottmüller, 1933, pp. 192 f. n. 5007; Visitation, Krefeld (F. Deneken, Zweiter Bericht des... Museums in Krefeld, Krefeld, 1904, p. 17/18); Nativity (Adoration of Shepherds), Krefeld (ibid.); Adoration of the Magi, Turin, Museo Civico (L. Mallé, Le sculture... , Turin, 1965, p. 177, pl. 157a); Presentation in the Temple, Berlin (Schottmüller, 1933, p. 125 n. 5008: made up and perhaps a replacement); a Flight into Egypt seems to be lacking. Each relief measures 12 1/8 x 19 1/3 in. (31 x 49 cm.); in addition there are two Evangelists in the Museo Civico in Milan (S. Vigezzi, La scultura in Milano, Milan, 1934, n. 662/3 which measure 12 1/8 x 12 1/3 in. (31 x 31 cm.). In the total length given above are included the other two Evangelists and the Flight into Egypt, which have to be assumed originally to have been part of the complex. Stylistically related is a relief in the Certosa of Pavia (L. Beltrami, La Certosa di Pavia, Milan, 1907, p. 41 ill.). (3) Venturi, x, III, 1937, figs. 392, 420, 421; U. Nebbia, La scultura nel Duomo di Milano, Milan, 1908, pp. 203 ff. ill. (4) G. Nicodemi, Agostino Busti, detto il Bambaja, Milan, 1945, figs. 87, 90. (5) Three reliefs in the Museo Civico in Milan (Vigezzi, op. cit., n. 391, 444); a relief in the Museo Civico of Pavia (F. Malaguzzi Valeri, Gia. Antonio Amadeo, Bergamo, 1904, p. 9 ill.); Genoese door-lintels of the Gagini circle, in Genoa (O. Grosso, Genova, Bergamo (1926), p. 30 ill.; H. W. Kruft, Portali genovesi del rinascimento, Florence (1971), pp. 8 f., pls. 3 ff.); in Chios (Hasluck, B.M., xviii, 1910/11, p. 329, pl. 10); in London (J.P.-H., Cat. V.A.M., pp. 390 f. n. 414); in Paris (Musée Jacquemart-André Catalogue, n. 853); in Seattle (2500 years of Italian Art and Civilization, Seattle, Art Museum, 10 Nov.-8 Dec. 1967, fig. 37); a stained glass in the museum of Como (U. Monneret de Villard, Le vetrate del Duomo di Milano, Milan, 1918, p. 136, fig. 3). The early reliefs by Amadeo in the Certosa of Pavia (C. Angelini ed., La Certosa di Pavia, Milan, 1968, figs. 449/50 and on the tomb of Bartolomeo Colleoni in Bergamo (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 69 ill.) either are earlier in type, or develop it a step ahead. Even later works by Amadeo (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 144 ill.) still reflect this composition. (6) The reflections mainly are found in the work of Amadeo and his collaborators, on the tomb of Bartolomeo Colleoni (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 69 ill.), the lunette of the Porta del Lavabo in the Certosa of Pavia (Angelini, op. cit., fig. 268) and other later reliefs of his (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 84 ill., p. 136 ill.). The components are slightly rearranged in Butinone's predella in Treviglio (Venturi, vii, 4, 1915, p. 874, fig. 574). (7) This scene occurs more varied in the tomb of Bartolomeo Colleoni (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 69 ill.), in the Torre tomb in S. Maria delle Grazie in Milan by the Cazzaniga (?) (ibid., p. 237 ill.), in the reliefs by Giovanni Antonio de' Piatti on the tomb of Giovanni Borromeo on Isola Bella (ibid., p. 242 ill.; Diego Sant'Ambrogio, I sarcofagi Borromeo... all'Isola Bella, Milan, 1897, pl. xvii), in a lunette by the Rodari over a door of the cathedral of Como (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 298 ill.; F. Frigerio, Il Duomo di Como e il Broletto, Como, 1950, pl. 11), in the predella of V. Foppa's altar in Savona, S. Maria del Castello (F. Wittgens, Vincenzo Foppa, Milan (1949), pl. xciv). (8) This composition has spread further than the others: Parma, Museum, relief (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 254 ill.); Pavia, Museo Civico, relief (U. Bicchi, Sala dei Montezegga (Civici Musei del Castello Visconteo, Pavia), Pavia, 1958, n. 41c); Certosa of Pavia, Museum, relief (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 285 ill.); Campomorton, altar (ibid., p. 112 ill.); lunette by the Rodari over a door of the cathedral of Como (ibid., p. 300 ill.); relief by Giovanni Antonio de' Piatti on the Borromeo tomb on Isola Bella (Phot. Perotto 2804); V. Foppa, predella in the Brera (Wittgens, op. cit., pl. lxii); a stained glass by Antonio de Pandino (?) (1475 ff.) in the Cathedral of Milan (ibid., p. vii; Monneret de Villard, op. cit., pp. 70 ff., pl. xxix); pictures by Gaudenzio Ferrari, B. Lanino, Bramantino (W. Suida, W.J., xxvi, 1906/7, pp. 316 ff., the same, Bramante Pittore e Bramantino, Milan, 1953, p. 105 ff.) seem still to be inspired by this composition, as well as a relief by Antonello Gagini in Palermo (Venturi, x, 1, 1935, p. 805, fig. 599) and a relief by A. Biffi on the choir screen of the Cathedral of Milan of 1624 (Venturi, x, 3, 1937, p. 513, fig. 421). (9) B. Brioso (?) on the façade of the Certosa of Pavia (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 274 ill.), a door by the Rodari on the Cathedral of Como (ibid., p. 301 ill.; Frigerio, op. cit., fig. 331) and A. Biffi on the choir screen of the Cathedral of Milan of 1617 (Venturi, x, 3, 1937, p. 510, Phot. Alimari 31900). (10) It has a vague resemblance to the relief on Piatti's Borromeo tomb on Isola Bella (Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., p. 242 ill., Phot. Perottii 2795). (11) Angelini, op. cit., figs. 491, 492. (12) P. Pecchiai, Rassegna d'Arte, i, 1914, p. 257. (13) R. Cipriani, G. A. Dell'Aqua, F. Russoli, La Cappella Portinari in S. Eustorgio a Milano, Milan, 1963, figs. 10–13; Venturi, vi, 1908, pp. 637, 688, 872. Photo Zuecca, 1375 (one of the capitals with an angel related to those in our relief). (14) U. Middendorf, Kunstgeschichtliche Studien für Hans Kaufmann, Berlin, 1936, pp. 136 ff. (15) Angelini, op. cit., figs. 427 ff. (16) Filippo Ferro, Giovanni A. Amadeo, Milan, 1966, pl. 11 (17) Malaguzzi Valeri, op. cit., pp. 40 ff. (18) Annali della fabbrica del Duomo di Milano, n. 1, Milan, 1877, p. 277. (19) Ibid., pp. 277, 284, 286, 287, 288, 289, 390. See also R. Mincocchi, Codice diplomatico artistico di Pavia, i, Pavia, 1937, pp. 222, 223, 226, 227, 243. Unfortunately most of the helpers mentioned are only names for us, or we do not know in what style they may have worked.
at that period (e.g. Antonio de' Piazzis). (20) *Annali, op. cit.,* ii, pp. 297 ff., 301, 316, vol. iii, 1880, p. 73. (21) *Ibid.,* vol. iii, pp. 77 ff., 79. (22) The altar of the Condottiere Alessio Tarchetta might be an alternative, but it seems too late (1478 ff.) and apparently was much more modest in size (*Annali, op. cit.,* vol. ii, pp. 304 ff., 312; vol. iii, pp. 47 (6 April 1489), 69; Diego San'tAmbrogio, *Archivio storico Lombardo,* xix, 1892, i, pp. 141 ff.; S. Vigesi, *La scultura in Milano,* Milan, 1934, pp. 30, 35, 162 ff. (23) An idea of the complexity of such an altar can be obtained from the later drawings by Bambaia, quoted in note 4. Of the altar itself no drawing or other trace seems to have survived. It may never have been set up or it may have become a victim of the reform of the cathedral at the time of S. Carlo Borromeo (d. 1584). (24) This door is not dated. It may be somewhat later than 1466, because the terracotta *lavabo* in the small cloister (Angelini, *op. cit.,* figs. 448-450) which was finished, gilt and polychromed by Amadeo's brother Protasio in 1466 (C. Magenta, *La Certosa di Pavia,* Milan, 1897, p. 454/5) looks more old-fashioned. (25) Amadeo himself is mentioned as working on the altar in 1475, 1476, 1477, and later in 1494. (26) C. Magenta, *op. cit.,* p. 473, and n. 2.

GIOVANNI ANTONIO AMADEO

and Collaborators

**KSF3 and KSF4 : Figures 95, 94**

**TWO KNEELING ANGELS.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (a24 and 25), since 1941.1 White marble. KSF3: 18½ x 17 x 4½ in. (46-½ x 43-½ x 12 cm.). Wings, hands, right foot broken and re-attached, repairs on elbow. KSF4: 19½ x 17½ x 3½ in. (49-½ x 43-½ x 9-½ cm.). Wings and head and the two tips of the base broken and re-attached. The neck is shattered. Repaired and cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.


An attribution to Amadeo is generally accepted4 and a date between 1470 and 14805,6 or 1480 and 14905 has been proposed. The two angels are not by the same hand: KSF4 is better in quality and different in style from its companion. The movement is freer and the articulation of the body clearer. The drapery is more finely broken up and reveals the body. The face and the hair are refined. Actually the whole figure is more alive and elegant. KSF3 represents an earlier phase in Amadeo's development, that of the Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo (1473 ff.) and of the tomb of Medea Colleoni (1470 ff.),6 while KSF4 approaches his more mature style. Similar angels occur already in as early a work as the door of the *Chiostro Piccolo* of the Certosa (1466 ff.)7 and in other work there, which is hard to date and to attribute.8 KSF3 must be the work of an assistant who was clinging to an older style. Whether Amadeo himself can be held responsible for KSF4 is uncertain. The original destination of the angels becomes evident from the comparison quoted and from KSF5, where they occur in much smaller scale.


**BENEDETTO BRIOSCO**

and **TOMMASO CAZZANIGA**

Lombard School. Benedetto Briosco (Brioschi) was perhaps slightly younger than Amadeo, and in rank second only to him. Member of a family of stone-masons and sculptors, and apparently head of a large firm, which associated with others such as those of Amadeo, of Tamagnino and particularly at one time that of the Cazzaniga brothers who were his brothers-in-law.1 Engaged, like them, in work on the cathedral of Milan and the Certosa of Pavia and on numerous smaller tasks, he is first mentioned in 14775 and died before 1526.3 In the beginning he must have been under the influence of Amadeo's mature style, but later he turned to a classic High Renaissance manner, perhaps influenced by Gian Cristoforo Romano. He may have been a friend of Leonardo.4 His family, A. Fusina, the Sesto and Bambaia continued his tradition. Attributions to his own hand are as hazardous as those to Amadeo.

Lombard School. Tommaso Cazzaniga, son of Antonio Cazzaniga, brother of Francesco, with whom he worked,
apparently mainly in Milan. Francesco appears for the first time in 1470. He died in or before 1486/7. Tommaso's activity is documented between 1483 and 1504. They were Benedetto Briosco's brothers-in-law, and there exists in a document the name Francesco Cazzaniga de Briosco,1 which might indicate a closer relationship or simply the common origin of both families from Briosco (Brianza) near Milan. They are also found in partnership with Amadeo,5 among whose followers they have to be counted.6

Workshop of BENEDETTO BRIOSCO and TOMMASO CAZZANIGA

KI884, KI885: Figures 96, 97

THE ADO RATION OF THE MAGI AND THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (1614, 1615), since 1952.7 Greyish marble reliefs, partly gilded. Each $24\times24\times5$ in. ($61\times61\times13$ cm). Well preserved. The brushed gold has turned dull and is lost in some parts of the patterns of the draperies; the lost shapes are still recognizable, as the marble underneath has remained without patina, so that they stand out light against a darker ground. Cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.

Provenances: S. Maria del Carmine in Milan.8 Vercellino Visconti.9 Prince Belgioioso, Milan.9 Prince Trivulzio, Milan.9 Jacob Hirsch, New York.10 Kress acquisition, 1952.11

These two reliefs belong to a group of five, all with the same provenance, of which two, the Annunciation and the Presentation in the Temple are in Kansas City,12 and one, the Adoration of the Child is in Cleveland.13 Their history is clouded by misunderstandings which to dispel, one by one, would serve no purpose. It is reasonably certain that they belonged to the lost tomb of Pier Francesco Visconti, Count of Saliceto,14 which his widow, Eufrosia Barbbara, had erected [fecit fieri] after his death in 1484 in a chapel in S. Maria del Carmine in Milan,15 and which carried a long inscription16 commemorating the dead and the signature BENE DICTVS DE BRIOSCHO ET TOMASIVS DE CACINGNO OPVS FECER(VNT).17 In fact the plaque with the inscription was separated from the reliefs only lately and has remained in the Trivulzio palace.18 There is proof that the plaque and the reliefs belonged to the Visconti di Saliceto tomb: their provenance can be traced back to a Visconti family;9 in two of the reliefs, the Presentation and Flight into Egypt, an eagle hovers above; this is not required iconographically but it is the armorial figure of the Visconti di Saliceto,19 as can be seen on a coat of arms still in the original chapel.20 The features of the kneeling knight in the Cleveland Adoration could be those of Pier Francesco but this cannot be proved, as there is no known portrait of him;21 the clothes he wears would be eminently suitable for a warrior and diplomat such as he was. The reliefs fit ideally into the tomb as it is described in an early source,22 and this tomb was of the same type as others done in the same period, in part by the same artists. At present it is impossible to tell when the tomb was dismembered.23 But already in Torre's description of Milan of 167424 it is not mentioned, neither is it found in Latuada's description of 1730.25 Joseph Maria Formara's chronicle of the convent of 168326 has a description of it, but this may have been taken from an earlier source.

The tomb was tall; as in so many other examples a sarcophagus with some kind of superstructure containing figures rested on four decorated and gilt marble piers, in front of which four female statues (of Virtues?) were standing. This last motif was unusual at the time and goes back to an older tradition.27 The reliefs must have decorated the sarcophagus, three on the front, and one on each narrow end; the plaque with the signature may have been at the back. Everything but the reliefs and the plaque is lost. The tomb must have been one of the most sumptuous of its kind. The question of the attribution of the reliefs seems to resolve itself into a choice between the two artists named in the inscription. Proposed attributions to Amadeo28 or the Rodari29 are not possible because of the inscription. But from what we know about the organization of these workshops it is quite possible that neither Briosco nor Cazzaniga had a hand in the execution of the reliefs.30 And it is probable that Amadeo had at least some hand in the matter,31 as the examples after which the tomb was modelled were either his or created in collaboration with him, and as the style of the reliefs certainly is derived from his.32

It is obvious that the reliefs are by different hands. The Adoration of the Magi and the Flight into Egypt belong together33 and are not by the best hand; they neglect the decorative detail, which is carefully treated in the Annunciation and the Presentation. The latter are different from each other; the Adoration with the donor has features in common with both groups. There are incongruities within the single reliefs. This disparate complex is hard to link clearly to similar ones. The type of the Visconti di Saliceto tomb is represented in the seventies and eighties by the Brivio Tomb in S. Eustorgio (d. 1486) by the Cazzaniga and B. Briosco,34 the Longhignana tomb (1485) by the same,35 the upper part of the tomb for Giovanni Borromeo on Isola Bella, by G. A. Piatti (1475–1479),36 the tomb of Gian Francesco della Torre (d. 1483) in S. Maria delle Grazie, whose author is not documented.36 A monument to Carlo Sforza (d. 1483)37 made by Cazzaniga in collaboration with Amadeo is lost; two tombs once in S. Tommaso in Pavia, designed by Amadeo, also are lost.38 The known ones show similar scenes, but always varied in composition and execution. No individual sculptors are identifiable. It is even uncertain to which of the two workshops these reliefs should be assigned. No works independently done by the Cazzaniga are known and what
the early work of B. Briosco looked like, we do not know; his later work is different. Apparently most of the Lombard sculptors in these years were completely under the sway of Amadeo,48 so that it is difficult to tell their work apart and even to isolate Amadeo’s own production from theirs. The style of the Visconti Saliceto reliefs and of those on the other tombs has parallels in some reliefs on the base of the Certosa of Pavia49 and in some other works in this church,50 which, however, are superior in quality. Our ignorance regarding their attribution and dating forbids us drawing a worthwhile conclusion from this observation.

LOMBARD AND GENOISE SCHOOLS: XV-XVI CENTURY

ANTONIO DELLA PORTA (called 'il Tamagnino')

Lombard School. Antonio della Porta was a member of a large family of stonemasons and sculptors from Porlezza (Lake of Lugano), son of a Giacomo della Porta, who worked at the Certosa of Pavia. He was known to be active from 1489 till 1519, and he was engaged mainly in work at the Certosa of Pavia; occasionally he worked in Brescia and later, from around 1500, more permanently in Genoa. Like all the Lombard sculptors of the period he must have had a large workshop, and he collaborated with nearly every sculptor who at the time was in a leading position in Milan or Genoa. He must have had a considerable share in the work on the façade of the Certosa of Pavia. Together with Pace Gagini, his nephew, with whom he collaborated longer than with anyone else, he executed some remarkable works for France. His style is difficult to define and his oeuvre, despite some brilliant examples, hard to circumscribe. Neither the date of his birth nor that of his death is known.1


STANDING ANGEL. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (447), since 1941.2 Marble, 33½ x 11 x 11½ in. (86.1 x 28 x 29.9 cm.). The figure lacks the right hand and the left lower arm with the hand. The right arm was splintered just below the shoulder and has been put in place again. There is a smoke(?). stain and some patching with plaster at the stump of the right arm. Damage to the base: three pieces in front broken off and recomposed; the right foot repaired, the left foot broken and put back again; damages at the back. The marble is stained brown, deeper towards the top of the figure. Cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.


The figure has been described as a singing angel, originally holding a shield.3 Apart from the fact that the two activities are difficult to reconcile, the angel does not sing, and if he had held a shield, his carefully modelled front would have been almost completely concealed. Initially attributed to the Lombard school,4 or even to Amadeo,5 it has been assigned first to the Venetian school in general,6 then with more or less confidence to Pietro Lombardi,7 and lately to his son Antonio.8 As parallels a number of Venetian sculptures have been quoted, in particular the pairs of candle-bearing angels on tombs, altars, etc. It has been assumed that our angel had a companion and may have come from the altar of S. Maria dei Miracoli.9 A standing Madonna in the museum of Aix-en-Provence has been mentioned as closely related.10 Our angel is a good example of the close interrelationship between Lombard and Venetian sculpture, the masters of which latter were almost all of Lombard origin; yet, our piece is distinctly different from similar Venetian pieces. Its closest associates are some angels in S. Maria dei Miracoli in Brescia for which Antonio della Porta, called 'il Tamagnino', was paid in 1489.11 The basic structure, the movement and all details of drapery, hair etc. are the same, even if the execution of our piece is much more careful and sensitive and calculated for closer inspection. It must have been a special commission rather than part of a complex decorative scheme such as the angels in Brescia. The other sculptures by Tamagnino, or ascribed to him, do not contradict the attribution of our piece, which must be one of his earliest works, but do not lend any corroboration to it either.12 It is difficult to find a unity in the oeuvre of the heads of these large Lombard workshops. There are rare predecessors or parallels in Milan;13 of Lombard origin, and almost dependent on our piece might be a pair of candlestick-bearing angels on the railings of the altar of St James in S. Mark's in Venice.14 It is not impossible that an angel in Los Angeles belongs in a later phase of Tamagnino's career. The function of our piece was either to hold a musical instrument, as do the angels in Brescia, or some liturgical implement, as do two Lombard angels of slightly different style in Vienna.15


**MILANESE SCHOOL:**

**EARLY XVI CENTURY**

KI023 : Figures 101–103

**MADONNA AND CHILD WITH SAINTS.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A40), since 1941.1 White marble relief, 21 3/4 x 36 in. (54.8 x 91.4 cm.). The relief is unfinished: the head of the donor at the left is barely blocked out; the angels behind him, the hands and left of the drapery of the saint at the left, and the heads of the three saints in the background lack finish in varying degree. The lower left corner, with the right foot of the saint and the toes of the other, has been broken and rejoined. The toes of this foot and the sleeve of the saint are damaged. Repaired and cleaned 1935 by J. Ternbach.

**Provenance:** Niccolini Collection, Florence.² Continui-Bonacossi, Florence. Kress acquisition, 1936.² Exhibited: Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich., 1938.³

Attributed to a minor Venetian sculptor, Zuan Zorzi Lascaris, called Pyrgoteles,⁴ of whom little is known and to whom a number of incongruous works have been attributed.⁵ Our relief fits with none of them, and is not Venetian, but Lombard.⁶ Valentiner⁷ rightly associated it with an angel in Los Angeles, and ascribed both to Amadeo, around 1480. Pope-Hennessy⁸ has observed the similarity of our Madonna to one in London, which is signed Ambrogio di Mazolisi and dated 1536. Nothing else is known about this sculptor, except that he was Lombard, and not Venetian as Pope-Hennessy concluded from the similarity between the pieces. These works belong only vaguely in the circle of Amadeo⁹ and rather in the succeeding generation of sculptors working in Milan and on the Certosa of Pavia, such as Benedetto Briosco, the Sesto, Tamagnino etc. Comparable are certain figures on the façade of the Certosa of Pavia,¹⁰ and on the pulpit in the refectory there¹¹ or the Bottigella tomb in the University of Pavia.¹² The attributions and datings for these sculptures are still most uncertain. Unfortunately the two portraits defy identification.¹³

MILANESE SCHOOL:
Early XVI Century

K1260 : Figure 104

The Man of Sorrows. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (666), since 1941.4 White marble relief, 118 x 10 in. (29.5 x 25.4 cm.). Manilla-coloured patina. The surface has lost some of its sharpness. The left arm and the hand with the chalice of the angel at the left are new; there have been repairs to the right arm and wrist of the angel at the left on the rear. Mounted in a new marble frame 1956 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: Count J. B. Lucini Passalaqua, Milan.3 L. C. Timbal, Paris.2 Duveen’s, New York.4 Kress acquisition, 1940.5

Introduced by Vitry2 as an anonymous North Italian work, the relief has been attributed to Cristoforo Solari, called ‘il Gobbo’.4 Despite his great reputation we have only a few works which are documented for him,7 and they do not justiﬁc many of the attributions proposed, including that of figs. 134, 135; Malaguzzi217; F. Malaguzzi Kunsthistorischen Institut Florenz, Berlin, 1904, p. 278 ill., Fot. Alinari 39837. (9) C. Angelini, I Solari, in Italienische Forschungen, hrsg. vom Kunsthistorischen Institut Florenz, Berlin, 1906, p. 133 ff. (8) C. Angelini ed., La Certosa di Pavia, Milan, 1968, fig. 217; F. Malaguzzi Valeri, I Solari, in Italienische Forschungen, hrsg. vom Kunsthistorischen Institut Florenz, Berlin, 1906, p. 133 ff. (9) C. Angelini, op. cit., figs. 134, 135; Malaguzzi Valeri, Giov. Antonio Anadeo, op. cit., p. 277 ill. (10) An early example in the cathedral of Milan has a similar gesture of Christ (U. Nebbia, La scultura nel Duomo di Milano, Milan, 1908, p. 4 ill.). Other examples mentioned in J.-P. H. Cat., V.A.M., p. 377 n. 400. (11) Malaguzzi Valeri, Giov. Ant. Anadeo, op. cit., p. 63 ill.; C. Angelini, op. cit., figs. 429, 430, 431, 432.


NORTH ITALIAN SCHOOL (?):
Early XVI Century

K1385 : Figure 105

Madonna and Child. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A158), since 1945.1 Half-length figure, high relief in white marble, 193 x 22 x 6 in. (50 x 56 x 17.5 cm.). Fair condition; the marble has yellowed and is stained brown. The lower left corner from the second furrow of the rocks, through the face of the Child to His elbow, has been broken and re-attached. The left lower corner of this piece is a replacement. The tip of the nose of the Virgin has been repaired. Cleaned and restored 1955 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: Mr and Mrs Otto Kahn, New York.2 Duveen’s, New York. Kress acquisition, 1944.3

This relief has been attributed to Cristoforo Solari;4 it is difficult to see on what grounds. It has been said that the motif of the Sleeping Child is frequent in Venice. This is true enough, but it also occurs elsewhere.5 To base on this an attribution to the young Solari, while working in Venice, is hazardous. The few certain works known from his later career would lead us to expect a higher level of accomplishment even at this early time. The idol-like quality of this image is due rather to primitivity than to artistic intention. Both figures are poorly constructed and carved. The character is faintly North Italian. The curious scene, in lowest relief in the background, of the three Marys and the Christ Child holding a cross and blessing with His right hand, occurs in a more sensible form in a relief in Berlin6 which, if Italian at all, may be Lombard. Such motifs and certain features, like the scenery of the background, could be and were taken by Lombard sculptors nearly everywhere in Italy and abroad.7

DOMENICO GAGINI

Domenico di Pietro Gagini, of Lombard origin, worked in Genoa, Naples and Palermo. Leading member of a large dynasty of sculptors, he was born c. 1420, probably at Bissone (Lake of Lugano), the home of the family; he died in 1492 in Palermo. He must have had some Florentine experience, though an apprenticeship with Brunelleschi is more than dubious. In 1448 he appears in Genoa, where in collaboration with other members of the family he executed various important decorative projects. In 1458 he is mentioned among the artists working on the arch of Castelnuovo in Naples. From 1460 he seems to have been in Palermo, where he founded a vast sculptor’s workshop which for some time almost had a monopoly in Sicily. It was continued by his sons, particularly Antonello, and their descendants until the first half of the seventeenth century.

KS35H: Figure 106

THE NATIVITY. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A32), since 1941.1 White marble relief, 35 1/4 x 20 3/4 in. (90.2 x 52 cm.). In general well preserved. The relief was broken in two at the level of the knee and the foot of the kneeling angels. There are some smaller damages and restorations along the break; two cracks at the bottom: one in the left corner and one at the right of the angels who support the shield. The faces of both these angels, of some of the large kneeling angels, and the Dove of the Holy Ghost are damaged. Joseph’s staff is broken. Cleaned and restored 1956 by J. Ternbach.

The relief has a frame consisting of two plain strips which hold an ornamented band between them. This frame opens into depth in a niche topped by an half-round arch. The posts and the intrados of the arch are decorated by foreshortened simple coffers. In the spandrels are the kneeling figures of the Annunciation. The representation is partly behind the arch, partly, at the bottom, spread out in front of it. The rocky ground forms something like the apron of a stage. Closest to the spectator is a coat of arms held by two angels. It is that of the Malvicini-Fontana of Piacenza; quartered, a cross trefoî in 1 and 4, and a cross chequy in 2 and 3.2 Above it a crown.

On each side of the foreground three adoring angels are kneeling, two in front of the post and one behind it. A stream is winding into the background. Half-way up in a bend, right in the middle of the relief, floats a dodecahedron with small pyramids on each face. Further up, the saddle and the bundles. In the centre Mary and Joseph with foreshortened haloes are kneeling, adoring the Child. Behind them are the trunks of trees, whose crowns appear at the very top. To the left are the ox and the ass, in front of a triumphal arch; at the right St John and Christ meeting as children; at the far right is a tall, classical, round building, which looks something like the Colosseum and also the Septizonium; it touches the arch and is crowned by some vertical elements. Above the main scene a choir of nine adoring angels kneel on clouds. They kneel in a circle, seen from below, the two in the centre front are seen in three-quarter view; the outer four in profile (two of which are in front and two further back); the two right at the back are seen in three-quarter view and the one in the centre, who is furthest back, is seen fully en face. The lunette is filled at the sides with the tree-tops, the outer ones of which are bending to follow the curve of the arch. In the centre, God the Father with pallium, triregnum and crossed halo, is blessing with His right hand and holding the orb in His left, surrounded by a glory of angels in clouds, who are sounding tubas. Below Him the Dove of the Holy Ghost is adored by five angels on clouds, two on each side behind each other and one in the middle in sharp foreshortening. Despite the odd arrangement of the frame, the composition is of the utmost clarity and has a simple monumentality. Great pains have been taken to suggest depth, in the over-all composition as well as in every small detail.

Provenance: Henry Harris, London.3 Contini-Bonacossi, Florence. Kress acquisition, 1937.4

The relief was attributed to Benedetto da Maiano5 until Valentinier correctly identified Domenico Gagini as its author.6 A misreading of the heraldry7 was the cause of the wrong attribution as well as of the opinion that the relief was done during Gagini’s presumable stay in Florence.8 Granted that the relief contains Florentine elements, it is much closer to works done in Naples or Sicily such as the tabernacle from Sutera (Sicily) now in the Rhode Island School of Design,9 a tabernacle in the museum in Palermo10 and some works in Naples,11 all of which can be attributed to Domenico Gagini. There is, however, no indication that the Malvicini-Fontana ever settled in the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, while another branch of the Fontana, the Arcelli, did. But theirs was a different coat of arms.12 The Malvicini for centuries furnished administrative officials for the city republics of Central Italy; for instance in 1454 Antonio Malvincio was capitano in Florence.13 There is, however, little certainty about the identity of these, as there seem to have been other Malvician families, who bore different arms and whose connection with that of Piacenza is dubious, members of which also held similar offices.14 Thus the coat of arms is of no help in dating and localizing our relief. It may date from before 1458, the year Domenico Gagini appears in Neapolitan documents, and it may have been made anywhere in Northern or Central Italy. The strange iconography, in particular the stream with the floating polyhedron, which seems to point to a specific sanctuary of the Virgin, have despite all efforts also defied interpretation.

DOMENICO GAGINI

Formerly attributed to Benedetto da Maiano, it was correctly given to Domenico Gagini by W. R. Valentiner and F. F. Mason Perkins. Presumably from the artist's Genoese period, because the style of the relief agrees with that of the sculptures on the façade of the chapel of St John in the cathedral of Genoa, and its general shape indicates that it was once placed over the lintel of a door as was customary in Genoa. St John the Baptist is one of the patron saints of Genoa; his relics are kept in the chapel in the Cathedral, and he is sometimes represented on Genoese door lintels. For the representation so far no parallel has been found. St John, dressed in a hair-shirt and an ample tunic, is shown seated on clouds. On each side two angels are standing; the two at the left seem to have brought him something; the other two are busying themselves with the Lamb on the book in his left hand. He has a rod in his right hand, possibly the remnant of a thin reed cross. The figures are placed in a rocky landscape with highly stylized trees. On the ground are some birds. The representation corresponds to no event in the life of the Baptist, and may be purely allegorical. The relief may have decorated the door of the buildings of a confraternity of St John the Baptist.


GENOESE SCHOOL: Mid XV Century

ST JOHN THE BAPTIST WITH ANGELS IN A LANDSCAPE. Lawrence, Kans., University of Kansas Museum of Art, Kress Study Collection, since 1961.1 Marble is dirty greyish, 413 × 445 × 45 in. (419 × 114 × 114 cm.). The edge of the frame on top is bevelled. Well preserved but for small damages to the faces and draperies of the figures.

This is a typical piece of Genoese decoration with most of its original polychromy preserved. Tabernacles of similar composition are frequent in Liguria.\(^3\) They can be associated with a group of sculptures which decorate the church of S. Maria di Castello in Genoa, and which seem to have been done in the 1450s under the supervision of Giovanni and Elia Gagini.\(^4\) Typical are the large circular rinceaux of the frame, which are also frequent in the elaborate Genoese doorways of the period,\(^5\) the purely decorative use of an arbitrarily chosen, distorted classical vocabulary, and the weaving together of figures and ornamental details into a closely-knit unity. This style finds its continuation in KS5H. The other tabernacles suggest that ours may once have rested on a bracket and been topped by some decorative elements, possibly even in Gothic form.


---

**VENETIAN AND PADUAN SCHOOLS: XV–XVI CENTURY**

School of the VENETO: Middle of the XV Century

**KS16 : Figure 109**

ST MICHAEL(?). Tucson, Ariz., University of Arizona Art Gallery, since 1961. Polychromed wood statue. Height, including base, 39\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (100·3 cm.). Base, 15\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (39·3 x 22·5 cm.). Armour is blackened silver on red bole ground with some gilding. Cloak is blue, painted with a pomegranate pattern; hair gilt; the flesh colour is well preserved. The palms of the gauntlets and the backs of the greaves imitate red leather. The base is old (original?), its frame is red and gold, the field silver with ornament of foliage. The figure had a rod in the right hand (a spear?). The sword is new.


There is no reason for the traditional attribution to Nanni di Bartolo, il Rosso,\(^1\) not even in his Venetian phase, if that is known. There is no resemblance to the figure of St George on the façade of S. Nicola in Tolentino, as R. Longhi has suggested.\(^1\) This is a typical piece of wood-carving from the Veneto,\(^2\) as we know it from large multi-figured and multicoloured carved polyptychs, which paralleled the painted ones of Antonio Vivarini and his contemporaries and followers. They are wide-spread in place and time, but not yet so well studied that their history can be written. Our figure resembles those of a polyptych in S. Maria in the Tremiti Islands (Apulia), certainly a piece of Venetian export to the South.\(^3\) The figure could easily have been part of such a large complex, depending on whether the base is its original one. The saint has been variously described as St George or St Michael; an argument in favour of the latter is the attitude of the arms: the right holding a sword at one time, the left the scales.

References: (1) G. Fiocco, R. Longhi, W. Suida, A. Venturi in ms. opinions. (2) F. M. Perkins in a ms. opinion. (3) Mostra dell’Arte in Puglia, Bari, Pinacoteca Provinciale, 1964, p. 65 n. 66, fig. 72.
VENETIAN AND PADUAN SCHOOLS: XV–XVI CENTURY

ANTONIO DENTONE?

ANTONIO BREGNO?

ANTONIO RIZZO?

Antonio Dentone, according to Francesco Sansovino, was the author of the monument of Orsato Giustinianni (d. 1464), formerly in S. Eufemia in the cloister of S. Andrea della Certosa in Venice, and of that of Vittorio Cappello (d. 1467) in S. Elena in Venice. He is called Venetian. Antonio Bregno, according to Sansovino, was the author of the tomb of Niccolò Tron (d. 1473) in the church of the Frari, the architect-in-chief of the Doge’s Palace and author of the staircase in its courtyard. An engraving of 1777 by S. Gianpiccoli of the tomb of Francesco Foscarini (d. 1453) in the church of the Frari names Antonio Bregno and his brother Paolo, an architect, as the authors. Their place of origin is given as Como. Antonio occasionally has been identified with a number of other Lombards named Antonio, active earlier in Venice.

Antonio Rizzo’s life, unlike that of the two others, is documented. The date of his birth is unknown, the place disputed between Verona and the diocese of Como. Already early, before 1464, he is celebrated in some poetry and his work in engineering. His only certain works are the statues of Adam and Eve on the Arco Foscari in the courtyard of the Doge’s Palace; the latter is signed and its date is in dispute, with 1462 as the earliest and 1491 as the latest one proposed. With certainty can be ascribed to him some of the main figures of the tomb of Niccolò Tron (d. 1473) in the Frari in Venice. His known dates run from the sixties(7) till 1498, when, as the architect-in-chief of the Doge’s Palace, he was accused of embezzlement and fled. In 1499 he was in Cesena and he disappeared in Central Italy without a trace. His documented work was mainly architecture and engineering.

The information on these three figures overlaps, their oeuvres merge. They have been variously identified with each other or distinguished from each other but, without supplementary information, it is unrewarding to speculate on their identities. The works mentioned and the various ones attributed have a strong resemblance, but cannot be arranged in a comprehensible or persuasive pattern.


Three statuettes belonging to the same series of Virtues are known, one in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and two, privately owned, in Padua. They were part of the tomb of Orsato Giustinianni (d. 1464), formerly in the monastery of S. Andrea della Certosa in Venice which has since been destroyed; the tomb was in a chapel in S. Eufemia, an old church incorporated into the cloisters, and is known to us from a drawing of the eighteenth century. After Paoletti had published another statuette as presumably belonging to this tomb, Planiscig and later Mariacher identified beyond any doubt five of the (presumably) six statuettes, which stood around the free-standing sarcophagus. K1918 and the statuette in the Metropolitan Museum are recognizable in the drawing. The Virtues are difficult to identify: the one holding a vase (K1917) might be a Temperantia. The sarcophagus of the Orsato Giustinianni tomb must have been almost identical with that of the Tron tomb. The Virtues find their closest parallels in the statues on the pinnacles of the Arco Foscari in the courtyard of the Doge’s Palace. These last statements lead right into the centre of the unresolved question of the identity of the artists involved.

References: (1) Francesco Sansovino, Venezia città nobilissima, ed. G. Martinioni, Venice, 1663, pp. 213, 216 (ed. of 1581, cc. 78r, 80 r; ed. of 1604, cc. 173v, 174r). (2) Ibid., p. 188. (3) Sansovino, 1663, I.c., pp. 320s; Paoletti, in Th.B., iv, 1910, p. 368. (4) The documents regarding him have never been gathered. They are difficult to judge, because there were contemporaries who bore the same name; one person might be known by different names, so that it is a continuous question which documents can be referred to which person. (5) The Samuel H. Kress Collection (El Paso Museum of Art), 1961, n. 21 (as Antonio Rizzo). (6) I want to thank D. Ken Smith-Burnet for his help in examining the condition of the pieces. (7) Drawing by Jan van Grevenbroeck in the Museo Correr in Venice (mid eighteenth century), reproduced in the literature quoted below. (8) A. Muñoz, Pièces de choix de la collection du Comte

Two Virtues. El Paso, Tex., El Paso Museum of Art, since 1961. White marble statuettes. K1917: 31 1/8 x 9 3/4 in. (78.7 x 29.5 x 24.1 cm.). K1918: 31 1/8 x 9 3/4 in. (80 x 26.8 x 23.5 cm.). K1917: Condition fair; restored: the nose, the right corner of the right eye, the chin, and the bottom of the right earlobe. The ridges of the folds in front and under the vases have been damaged and partly restored. The vase has lost its top and one handle or a spur. The base is chipped. K1918: Condition fair; the head is modern; the lower tips of the hair still original, the throat completely retouched with plaster. The right arm was broken below the elbow; the wrist area is restored in plaster; on the platter in her hand are two holes in which to insert dowels.
PADUAN SCHOOL: 1525

K1935 : Figure 112

FULL-LENGTH MADONNA. Tulsa, Okla., Philbrook Art Center, since 1953.1 Terracotta, 55 1/2 x 164 in. (14141/9 cm). Baked in two sections. On the base incised the date MDXXV. No polychromy left except the gilding of the edges, and brown and gold colour in the hair. The terracotta surface uniformly buff. The whole upper half, particularly the faces and the hair, completely gone over. Restored in 1963.


The statue is traditionally attributed to Giovanni Minelli di Bardi, a Paduan sculptor at the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth. It has little resemblance to his work, though its Paduan origin perhaps can be defended. In type and style it may be compared with a number of Madonnas which have been linked with the young Andrea Riccio.3 It shares with them the classificated face, the stylization of the hair, the formal covering of the head. In all of them the Child has unconventional attitudes. Related is also the head of a maturer work by Ricci himself, the seated Madonna in the Santo in Padua.4 The drapery has a parallel in that of the terracotta relief of the Pietà in S. Stefano in Carrara (Padua).5 None of the works mentioned seem to be by the same hand as ours, and they show considerable differences between each other. We have in them and in our Madonna perhaps the products of a terracotta industry rather than the creations of leading sculptors.

**ROMAN AND CENTRAL ITALIAN SCHOOLS**

**XV CENTURY**

**ANDREA BREGNO**

Roman School. Born in Osteno (Como) in 1418, he died in Rome 1503. Nothing is known about his education. From the sixties he was active in Rome as the leading sculptor, who took the lion's share of commissions for altars, tabernacles and tombs. He collaborated with others, e.g. Mino da Fiesole and Giovanni Dalmata. His production has excellent decorative qualities but it remained fairly uniform throughout his career, and is variable as to the quality of execution; he must have had a large number of assistants and helpers, whose shares have never been defined.¹

K1922, K1923 : Figures 113, 114

**THE APOSTLE JAMES THE LESS AND THE APOSTLE PHILIP.** Kansas City, Mo., William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art and Mary Atkins Museum of Fine Arts. (25/26), since 1952.² The saints are standing in niches. High relief; white marble; excellent condition. St James: 41 × 18 × 3½ in. (104.1 × 45.7 × 14.6 cm.). St Philip: 41 × 18½ × 3½ in. (104.1 × 46.3 × 14.6 cm.).


Two other figures of the same type and provenance are said to have been sold to Berlin.³ This is partially true; the Berlin Museum acquired in 1882 from the same dealer two figures of angels reclining on a pediment and holding the Rovere arms.⁴ The four figures were correctly identified by A. Schmarsow⁵ as belonging to a tabernacle which was part of a decoration in the apse of SS. Apostoli, done between 1475 and 1477 for Giuliano della Rovere, the later Pope Julius II. Albertini’s guide of 1510⁶ succinctly describes it and names the two apostles who were the original titular saints of the church.⁷ The attribution to Andrea Bregno is convincing, as the reliefs resemble his other works⁸ to such a degree that for a long time it has been assumed that they were part of one of the altars which he executed for the Cardinal Guillaume des Perriers.⁹ It is impossible to be dogmatic in regard to attributions to Bregno, as the oeuvre which can be attributed to him shows a great number of variations of his style. Also the dating would be almost impossible, as there seems to be little development during his whole career; fortunately our two pieces are datable. For the Berlin pieces the assistance of a helper, perhaps Luigi Capponi, has been suggested¹⁰ and our reliefs have been cautiously attributed to Andrea Bregno’s workshop.¹¹


**CENTRAL ITALIAN SCHOOL:**

**Second Quarter of the XV Century**

K1384 : Figures 115–117

**MADONNA OF HUMILITY.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A157), since 1950.¹ Full-round statuette in
marble; the back fully, if summarily, modelled. The simple base irregularly hexagonal. 22 ¾ x 19 ½ x 11 ½ in. (58.4 x 48.8 x 28.3 cm.). Well preserved but for a few minor bruises and chips. The marble, which has a few dark veins, has taken a yellowish patina. The hair, the edges and linings of the garments, the belt of the Virgin have traces of gilding applied over a green-blue colour. The base shows traces of red and gilding; at one time it was believed that it bore an inscription: MARIA MEA, of which no trace can be found. 2

There are holes in the heads for fastening halos, and at both sides of the necks of the Virgin and the Child, for necklaces. Cleaned 1936 by J. Ternbach.


With the uncertain provenance, the attribution of the piece remains uncertain. It has been ascribed to Jacopo della Quercia 9 or a follower of his. 10 Sometimes it is cautiously quoted as ‘attributed’ to Quercia. 11 Other artists tentatively proposed are Giovanni Turini 12 and Domenico de’ Cori. 13 An attribution would depend on the presumable date of the sculpture. And indeed, as a way out of the difficulties presented by a certain awkwardness of the piece, the latest advocates of an attribution to Quercia himself have assumed it to be an early work. 14 Such a dating can scarcely be maintained, particularly since its main support, the Madonna of the Piccolomini altar in the Cathedral of Siena, is quite different, and, moreover, is unlikely to be an early work by Quercia. 15 Our Madonna, as is agreed among most of the critics, finds parallels rather in the works of Quercia’s later years. The question is how close it is to them. We know that there were collaborators from all parts of Italy in Quercia’s workshop, 16 and certainly outsiders were also influenced by him. The mixture in our piece of a certain archaic simplicity, a halting rhythm of the movement of the body and of the drapery, with elements undoubtedly derived from Quercia might point to an artist, possibly working in Emilia, 17 in whom several traditions merge. The piece seems to be far away from the Sienese tradition and it is difficult to see what it should have in common with the works of the Ghiberti-Rucellai Turini or those of the tradition-bound wood-carver Domenico de’ Cori. The iconography does not help either, as the motif of the Magi 18 is interesting, but not convincing, as there are other individual Madonnas of this type, turned toward the side. 18 One would expect a wooden tabernacle to have protected the group at one time.


**UNDETERMINED ITALIAN SCHOOL: XV CENTURY**

**ITALIAN SCHOOL:**
Second Half of the XV Century

**KSF51 : Figure 118**

PROFILE OF A GENTLEMAN. Tulsa, Okla., Philbrook Art Center, since 1953.1 Istrian2 stone, 17 1/2 x 13 1/2 in. (45.1 x 39 cm.). Upper left corner broken and re-attached. Otherwise good condition.

Provenance: W. Count Oriola, Bödesheim, Oberhessen.2 Centini-Bonacossi, Florence. Kress acquisition, 1938.1

The relief has been attributed to Pietro Lombardi,3 Bartolomeo Bellano,4 a fictitious 'Master of the Laurana Profiles'5 or, more cautiously, to a North or Central Italian master of the second half of the fifteenth century.6 It has also been compared to profile portraits in Ferrara and Bologna.1 Actually there is nothing in the relief that makes a precise attribution possible. It might date from the years around 1480, for which the head-gear is documented in North Italy.7


FLORENTINE SCHOOL:
Middle of the XVI Century

KSFSE : Figure 119

PROFILE PORTRAIT OF A COURTESAN. Lawrence, Kansas, The University of Kansas Museum of Art, Kress Study Collection, since 1961. 1 Marble relief, 25\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 19\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (65.1 x 49.9 x 12 cm.). Good condition. Broken and mended at the upper right edge. Possibly contemporary gilt wood frame. 31\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 26\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. (79.4 x 67.6 cm).


A conjecture as to the nature of the sitter has been made possible by the appearance of a similar, slightly smaller relief in an identical frame in the London art market, 3 which bears an inscription: CECHINE-PULCIRITUDINIAE. IMMORTALITATE. Cecchina is known through an anonymous volume of poetry I Germini sopra quarta maritrici della città di Firenze, Florence, 1553. 4 The girl represented in the present relief is probably one of the other courtesans celebrated in these poems. Similar portraits in an equally extravagant decorative taste are found in North Italian medals by Ruspaghiari, Signorotti and Bombarda. 5 The fashion of the hair has its parallels everywhere, as shown by the contemporary medals by Galeotti, Pastorino, Jacopo da Trezzo, Leone Leoni etc. 6 Our relief, however, has been correctly assigned to the Florentine school, either to the circle of Michelangelo 7 or to Perino da Vinci. 8 Indeed, this kind of idealized female head finds its sources in certain drawings by Michelangelo and his circle, which were also imitated in painting. 9 The workmanship of the marble points to someone trained in the workshop of Bandinelli, who himself did similar portraits. 10 Our two reliefs, which do not seem to be by the same hand, show the extreme formalism cultivated by Bandinelli’s followers like the young Stoldo Lorenzi, Battista Lorenzi (del Cavaliere) and Giovanni Bandini. 11 A precise attribution would be difficult.

References: (x) Register of the Art Museum of the University of Kansas, II, n. 4, March 1960, pp. 49 f. (as Perino da Vinci, c. 1530). (2) N.G. Prelim. Cat., I, 1941, p. 238 n. A29 (as...

PIETRO FRANCAVILLA
(Pierre de Francqueville)


KI1909 : Figures 122-124

STANDING CUPID. Seattle, Wash., Seattle Art Museum, since 1952. Full round marble statue, 20 x 12 x 11 in. (73.7 x 30.5 x 29.2 cm.). Condition: surface pitted with some areas of reddish-brown and greyish discoloration; wings have been restored; the left leg has a fault in the marble which has been repaired and the right leg has been repaired at the big toe, across instep, through ankle; there is a repair at the back of the sculpture at the bottom of the quiver of arrows ⅜ in. high continuing through drapery; top knot of hair broken off and put back; the arrow is broken off between thumb and finger. The upper section of the base has been repaired diagonally across front corners meeting approximately at centre, at left chord length 5 in. with secondary repair c. ⅜ in. near centre, at right chord length ⅝ in. meeting another crack starting 4⅜ in. from front along side extending to left foot of cupid; there is a repair connecting the other two repairs along outside edge of left foot; and one at the back about 2 in. from back left corner; in the lower section of base there is a break at back right corner, and a filled-in chip along front right edge. Repairs appear not to be recent; breaks seem to be filled in and covered with thin plaster-like substance, generally greyish-cream in colour, but across front right corner greyish-lavender in colour.


Attributed to Giovanni Bologna by Planiscig and Valentinier, by F. Kriegbaum to Francavilla. Compares well with the children of the latter's Caritas in the Villa di Bellosguardo in Florence, made c. 1604 for the Michelozzi. Francavilla quite obviously followed here an idea of Giovanni Bologna's, and the piece could possibly be identified with a Cupid in marble, listed 1623 as by Bologna in the estate of Don Antonio dei Medici. An attempt to place the figure in the circle of Germain Pilon is hard to sustain.


GERHARDO SILVANI

Florentine School. Born in 1579 in Florence and died there in 1675. The leading architect of his time in Florence, also active as sculptor. Taught by the painter and architect Lodovico Cardi, Il Cigoli, and the sculptor Giovanni Caccini, for whom he occasionally executed marble sculptures. He married the grand-daughter of the architect Bernardo Buontalenti.

GERHARDO SILVANI (?)

KI1249 : Figure 121

GIANNI DI PIERO CAPPONI. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A59), since 1941. White marble
J. Ternbach. (1960), in the SS. Annunziata, seem to have been executed by in Volterra, which is documented for Silvani. 

ANIMI PATERNI (Horace, Carmina, II, 2, 6). Well pre­

bust, 23\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 23\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (60:2 x 60:2 x 25:7 cm.); with base 30\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (77.2 cm.) high. On the chest the T of the Knights of Altopascio and the inscription NOTVS IN FRATRES/ ANIMI PATERNI (Horace, Carmina, II, 2, 6). Well pre­


DOMENICO PIERATTI

Florencine School. Died in 1656 in Rome. With his brother, the sculptor and architect Giovanni Battista Pieratti, he was a pupil of Andrea di Michelangelo Ferrucci (d. 1626), and was active in Florence and later in Rome. He produced religious, mythological and allegorical statuary in marble, and decorative work for the Boboli gardens.
DOMENICO PIERATTI (?)

K2130, K2131: Figures 125, 126

CHIARO AND GIOVANNI DA VERRAZZANO. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1664, 1665), since 1956.1 Busts in white marble, K2130 (with base): 36x27x4 in. (91.4x68.9x37.8 cm.), inscribed: M. CHIARO DA VER. K2131 (with base): 34x27x4 1/2 in. (86.6x68.9x33.6 cm.), inscribed: GIO. DA VER. The bases with the inscriptions are separate, but original. Well preserved. Cleaned 1956 by J. Tembach.


The portraits are those of the explorer Giovanni da Verrazzano (1485–1528) and a famous ancestor of his, Chiaro di Bene (thirteenth century).6 The star on the latter’s chest is the family coat of arms.7 Obviously the busts are not contemporary with the sitters. That of Giovanni has some parallels: a picture once in the Verrazzano house, known from an engraving8 and another painted portrait,9 one of them by Orazio Fidani.10 They all agree as to the features and character, but it is impossible to tell from which contemporary original they might stem. The portrait of Chiaro is probably pure historical fiction and an attribution for such a historicizing portrait is difficult; a clue furnished by a third bust, that of the admiral and knight of S. Stefano, Lodovico da Verrazzano (d. 1647),12 which was together with the two others10 till they became recently separated and which belongs to that part of the Contini-Bonacossi Collection which was given to the Florentine Galleries.12 However different from ours it may look, it could still be by the same hand.13 Its author is given as a ‘Romeo Pieratti’ – the first name is obviously a misreading for an abbreviated ‘Domenico’.14 There would be some supporting evidence: Lodovico da Verrazzano, to whose initiative the busts might owe their existence, must have been well acquainted with Pieratti; they both frequented the drawing lessons of Baccio del Bianco,14 and it seems that a bust of Christ, which looks very much like a work by Pieratti, was made for a Verrazzano villa near Florence.15 Among the few known works by Pieratti there is no parallel for our busts, but they do not exclude their attribution either.17


PISAN SCHOOL: Second Half of the XVI Century (?)

K2081, K2082: Figures 127, 128

TWO ADORING ANGELS. Memphis, Tenn., Brooks Memorial Art Gallery, since 1958.1 Light-coloured walnut(?), full round angel (head turned to left): 42 1/4x14x12 1/4 in. (108x35.9x31.1 cm.). Angel (head turned to right): 42 1/2x14x10 3/8 in. (107.3x35.5x26.4 cm.). The wood composed of different pieces. Worm holes and some minor repairs. The surface entirely gone over.


The work of a woodcarver, who was inspired by similar figures by Silvio Cosini, two marble angels in the cathedral
of Pisa (1528) and an angel on the monument for Antonio Strozzi in S. Maria Novella in Florence (1524). The style, however, is harder and seems to betray a knowledge of the bronze angel in the same cathedral by Stoldo Lorenzi (1582/3). There are even later examples for this type of angel, e.g. the bronzes of 1633 by the Florentine Francesco Bordoni in the chapel of St-Trinité at Fontainebleau. A traditional attribution to Beccafumi has been rightly discarded.


LOMBARD SCHOOL: XVI CENTURY

LEONE LEONI

Milanese School. Born in 1509 in Monaggio (Como), the son of a native of Arezzo, he died in 1590 in Milan. The leading sculptor and bronze-founder in Milan, active in and for various places; among his patrons were the Emperor Charles V, King Philip II of Spain and the Gonzaga family in Mantua.

After LEONE LEONI

K1906 : Figure 129

BUST OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES V. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1628), since 1952.1 Bronze (bell metal?) with transparent light patina, 43½ x 22 x 16½ in. (109.5 x 55.9 x 41.9 cm.). Height of base: 10½ in. (27 cm.), height of the bust alone: 32½ in. (82.6 cm.). On the rectangular base the inscription: KAROLVS QINTVS/IMP-ERATOR SEMPER/AVGUSTVS. The ornament on the base repeated on all four sides. Condition: good. Cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.


In 1549 Leoni modelled in Brussels a life-size bust of Charles V. In 1551 he saw the Emperor again in Augsburg. In 1552 he was engaged on a bronze of Charles in Milan. Two busts of the Emperor by him are mentioned in a letter by Ferrante Gonzaga, dated from Milan, 28 December 1553. Both - one in marble, the other in bronze - are in the Prado.4 Leoni cast one for the Duke of Alba,5 the whereabouts of which is not known, and in 1555 one for Cardinal Granvella, which now is in Vienna.6 A slightly smaller, highly ornamented silver version with a different base, dated 1575, is in the Museo de Santa Cruz in Toledo.7 A weaker replica, according to Planiscig, was in the collection of Count Batthyany in Nagy-Csolthány (Hungary).8 The ultimate origin of the present bust is unknown. The simple rectangular base, the insensitive dry chasing, and the pedantic ornamentation distinguish it from the others, as Planiscig,9 and Schottmüller and Hill10 point out. Perhaps it is one of the casts executed in Flanders11 mentioned in the correspondence between Leoni and Granvella; the material and the technique favour such a theory. As in bells, mortars and similar objects, the ornament is composed of a few basic units. It is produced by small stamps and applied to the smooth surface of the wax model. In the same fashion the decoration of the base is repeated four times. These are the typical procedures of the bronze or brass foundries that existed at the time in great number in Flanders. The character of the ornamentation also seems northern.

ANNIBALE FONTANA

Lombard School. Born in 1540 in Milan, died there in 1587. The leading and most famous sculptor of his generation in Milan. Around 1570 active in Palermo.

After ANNIBALE FONTANA

Figure 130


Traditionally considered a model by Annibale Fontana for his famous marble relief on the façade of S. Maria presso S. Celso in Milan, for which he was paid on 8 July 1580. The different proportions, some misunderstandings of details in the middle-ground, such as the tree at the left and the broken arch at the right, the more pictorial character, the prettier facial types, the loose modelling suggest that the terracotta probably is a fine copy, possibly from the later seventeenth century, by an artist like Carlo Simonetta (d. 1693, Milan). The size would make it suitable for the altar of a private chapel. The view that it is a model has been challenged before.


VENETIAN SCHOOL: XVI CENTURY

JACOPO SANSOVINO

Florentine, Roman and Venetian School. Sculptor and architect, born in 1486 in Florence, died in 1570 in Venice. Jacopo d'Antonio Tatti took the name of his teacher Andrea Contucci called Il Sansovino, whose classic style he continued and eventually transplanted to Venice. In 1505/6 either his teacher or Giuliano da Sangallo took him to Rome, where he studied classical sculpture and architecture. The years between 1511 and 1527 he divided between Florence and Rome. Already in 1523 in Venice, he returned there after the sacco di Roma in 1527, to stay. Here he became the leading sculptor and architect and together with his friends Titian and Pietro Aretino completely dominated the scene.

After JACOPO SANSOVINO

Figure 131

MADONNA AND CHILD. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1662), since 1955. Cartapesta and stucco
relief, polychromed and gilded. The tunic of the Virgin is dark red, her wrap gold, lined with blue. The Child’s diaper is white. Belt, clasp and neck of the tunic are gold; hair brown; flesh colour darkened. In a contemporary, but apparently not its own carved wooden frame, black and gold. 47×37½ in. (119.4×95.6 cm.). Condition: good as far as the figures are concerned. They have undergone a cleaning, and the ground has been thoroughly patched up, as a comparison with older photographs shows. The polychromy has darkened. Restored, polychromy secured 1955 by M. Modestini.

Provenance: A Villa in Farano, Lago di Garda. Baron Max von Heyl, Darmstadt. Barlow Randolph Hearst Collection. Duveen’s, New York. Kress acquisition 1949. Exhibited: Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia 1950-3. Of the known replicas, which are all in the same technique, two, one formerly in the Venetian art market and the other in the museum of Serravalle (Vittorio Veneto), are said to be signed. Sansovino’s signatures, however, are not always a guarantee for autograph execution. Of three similar Madonna compositions this one seems to have been the most popular. Another is known in only two examples; the third in only one example, which on account of its size and technique stands apart, and to judge from its quality and its provenance from Sansovino’s Villa Garzoni in Pontecasale, could easily be autograph. Various widely divergent proposals have been made as to the dating of these reliefs. It has been suggested that one of them might be associated with the Madonna which the printer Francesco Marcolini in 1551 saw in Pietro Areto’s house and which might be the one which the latter in the following year sent as a gift to the Duchess of Urbino. This relief, however, is stated to have been in marble. It is possible that one of the two compositions preserved in such cartapesta squeezes was taken from it. Ours could just be that one, as the Berlin-Budapest version seems to be earlier and contemporary with the bronzes on the Loggetta (c. 1540-1545), while works of a later date, like the figures on the Venier monument (1551-61), the undated, but late Madonna in Palazzo Ducale, and the relief of the Miracle of St Anthony in the Santo in Padua (commissioned in 1536, but not finished till 1563) are the closest parallels for ours. A derivation from our composition is a stone relief, dated 1562, in Palazzo Ducale. The composition in reverse occurs in a small bronze plaque. Bode, who was the first to identify these reliefs correctly, has observed that their compositions are exceptional in Venice, and continue the tradition initiated in Florence by Donatello and his contemporaries. Significant in this connection is the fact that there are related compositions of which it is not always certain whether they are of Tuscan or Venetian origin. The piece is perhaps the finest of the series to have survived.


**ALESSANDRO VITTORIA**

Venetian School. Born in 1525 in Trent, died 1608 in Venice. He started in Venice as helper of Jacopo Sansovino, from whom he eventually became estranged. He developed into Sansovino’s most successful successor, becoming the leader of Venetian sculptors of his generation. His work in stone, bronze, stucco, and terracotta includes individual monumental and small statuary, architectural decorations, and, above all, portrait busts, which belong to the best of his time.

**K1983, K2077 : Figures 132–135**

**PORTRAIT OF A YOUNG MAN IN ARMOUR.** Terracotta, 35% × 24 × 12 in. (90 × 61 × 32 × 3 cm.). Signed below on thickness of the bust: *A.V.F.*

**PORTRAIT OF A LADY.** Terracotta, 31% × 23 3/4 × 13 1/2 in. (81 × 59 × 33 cm.). Signed below on thickness of the bust: *ALEXAN. VICTORIA. F.*

Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (a1666, 1667), since 1954. The damages, some missing ridges of folds which probably had been badly attached during modelling, are well visible in the photographs; they are old and already mentioned by Frimmel, who also describes remnants of the original gilding on red bolus ground, which have been removed in a recent cleaning. The surface today corresponds in no way to the intentions of the artist, who used to paint his terracottas to look like bronze or marble. Repaired and cleaned 1935 by J. Ternbach.


A third bust, that of an elderly lady, of the same provenance as the two others, is still in Vienna. It has always been assumed that the three busts represent members of the Zorzi family, as suggested by their provenance, though it has not been possible to put individual names to them. A recent attempt to identify the portrait of the young lady as that of Adrianna, the wife of Palma Giovane, cannot be sustained, as it is mainly based on the resemblance of a hair-style fashionable at the time. Also, the bust does not lend itself as a companion piece to that of Palma, later acquired in Vienna. The Palazzo Zorzi was famous for its works in marble and stucco by Vittoria, among which portraits are specifically mentioned. The dating of the busts is difficult, as is indicated by the fact that Cessi dates the three busts in different periods, though they seem to have been conceived as companions. A date around 1570 has been proposed, and also one in the 1590s. The date of Sansovino's book, 1581, might furnish a convenient terminus ante quem, which would agree with the austere and slightly abstract monumentality of the pieces.


**VENETIAN SCHOOL:**

Third Quarter of the XVI Century

K1247: Figures 136, 137

**BUST OF A KNIGHT OF SANTIAGO.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A60), since 1941.1 Terracotta 28\(\times\)26\(\frac{2}{4}\) in. (71 \(\times\) 65.2 cm.). The surface has been evenly gone over. Base stained black (old?).


Traditionally attributed to Alessandro Vittoria and identified as a portrait of a Acrobat Contarini. The badge on the chest, however, has nothing to do with the Contarini arms, and has been identified correctly as that of the order of Santiago by Pietrogrande,3 who also disputed the attribution and has given the bust, with some reservation, to Francesco Segala. The original attribution and identification maintained by Valentiner,2 Langton Douglas,2 and G. Swarzenski,2,5 have been defended by F. Cessi.4 The identity of the sitter is difficult to discover. There lived at the time a senator Jacopo Contarini, a great patron of art and literature,6 of whom, however, no portrait seems to be known. A superficial resemblance to an admiral of the Venetian School: XVI Century warmth of Jacopo Sansovino’s statue of Tommaso Rangone10 on the façade of S. Giuliano in Venice (1554), e.g. the so-called Pietro Aretino in Leningrad,11 the puzzling Gianello Turreani (1500 Cremona–1575 Toledo) in Toledo12 and the Priamo da Lezze (d. 1557), in the Gesù in Venice.13 The dating of the piece has been confirmed by thermoluminescence testing.

ROMAN SCHOOL: XVI CENTURY

MICHELANGELO SENESE

Sculptor in Rome, identical with Angelo de Marinis. His reputation is vouched for by Cellini, who mentions him with praise in his autobiography and by Baldassare Peruzzi who entrusted him with the execution of his design for the tomb of Pope Hadrian VI in S. Maria dell’Anima in Rome (1524 ff.). According to Vasari he died shortly afterwards when he was very old.

MICHELANGELO SENESE (?)

KSP5A : Figure 138

MADONNA AND CHILD. Lewisburg, Pa., Bucknell University (Kress Study Collection), since 1961.¹ High relief, marble, 23½ x 16 in. (99.7 x 40.6 cm.). Flat back, partly covered by a rough plaster. Probably originally inserted into a roundel. Right arm of Child and drapery around it worked separately and inserted. Base of a later date. Surface slightly corroded and rubbed.


Attributed to Andrea Sansovino⁴ or his school.⁵ The general resemblance to Sansovino’s St Anne in S. Agostino in Rome (1512) is obvious. The closely packed composition and the metallic quality of the drapery, however, recall the figures on the tomb of Cardinal Armellini in S. Maria Trastevere in Rome (1524) and those on the tomb of Hadrian VI in S. Maria dell’Anima (1524 ff.), which seem to be by Michelangelo Senese,⁶ both done according to designs by Baldassare Peruzzi.⁷ The two Madonna tondos of the Armellini tomb are placed in spherical niches. Similar compositions occur also elsewhere in Peruzzi’s oeuvre,⁸ among Raphael’s early Roman drawings (the pink sketch-book) and among the works of Sienese painters like Gerolamo del Pacchia.


ROMAN (?) SCHOOL: XVI Century

K1883 : Figure 139

EAGLE. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1613), since 1932.¹ White marble, with a few dark spots, 29½ x 24½ x 12½ in. (75.6 x 62 x 31.7 cm.). Very well preserved, except that both wings at the height of the shoulders and the beak have been neatly broken and joined again. The left corner of the base with two claws of one foot are missing. At one time the gap was filled with an (old?) replacement.² Disencrusted, repaired and cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.


The eagle is said to have been found in 1898 in an excavation in Egypt and has been considered an acroterion of a Hellenistic temple.³ Even if similar eagles existed in antiquity,⁴ the type, the workmanship and the condition of the surface of our piece seem to suggest a later date.⁵ Eagles of this type appear in the coats of arms of some major Italian families, the Doria, the Gonzaga, and the Este. In an inventory of the collections of Alfonso II of Ferrara of 1584 are mentioned ‘un’altra aquila, che doveva servire a qualche cosa’ and ‘un’ aquila su un piedistalle con ali aperte forse moderna’⁶ which might refer to an eagle like ours. The Fountain of The Dragon in the Villa d’Este in Tivoli (1572) originally was guarded by a number of such eagles, possibly of similar size, which today are missing.⁷ The eagle on the relief of the Smithly of Vatican from Ferrara by Antonio Lombardi, now in Leningrad,⁸ and the wings of the Roman eagle in the portico of SS. Apostoli in Rome, which were restored by Giuliano della Rovere, the later Pope Julius II,⁹ are not dissimilar in treatment. That the eagle should have found its way to Egypt, possibly during the nineteenth century, and lost its identity there would not be hard to explain.
References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1963, p. 158; Ill., 1968, p. 140 (as Hellenistic School, Egypt). (2) Kress Coll. Cat., 1956, p. 254 f. n. 94; Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 381 (as Hellenistic). (3) Letters from Dr Jacob Hirsch. (4) E.g. in connection with Roman imperial statues, as Dr Erkinger Schwarzenberg communicates in a letter, in which he also points to the motto 'Illeso lumine solerm', which was that of many families and which would here be appropriate (J. Dietlitz, Die Wahl- und Denkspriiche, Frankfurt a.M., 1888, p. 140). It refers to the legend that the eagle is capable of looking into the sun without being blinded. (5) The Hellenistic origin is doubted also by Dr Schwarzenberg and by Dr Theodor Kraus and his helpers at the German Archäologisches Institut in Rome, to whom thanks is due for their help on this problem. (6) Documenti iscritti per servire alla storia dei musei d'Italia, vol. III, Rome, 1880, p. 16. (7) David C. Coffin, The Villa d'Este at Tivoli, Princeton, 1960, pp. 21, 78 ff., figs. 16, 17. (8) Sculptures from Western Europe of the 15th to the 20th Centuries, Leningrad, 1960, fig. 10. (9) E. Zocca, La Basilica dei SS. Apostoli in Roma, Rome, 1959, pp. 74 f.

Kevin 1613: Figures 140-146

RELIQUARY. Chicago, Ill., David and Alfred Smart Gallery, University of Chicago, since 1974. Silver gilt, height 23 ¼ in. (59.7 cm.). The triangular foot rests on the back of three sphinxes. The figures of a Pope, presumably Paul III, of St Peter and of an unidentified saint or prophet sit on its corners; on each side in a cartouche the Farnese arms in blue enamel on gold ground surrounded by a red ornamented rim, with the Keys of St Peter and the tririgium above (the arms of Pope Paul III Farnese, 1534-49). The figures lean against a capital-like base, from which rises the hexagonal stem in the shape of a baluster, which is decorated with scrolls and garlands held by three caryatid-like figures. There follows a four-sided oblong capital-like shape, which carries an oblong platform. On it stand on each side an angel and in the middle, supported by the angels, the oval reliquary itself. It rests on a baluster-like foot, which is crowned by a cherub's head, whose wings support it. It is a flat oval capsule which opens in the back. The front and back are decorated by two églomisés on rock crystal. They are framed by lapis lazuli bands held by narrow silver frames; the outer and inner frames are linked by four medallions also of lapis lazuli. The églomisés represent, in front, the Coronation of the Virgin, at the back, the Virgin bestowing a crown and palus on a group of kneeling Saints. The finial is a small crystal ball, held by two putti, with a floral top. The main elements are worked separately and are held together by a modern iron rod, probably the replacement for one in silver. The individual figures and ornamental elements are all cast separately and riveted and soldered in place. Every detail is carefully chased. But for minor repairs in wax the piece is well preserved. The églomisé at the back is somewhat damaged by flaking.


This is one of the very few great works of the goldsmith's art surviving from sixteenth-century Italy. They are so few and far between that not two of them seem to have any connection with each other, and our piece cannot be linked to any of them. Its traditional attribution to Manno di Battista Sbarri, the pupil of Cellini, is unsupported by evidence; his only known work, the Cassetta Farnese in Naples, which he fashioned between 1548 and 1561 for Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, is quite different in design, style and workmanship. The reliquary must have been meant for a very special purpose. It is unusually sumptuous, with its sculptural figures; its workmanship is very fine; and it is most unusual for the Pope to have had his own portrait included. There can be no doubt about his identity; apart from the evidence of his coat of arms his features correspond to those in his portrait painted by Titian and modelled by Guglielmo della Porta and as they appear on many medals. Unfortunately the figure which could furnish a clue as to the destination of the piece, the third seated figure on the foot, does not seem to be identifiable. And the piece cannot be found in those sections of the Pope's accounts which have been preserved or in the inventory of the church treasure after his death. A search in the published records of churches favoured by the Pope, S. Maria sopra Minerva, S. Maria della Quercia in Viterbo, the Casa Santa in Loreto, has not yielded any results. The general stylistic milieu into which the piece fits is that of Perino del Vaga and, to some extent, that of Guglielmo della Porta. The sources name a number of goldsmiths, e.g. Tobia da Camerino, who were engaged on a variety of work,7 and who, including Tobia and Manno, were working on silver statues of the apostles, from models by Raffaelo da Montelupo.6 A parallel in style seem to be two large bronze candelsticks in the treasure of St Peter's,9 which unfortunately seem to be completely undocumented. The style of these and of our reliquary is important, as it forms the basis of later works by A. Gentili,10 A. Fontana,11 and other goldsmiths of the advanced sixteenth century. The form of the reliquary — an ostensorium — is traditional.12

References: (1) C. and E. Canessa Collection, Sale, New York, American Art Association, 25-26 Jan. 1924, n. 213. (2) See note 1. Fiftieth Anniversary Exhibition of the Art of Europe during the XVth and Xvith centuries, 11 April-

**ROMAN SCHOOL: XVII–XVIII CENTURY**

**GIOVANNI LORENZO BERNINI**

Roman School. Born in Naples on 7 December 1598 and died in Rome on 28 November 1680. He was the leading sculptor of his time in Europe, active also as painter, architect and designer. Trained in Rome by his father Pietro, a Florentine, who after beginnings in Rome, and some years of activity in Naples, settled in Rome in 1604 or 1605. At an early age Bernini helped his father; already in 1615 he began to work independently. He became the favourite sculptor of the Popes Paul V Borghese, Gregory XV Ludovisi, Urban VIII Barberini, Innocent X Pamphili, Alexander VII Chigi, Clement IX Rospigliosi, Clemens X Altieri, and their families. Their features are known to us through his portraits; Urban VIII's and Alexander VII's tombs are his work. He worked for Queen Christina of Sweden in Rome, for England, and for France, where he went towards the end of his life and gave advice on the rebuilding of the Louvre. His work, besides portraiture, comprises expressive religious subjects, sumptuous decorations and large architectural projects. He was president of the Guild of St Luke's in Rome, member of the Academy in Paris; he was superintendent of many buildings in Rome, among them St Peter's. He was knighted already by Pope Gregory XV (1621-3). Numerous pupils received their training in his workshop. He eventually completely changed the style of sculpture in Europe.

**KTB828 : Figures 147-149**

**MONSIGNOR FRANCESCO BARBERINI.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1646), since 1952.1 Bust of white marble, 31³⁄₄ x 26 x 10³⁄₄ in. (80.3 x 66.1 x 26.7 cm.). The base is of the same block. Height of the bust alone 24⅔ in. (62.2 cm.), of the base 7¼ in. (18.1 cm.). On the front of the base there is an empty cartouche with a bee between the two scrolls at the top — alluding to the coat of arms of the Barberini family. The back of the bust is carefully finished. At the tip of the beard a triangular piece of marble containing a few strands of hair is carefully inserted, maybe to eliminate a fault in the stone, or to correct an error.2 The piece is well preserved; the marble has some spots; it is insignificantly chipped at the tip of the collar. Cleaned 1955 by J. Ternbach.

**Provenance:** Barberini family, Rome.3 Contini-Bonacossi, Florence. Kress acquisition, 1950.4

Francesco di Carlo Barberini (1528-1600)5 was one of the earliest members of a Florentine family to settle in Rome. He held the offices of an apostolic protonotary and referendario in the *Collegio Romano*. He was learned; at the same time he became immensely wealthy. His nephew Maffeo, the later Pope Urban VIII, was guided by him in his career and eventually inherited his estate. He is buried in S. Andrea della Valle in a tomb with a statue by Cristoforo Stati, provided by his nephew while still cardinal.6 Bernini's portrait, then, is posthumous, and must have been based on a portrait such as the picture in the collection of the Corsini in Florence,7 vaguely attributed to Scipione Pulzone, which is identified by the inscription on a letter the sitter is holding in his hand. The picture is so similar to the bust that it could well be the one used by Bernini. The fact that the bust was not made from life may account for a certain coolness and reserve, which distinguishes it from Bernini's other portraits. The attribution to Bernini is made certain by an entry in the Barberini inventory of 1627,8 and by the list of works in Baldinucci's biography.9 The attribution is generally accepted.9 Only once has a doubt been voiced that the bust might not be altogether
It does not seem as rigid and severe as the portraits of the Apollo and Daphne group (1624/5). It has been made responsible for it himself. And indeed, in a letter of 14 December 1665, after his return to Rome, he

After GIOVANNI LORENZO BERNINI

The close connection of this bust with Bernini's marble of 1665 in Versailles is obvious; its nature less easy to define. If the height of 80 cm. given for the marble is correct, the bronze is 4 cm. taller; but without a comparison of inner measurements it is difficult to be certain about the relative sizes. The marble and the bronze differ in many details. Individual folds are crisper in the marble, the laminations of the cuirass are more elegantly contoured. The curls of the wig are identical, but the curves of those of the bronze are somewhat tired. The most startling difference is the fact that in the bronze the undercuttings produced by drilling are filled in, which robs the hair of its sparkle and texture. The closest correspondence seems to be that of the faces, though here, too, some details, such as the draping of the pupils, the drawing of the eyebrows and the moustache, are comparatively weak; the few hairs under the lower lip are gone. In view of all this it seems impossible to see in the bronze a cast 'taken from the sculptor's first plastic model', apart from the fact that in the process of creation of the bust, which is documented almost day by day, such a cast is cast in one piece with the bust; inside is an oak block and plinth. There is an inner vertical wooden support, which seems modern and actually supports nothing.


The close connection of this bust with Bernini's marble of 1665 in Versailles is obvious; its nature less easy to define. If the height of 80 cm. given for the marble is correct, the bronze is 4 cm. taller; but without a comparison of inner measurements it is difficult to be certain about the relative sizes. The marble and the bronze differ in many details. Individual folds are crisper in the marble, the laminations of the cuirass are more elegantly contoured. The curls of the wig are identical, but the curves of those of the bronze are somewhat tired. The most startling difference is the fact that in the bronze the undercuttings produced by drilling are filled in, which robs the hair of its sparkle and texture. The closest correspondence seems to be that of the faces, though here, too, some details, such as the draping of the pupils, the drawing of the eyebrows and the moustache, are comparatively weak; the few hairs under the lower lip are gone. In view of all this it seems impossible to see in the bronze a cast 'taken from the sculptor's first plastic model', apart from the fact that in the process of creation of the bust, which is documented almost day by day, such a model does not appear. The bronze then seems to be a copy of the marble, possibly a cast, at least of parts like the face, the hair (appropriately simplified), the lace jabot. The date and the author of the cast remain controversial. Bernini has been made responsible for it himself. And indeed, in a letter of 14 December 1665, after his return to Rome, he

After GIOVANNI LORENZO BERNINI

writes that 'many princes have asked him for bronze casts of the king's bust and he remembered the head so well that he could make it again without a model'.\textsuperscript{10} We do not know whether any were done. However, from other bronzes made by or for Bernini we would expect a much finer quality. We only have information on some plaster-casts.\textsuperscript{13} It is said that a bronze copy by Jerome Derbais was set up in 1686 in the town square of Quebec in Canada, where it remained until 1699/1700.\textsuperscript{12} It has been suggested that our bust might be that one.\textsuperscript{13} We do not know what the bust in Quebec looked like; there does not seem to be proof that it was a copy of Bernini's portrait; the name of Derbais is puzzling in connection with a bronze bust, as he is known as a marble-worker. Probably our bust is a French cast by one of the founders who cast for sculptors like Coysevox.\textsuperscript{14} But it lacks the perfection of the casts made by the Keller etc. after the marbles by Coysevox.\textsuperscript{14}

* This entry has been prepared with the help of notes by C. Seymour and Gertrud Rosenthal, on file at the National Gallery of Art in Washington.


ITALIAN SCHOOL: XVII–XVIII CENTURY

ITALIAN SCHOOL:
First Half of the XVII Century

X35 : Figure 152

MADONNA AND CHILD. Berea, Ky., Berea College.
Kress Study Collection, since 1961.\textsuperscript{1} Half-length figure in a roundel, glazed terracotta. Diameter 20½ in. (52 cm.). The ground forms a concave niche (correspondingly convex at the back), into which the figure is set. Her head, hand and the Child are modelled separately and joined to the rest. The figures are glazed greyish-greenish white, the ground blue; the foliage in the Virgin’s hand green; the back roughly glazed white. Condition: some breaks in the lower part of the background patched up with oil colour. Cleaned and restored 1955 by M. Modestini.


The technique is that used by Luca della Robbia and his followers; and the relief has been ascribed to Andrea della Robbia,\textsuperscript{2} to Giovanni della Robbia,\textsuperscript{3} and more cautiously to the school of the Della Robbia.\textsuperscript{4} Bode declared he had never seen this composition before; Longhi speaks of ‘classical sixteenth-century flavour’; so does Mason Perkins; Venturi suspects a drawing by Andrea Sansovino. The relief seems to be much later than even the very end of the
Robbia tradition itself. That the technique was not forgotten is known from an experiment by Antonio Novelli (Florence, 1600–62), the result of which is lost, and from surviving works of the late seventeenth century, and from Robbia-like works, which seem to come from ceramic centres like Faenza and are sometimes dated. The iconographic type of our Madonna, ultimately derived from a very popular Byzantine model, finds parallels in Guercino (Florence, Palazzo Pitti), Lodovico Carracci (Bologna, Pinacoteca) or in Rubens’ Madonna in S. Maria in Vallicella in Rome. The head of the Virgin recalls certain heads by G. Caccini (1556–1612/13), the Child looks like a direct imitation after Du Quesnoy (1594–1643). Related, but not by the same hand, are two small figures of saints in niches formerly in the Tolentino Collection. An attribution is not possible; it is even open to doubt that the piece is Florentine. There exist a few similar objects, however, cannot be closely associated with ours: a Madonna in the Vatican, one, a fragment of a larger complex, in the museum in Budapest.


ITALIAN SCHOOL: XVII–XVIII Century


This decorative piece, taken out of its original context, is hard to judge. Even the subject is not necessarily that traditionally indicated. No clue seems to be forthcoming from the checkered histories of the Villa La Favorita and that of the Palazzo Reale in Portici. The style is that of an Italian or foreigner under the sway of the Berninian fashion. The plump, slightly oversweet face finds a certain parallel in the medallion of a bacchante recently acquired by the Italian state and quite unjustifiably attributed to the young Bernini. Ursula Schlegel recently has proposed an attribution to Pierre Étienne Monnot, at the time (1700-4) when he was working for Lord Exeter.


ITALIAN SCHOOL, XVII–XVIII Century


This is a copy of the famous marble in the Uffizi, which was found in Rome in the later sixteenth century, soon became Medici property and was brought to Florence in 1775.
ITALIAN SCHOOL: XIX CENTURY

FLORENTINE (?) SCHOOL:
First Half of the XIX Century

K1409: Figure 153

MADONNA AND CHILD. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (Ar61), since 1946. High relief, contoured; the bottom is the segment of a circle. Terracotta, figures glazed white, the lower frame glazed blue. The glaze has large crackles. 24\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 22\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 8\(\frac{3}{8}\) in. (62 x 56.6 x 21.5 cm.). In storage at the Gallery since October 1955.


The piece has been attributed to Luca della Robbia as an early work,3 and later to Michelozzo.4 The attribution and dating have been doubted.5 Those who place the piece in the nineteenth century are certainly right; the question when and by whom it was done is more difficult to answer. It certainly is not without merit, though the utter lack of construction, of coherence of movement and the loose combination of elements in a pure pattern disqualify it for the fifteenth and most of the nineteenth century. A certain Nazarene quality would suggest the date of the acquisition through C. E. Norton, between 1835-40, which has been unjustifiedly questioned by Ragghianti.5 Thermoluminescence testing has indicated a date of firing after the middle of the eighteenth century.

FRENCH SCHOOL

FRENCH, Early XIV Century

KI974 : Figure 156

THE HOLY TRINITY (THRONE OF MERCY). Portland, Or., Portland Art Museum, since 1953. 1 Marble group, 28⅓ × 13⅔ × 5⅜ in. (72.4 × 34.3 × 14.6 cm.). The group shows God the Father seated on a bench, holding in front of Him a Crucifix. Centrally, above Christ’s head which is lost, are the remains of the Dove of the Holy Spirit. Condition: a nearly-horizontal fissure runs across the shoulders. The left hand of God the Father and the arm of the cross are missing, as are the Dove, the head of Christ and His legs. Superficial damages around the base and the drapery of God the Father. No traces of polychromy remain and the marble has acquired a brownish patina. The surface is well preserved.


The subject has been exhaustively discussed by P. Verdier. 6 Our piece has some closer or less contemporary parallels: in the gable of the portail des libraires of the cathedral of Rouen; 7 a group in the Musée Lapidaire at Limoges; 8 a relief from the cathédrale of Rouen; 9 a group in the Musée Cantonal de l’Art in Fribourg (Switzerland). 10 Despite some dissenting voices 11 the group has always been thought to be French, and to date from the early fourteenth century. It is said to come from an abbey near Marigny; it may have been in a private collection at Roanne 3 which included other than merely local objects. 12 Its style points to the Île-de-France or a region nearby. The parallels are sculptures like the beautiful Madonna of the canon Manuel de Jaulmes in the Cathedral of Sens (1334), 13 the Apostles from St Jacques in Paris by Robert de Launoy (1326–7), 14 the draperies of which compare well; some figures in the Collegiate Church in Écouis (after 1314), 15 a statue in the Louvre. 16 The puffed eyelids and elegant curves of the hair are characteristics also found in some of the tombs of the early fourteenth century in Saint-Denis. 17 Related pieces in America are a statue in the Toledo Museum of Art 18 and a head in the museum of Duke University. 19, 20

FRENCH (ÎLE-DE-FRANCE):
First Half of the XIV Century (?)

**F2161: Figure 157**

**Virgin and Child.** National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (1644) since 1957. Marble statue. Height 39½ in. (100-4 cm.).

The Virgin is frontally posed, with a slight déhanchement of her left hip. She holds the Christ Child at waist-level in her left arm, and in her right she holds the base of a sceptre. The Virgin wears a high, foliate crown, which holds in place her cloak which is drawn over her head. She has wavy hair, parted centrally, small oval eyes, a dainty nose and small mouth. The Christ Child, the whole of whose left arm and right forearm are missing, has a chubby face with noticeably protuberant eyes. His head has been broken off and replaced. Round the Virgin’s crown, the edge of her robe, on her chest and on her right wrist, holes of geometrical shape are cut, as though to accommodate precious stones. The fingers of her right hand have been broken. The surface is perfectly smooth, the missing arms of the Child may have been dowelled on (originally?). The cut of the left arm is completely smooth. The holes around the edge of the robe, and on the right wrist show no trace of ever having contained precious stones or glass imitation. There is an iron loop in her back, for securing the figure against a wall.


The Virgin and Child conforms in general to a type that was popular in the Île-de-France early in the fourteenth century, which is distinguished by the high, foliate crown, the pronounced sway of the body along an s-shaped axis and the sweet but bland expression on the face. Among these, the most remarkable are located as follows: Notre-Dame in Paris;2 Chartres Cathedral; St Martin-aux-Bois (Oise);3 Coutomer (Seine-et-Marne);4 Sées Cathedral (Normandy);5 Louvre, Paris (one ex-Arconati-Visconti Coll.; the other ex-Timbal Coll.);6 Musées Royaux, Brussels;7 Musée de Cluny, Paris;8 and many others elsewhere. Sometimes the crown was added in metal, so that the head of the Virgin on the statue is covered only with a veil or the cloak, although perhaps a warning note should be sounded.9 This paradoxical situation has traditionally been explained by a supposition that marble, being difficult to obtain in France, was used only for the smaller and more important pieces by master-sculptors. By a process of aesthetic selectivity, it is then argued, just these pieces came to the attention of connoisseurs in the last century, and this explains why so few are left in their proper locations. But the present writer contends that since authentic sculptures in marble are indeed likely to have been rare in France during the Middle Ages, owing to the comparative difficulty of obtaining the material, the number which mysteriously seeped into the art market after about 1850, lacking any convincing provenance beyond a generalization appropriate to their style (e.g. ‘Île-de-France’), suggests that there was in France an industry supplying pastiches of such ‘fine and rare’ pieces in marble in quantities to match the demand among collectors. A case in point might be a marble Virgin and Child in the Victoria and Albert Museum which has close affinities with the example under discussion, not only in medium, but in type, style and dimensions.11 This Virgin is carved out of a shallow slab of marble and when viewed from the side is disconcertingly flat. All the high points of the sculpture rise to the original surface-plane of the slab. Its back is immaculately smoothed off so that it can be mounted flush against a wall. These disagreeable characteristics have given rise to doubts about its authenticity, in spite of the comparatively early date of purchase (1860).13 A third marble Virgin, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, also has many characteristics in common with the Kress statue.14 Indeed they might be by the same hand, judging from a comparison of the faces and the way in which the knuckles of the Virgin’s left hand are treated with little oval markings.15

To sum up, it will be noted that a claim of rarity that has been made for the Kress Virgin on account of its medium is exaggerated. In fact it belongs to a class of sculpture that turns out to be quite common in private collections and museums and has accordingly enjoyed an acceptance that in retrospect seems to have been quite uncritical. None of the pieces has a pedigree that is above suspicion or goes back substantially before the middle of the nineteenth century. This group, three examples of which in major museums have been discussed, urgently needs to be submitted to
VIRGIN AND CHILD. University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, since 1957. Full-rounded statue in limestone. 58 × 20 × 12 in. (147.3 × 50.8 × 30.5 cm.).

The Virgin stands with her weight on the left leg. The right leg is relaxed, its knee bending forward to interrupt the fall of the folds of her robe and its foot pointing diagonally outwards towards the corner of the base. With her left arm she supports the Christ Child and in her right is the remains of the stem of a lily (broken). She looks straight forward. A coronet holds a shoulder-length veil over her wavy centrally-parted hair. Her mantle falls down in simple lines outside her arms and is not held across the body in front. The Christ Child wears a long dress, which fits the torso snugly and has six buttons down the front, and then falls freely as a skirt. The faces of the Mother and Child are identical in type: the eyes have a straight lower lid and an arched upper one, with eyebrows following a concentric curve above; the nose is straight, but sharply pointed and the mouth a straight gash in the stone. Condition: there are a few traces of polychromy; the Virgin’s cloak was red, the Child’s dress blue and His hair gilded. The fact that the group was painted explains the bold simplification of the sculptural treatment; all detailing was meant to be added in colour, which would have conveyed a far more lively and pleasing effect. The two major damages are the stem of the Virgin’s lily and the Child’s left arm, which is truncated at the shoulder, and was possibly raised in benediction (it may originally have been carved separately and dowelled on). There are multiple, minor damages all over the outer projections of the sculpture, which give an impression of age.

St-Goery, Épinal (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), and others in the Vosges at Le Grand Thon; in the Musée de la Ville at Metz; and at Sarrebourg (Moselle). A similar scheme appears in the Virgin said to come from Meaux (now City Art Museum, St Louis, Mo.). The examples from Lorraine are, however, readily distinguishable by a much broader, even Germanic, facial type, a serious expression, and a thicker, less graceful body.

The present Virgin and Child is clearly analogous to the statues mentioned above at Ste-Savine and Beaune, as well as to others in the variant group with the fold of mantle over the right forearm. Nevertheless, it cannot be confidently claimed that the facial type of the Virgin or the Child is absolutely characteristic of the Troyen pieces. It is possible that the sculptor was influenced to some degree by the style of the Virgin carved in the Vosges, some of which are cited above. Particularly close in these respects is a Virgin and Child from Châtenois (now in the Cloisters, New York). Nevertheless, the reported provenance of the piece from the region of Troyes, though it cannot be verified, is perfectly consistent with the stylistic data of the sculpture. A date in the second half of the fourteenth century might be suggested.

sceptical about its authenticity. The present author refuses to believe in the motif of the Child playfully pulling the thong that fastens the Virgin's mantle on her chest; such fastenings were never so slack that a loop could be pulled in them. From a practical standpoint, if the Child were to relax His grip, the mantle would have nothing to prevent its sliding off the Virgin's shoulders. As a detail of mediaeval costume it has also been doubted by experts. Also the strange location of the damages, the odd condition of the surface and a complete inconsistency in the handling of detail give pause. Accordingly the statue should be regarded with extreme scepticism, pending further investigation of its credentials. It is unfortunately all too likely that it may be a pastiche of comparatively recent date, based on the class of Virgins from Lorraine that has been discussed above, and incorporating a motif that would have been out of the question at the purported date of execution.

References: (1) European Art, Denver Art Museum Collection, Denver, Col., 1955, p. 38; Denver Art Museum, Guide to the Collection, 1965, p. 24 ill. (2) Letter of 16 August 1954 from French & Co., in files of Kress Foundation; no corroboratory evidence located. (3) Same letter; not in Chauncey Blair sale, American Art Association, New York, 15-16 January 1932. (4) Same letter. (5) Same letter. (6) Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Bulletin, xvii, April 1939, no. 100, pp. 10-12; exhibited ibid., Arts of the Middle Ages, 1940, no. 185, pl. LXVI. (7) Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Bulletin, i.e., p. 12 repro.; cf. P. Vitry and G. Brière, Documents de Sculpture française du Moyen-Âge, Paris, n.d., pl. xcvii. 3. (8) J. A. Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth, 'Loth­ringische Madonnen-Statuetten des 14 Jahrhunderts', in Fest­schrift Gerke, Baden-Baden, 1962, pp. 119-48. W. H. Forsyth, 'The Virgin and Child in French Fourteenth Century Sculpture', in The Art Bulletin, xxxix, 1957, pp. 171 ff. (9) Correspondence of September 1954, on file at the Nat. Gall. (10) Professor George Zamecki, Dr Peter Kidson and Dr Julian Gardner (Courtauld Institute of Art) were unanimous in their hostility on the basis of photographs that they were shown by the author. (11) Mrs Stella Mary Newton (Courtauld Institute of Art) and Mr Donald King (Keeper, Department of Textiles, Victoria and Albert Museum) both denied that this essential detail was credible. (12) This entry was prepared by Charles Avery, with the kind help of the colleagues mentioned above.

FRENCH SCHOOL (PICARDY):
Early XVI Century

K1975 : Figure 161

ST CHRISTOPHER. Portland Art Museum, Portland, Oregon, since 1953. 4 Albaster (7). Height 44 in. (112 cm.). The statue is actually a deep relief, with parts of the back flattened and the underside of the base sloped, presumably to accord with architectural features of its original location. The saint is shown walking through stylized water with fish in it. His legs are bare, but he wears a leather shoe on his
left foot which is visible as he steps ashore. He is clad in a buttoned tunic, over which is thrown a heavy, wrinkled cloak with a decorated border. In his left hand he grasps a stave under the cloak, while with his right he is holding the cloak up, clear of the water. He has a broad, open face with a straight nose and large, wide-set eyes. Curls of hair escape from under the turban that is bound round the head, and his mouth is framed in a curly beard and moustache. Perched insecurely on his shoulders is the Child Christ, holding an orb, which rests on Christopher's turban. The Child's right leg stretches down to the saint's right shoulder, but his right hand, which was probably raised in beneficence, has been broken off. The Child has a round face with pointed chin, dimpled cheeks, and short curly hair. Condition: the main figure has been broken at knee-level and restored accordingly: the left leg and tree-trunk are made up behind in plaster. The surface is weathered all over, especially on the projecting areas, and there are a number of small losses, e.g. round the edge of the cloak. The Christ Child's right forearm is missing.

Provenance: said to have come from the region of Amiens (Picardy). J. Seligmann & Co., New York. Kress acquisition, 1953.¹

The statue shows St Christopher carrying a child across a river, unaware that it is the Christ Child, until he reaches the far side. This episode was popularized in the Golden Legend.² It is found in representations that date from the thirteenth century onwards. As patron saint of travellers Christopher was the object of a cult which spread rapidly throughout Europe. Because of the relatively late invention of this episode, there is an unusual degree of uniformity in representations of it in art. Within the standard pattern, however, stylistic traits emerged that were peculiar to certain countries. In England one particular composition gained currency through reproduction in Nottingham alabasters. These were intended as separate images to be set against a wall rather than as components of the usual retables.³ A closely similar scheme was employed for the monumental statue of St Christopher now in the City of Liverpool Museum.⁴ Not dissimilar are the polychromed wooden statuettes produced in Flanders e.g. at Malines during the late fifteenth century; their composition may even be derived from the English alabasters, which were widely exported.⁵ In both groups, the tendency is for Christopher to hold his stave in his right hand; for Christ to be seated securely on his left shoulder: for the Saint to look up in His direction; and for Christopher to be advancing and lifting his right leg, sometimes completely clear of the water. It will be noticed that the present sculpture differs in all these particulars. In Germany large statues of St Christopher in stone and wood are frequent in the fifteenth century; characteristically, much attention is paid to the folds of the cloak, which are deeply excavated. The best examples are the stone statue dedicated in 1442 for the church of St Sebaldus in Nürnberg (now in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum: Height 2·60 m.); and the flanking figure in polychromed wood on the retable in the church of Kefermarkt in Upper Austria, about 1491–8. Statuettes in wood are not uncommon; there is an idiosyncratic one by the Ottobeuren Master in the Museum at Düsseldorf and a less unusual one of c. 1490 in the Württemburgisches Landesmuseum in Stuttgart.⁶

In France, one of the earliest monumental sculptures of St Christopher is a relief set in a shallow niche high on the south wall of Amiens Cathedral;⁷ its pose is strongly symmetrical and frontal, with a contrast between the catenary curves of the folds of the cloak and the vertical folds of the knee-length tunic, rather as in a fourteenth century French Virgin and Child. The most celebrated St Christopher was a colossal statue ‘de merveilleuse hauteur’ in Notre-Dame, Paris, given as an ex-voto in 1415 and erected at the entrance to the nave; this was destroyed in 1786.⁸

Another important statue, in the Cathedral of Aixerre, was removed in 1768, while that on Strasbourg Cathedral had been taken down as early as 1531.⁹ Other examples are common, as most principal churches of pilgrimage and many towns had them with the intention of safeguarding travellers.

The most striking St Christopher of the early sixteenth century is a stone statue in the church of Notre-Dame in Verneuil (Eure).¹⁰ Although this is probably the work of a local sculptor, analogies have been noticed with a wooden statue, painted and gilded, which is thought to be from Bruges (Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg).¹¹ This in turn is not dissimilar from an oak statuette regarded as ‘Lower Rhenish, about 1500’ in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Inv. n. 374–1890). These two wooden statuettes both manifest in differing degrees the pattern of crinkled, rectilinear folds that is the principal stylistic feature of k1975. However, this gives little assistance in locating our piece, as neither has a certain provenance. In fact there are transitional and almost international traits in k1975 that lead experts in French sculpture to regard it as German and experts in German sculpture to think of it as French or Flemish.¹² The putative provenance from Amiens (on which no reliance should be placed) offers a possible explanation, in as much as this town was at the crossroads of northern Europe. Foreign as the crinkled pattern of the folds may seem to France, it appears momentarily at Amiens Cathedral early in the sixteenth century. Traces can be found in the choir stalls and misericord seats that were carved between 1508 and 1522 by a number of French craftsmen.¹³

These traces are one of the features that determine the description 'Franco-Flemish' for the style of the wood carvings rather than purely French. Similarly, in the series of narrative carvings in stone on the outside of the enclosure of the choir in the cathedral, traces of this German or Flemish style of drapery appear, though less markedly.¹⁴ Especially in the reliefs devoted to the life of St John the Baptist on the north side, which were executed as late as
1531, angular 'breaks' in the folds are the rule. This gives a retardataire, Gothic appearance and relates the sculpture stylistically to contemporary Brabant wood-carving; in a St John Baptizing Christ, the Saviour is shown up to His ankles in the water of the River Jordan in a pose distinctly analogous to that of our St Christopher, while His garments, held up on the left by an attendant angel, fall in a pattern of angular, 'broken' folds within a curving outer contour, that is suggestively similar.16 The facial types of an elderly, bearded man and infant of our St Christopher group may also be paralleled in the narratives at Amiens, as may also the attention paid to the long, delicate fingers.

The solution to the problem of style presented by k1975 thus lies in its date and location. In the second half of the fifteenth century it is difficult to admit as French, whereas in the second or third decade of the next century it again seems feasible, owing to the deep impression made on sculptors in northern France by the prolific workshops of Antwerp and the other centres of wood-carving in Brabant. These in turn show the influence of sculpture from the adjacent area of Germany, the Lower Rhineland.16

References: (1) Handbook of the Samuel H. Kress Collection. Paintings of the Renaissance, Portland, n.d. Addendum no. 29. (2) K. Künstler, Iconographie der Christlichen Kunst, Freiburg i. B., 1926, ii, pp. 154 ff.; G. Servières, G.d.B.-A. 5 periode, iii, 1921, pp. 23 ff.; L. Réau, L'Iconographie de l'Art chrétien, Paris, 1958, iii, pp. 304-13. (3) W. L. Hildburgh, The Antiquaries Journal, i, 3 July 1921, pp. 228-31, pl. IX. (4) Unpublished; presented to the Walker Art Gallery in 1964 by the City Museum. Pinkish sandstone. From Norton Priory, near Fiddler's Ferry, Warrington, Cheshire. Probably set up as a votive statue for travellers crossing the Mersey; the prior of Norton had rights over the ferry and the land giving access. (5) W. Godenne, 'Saint Christophe, Sculptures Malinoises et autres', in Aachener Kunsthüllen, 32, 1966, pp. 74-82. (6) T. Müller and A. Feulner, Geschichte der Deutschen Plastik, Munich, 1953, p. 254, fig. 207, pp. 339-41, figs. 280-1, pp. 318-319. For the last statuesque see Künstler, op. cit., ii, pp. 158-9, repro. (7) Listed by Réau, i.e., p. 309; Servières, i.e., p. 39: harshly described as 'laide et grossière, elle remonte au XIVe siècle'; G. Durand, Monographie de l'Église-Cathédrale Notre-Dame d'Amiens, Amiens, 1901-3, iii, pl. XXIII. (8) Listed by Réau, i.e., p. 309; Servières, i.e., pp. 38-9. (9) Servières, i.e., p. 39. (10) Listed by Réau, i.e., p. 309; Servières, i.e., p. 37, ill. p. 40; P. Vitry, Michel Colombé et la sculpture française de son temps, Paris, 1901, pp. 256-65. (11) Servières, i.e., p. 39, ill. p. 40. (12) Verbal opinions of: (a) Professor G. Zarnecchi, Dr Peter Kidson, Dr Julian Gardner (Courtauld Institute of Art); (b) Dr Michael Baxandall (Warburg Institute of Art); all of whom we would like to thank for their attention to this problem. (13) G. Durand, op. cit., iii, pls. lviii-lxxv. (14) G. Durand, op. cit., iii, pls. xix-lxiv. (15) G. Durand, op. cit., iii, pl. li. (16) This entry was prepared by Charles Avery.

FRENCH SCHOOL
First Half of the XVI Century (or later)

1961 : Figure 164

The Dormition and Coronation of the Virgin.
Denver Art Museum, Denver, Col., since 1954. 1 Relief in marble, 34 1/2 x 28 1/4 in. (87.6 x 72.1 cm.).

The relief consists of two narrative panels, a rectangular scene of the Dormition below and a semicircular field above containing the Coronation. The Dormition is framed by two engaged half-columns, each with a candelabrum-type ornament in low-relief, and a concave frieze above, decorated with a central mask and symmetrical rinceaux on either side. From a rail hang pretence curtains which are drawn on rings to each side and then bunched up, their ends tucked up into themselves. In the centre the Virgin lies propped up against pillows on a bed, which is set parallel to the front plane. Round her are grouped the twelve apostles, one seated and one kneeling at each end of the bed, and the rest standing at the sides and behind. Above and to the left, a partially nude, female figure on a smaller scale is raised aloft by four angels: this represents the departing soul of the Virgin. To the right in a bank of clouds that are stylized as crinkled ribbon-like shapes, two angels with censers hover, with two larger cherub-heads above. In the lunette, the scene of the Coronation takes place in a rectangular area defined by two vertical pillars, while in the almost triangular field outside stand two attendant angels. The main stage is covered by three unorthodox arches that are supported on ill-defined corbels leaning visibly outwards. A canopy is suspended from the centre arch, its curtains drawn aside by angels swooping down from under the flanking arches. The Holy Spirit in the form of a dove flies down from beneath this canopy, immediately over the crown which Christ (left) and God the Father (right) are about to place on the head of the kneeling Virgin (centre). There is a suggestion of space in the wall panelling behind the bench on which Christ and God the Father are seated. The complex appears to have lost finials above the flanking columns and a central element to complete the semi-circle of the frame above. In a strange, rectangular recess precisely in the centre of the blank background of the Dormition, a cross has been inserted on a separate piece of marble, which is in itself much damaged; this is designed to complete a staff held by an apostle immediately below. There are traces of gilding and the flame of a candle is painted red.

Provenance: (reported) M. Gaudin, Le Mans (Sarthe), confiscated by Germany during World War II and then restituted by the Service des Beaux-Arts. 2 Paul Drey, New York. 3 Kress acquisition, 1953.

The relief is in a style which in general terms is connected with France and datable perhaps in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. A mixture of Gothic and Renaissance elements in the decorative and architectural parts is characteristic of this period throughout Europe. However, despite the mixture of old-fashioned and modern styles, there is normally a fundamental structural logic in sculptured or painted representations that reflects current architectural practice and conforms with the dictates of common sense and aesthetic decorum. Regrettably, several features of the present complex fail to measure up to these basic criteria. The forms of the arches that sub-divide the lunette of the Coronation are unorthodox by both Gothic and Renaissance standards. The unevenness of the three central arches and their eccentric corbels is disconcerting. The bizarre profiles of the triangular fields at each side, which are not even consistent with each other (that on the left coming to a sharp point and that on the right forming a tight curve) are quite outrageous and cannot be paralleled in ogival or classical architecture or decorative carving in France. The fact that the candelabrum-type motifs on the flanking columns below are at variance with one another is irregular; however bizarre might be the variations to which the imaginations of French architects subjected classical prototypes, columns flanking a single scene would have to match. Finally, though this criticism may be less demonstrably justified, the way in which a narrow, architectural mould-
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ing is made to double as a rail from which curtains hang is most irregular; it is not clear whether this motif is a sym-

bolic reference to the hangings of the Virgin's bed (with

which it in fact has no connection, as it ought to have in a

proper four-poster type) or whether it is meant to serve as

a proscenium arch, through which we view the spectacle

of the Dombition, as though it were a miracle play. If the

latter, it is an extraordinary and illogical departure from

the normal practice with such pretence curtains, where

they are caught back at the sides, either by loops or by

human attendants. It is also difficult to comprehend how

and why the rectangular incision was made in the back-

ground of the Dombition and then repaired; had it ever

contained a relic, as might be argued, the role of the

apostle below grasping part of a staff that is carved in the

original block of marble is inexplicable.

The use of marble (and of such a large slab) for a detailed

narrative panel is extremely rare in France. The local lime-

stones or sandstones were so much easier to work, quite

apart from being more readily available and presumably

cheaper, that they were used almost universally for

narrative reliefs with many figures on a small scale. In all

the many retables and reliefs in the region of Troyes, for

example, limestone was the standard material, even for

the finest work, at least until the middle of the century, when

Italian practitioners introduced the more expensive and

intractable material. The style of the present relief puts it

well before this moment. Even so, the medium of the panel

does not in itself constitute a conclusive argument for its

authenticity or date.

It is very difficult to find direct analogies for the stylistic

peculiarities of the relief; it has nothing in common with

the products of the school of Troyes, as might at first sight

have been surmised. It is far less satisfactory and far less

sophisticated than the best Troyen example of the composi-
tion, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
(which admittedly must be at least a generation later than
the present panel purports to be), or a derivative from it
that is still in situ in the church at Avreuil (Aube). This is
not simply because the Troyen reliefs are fully imbued with
the Renaissance spirit; it is a question of artistic and aesthetic
quality, which in K1961 are sadly lacking, however pro-
vincial one might care to regard the sculptor responsible
for it. Closest, perhaps, to the Kress Dombition is a stone
relief in the church at Lorges, which shows just the earthly
zone of the Dombition: even so, it is far more compact,
balanced and impressive as a narrative sculpture. Two
further renderings of the same theme may be mentioned,
although stylistically they have nothing to do with
K1961; they serve, however, to show the wide range of
interpretations and styles to which the theme was sub-
jected, and the incompatibility of the present relief with
any of them. Probably the later is the central panel of a
stone retable formerly in the Peyre Collection and now
in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, which displays
an extraordinary horror vacui, in the throng of apostles
pressing round the death-bed. Finally, what may be
proclaimed as the masterpiece of the whole group of
French Dombitions, a large marble panel from the church of
Saint-Jacques-la-Boucherie, Paris, and now in the Louvre,
proves the heights to which the metropolitan workshops
of the French or Italian sculptors working around Guido
Mazzoni at the Petit Neve could rise about the turn of the
fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It will be noticed that
among the wide range of comparable reliefs of the Dombi-
tion from all over France, none lends credence to the authen-
ticity of K1961.

Furthermore, a perusal of the admittedly inadequate
literature on narrative sculpture elsewhere in France has
not produced any striking or consistent parallels in any of
the provincial workshops, whence such a mediocre sculpt
might have been supposed to originate. In general
terms the nearest style that is at all compatible is embodied
in a retable from Aveyron, bearing the arms of Antoine de
Lescure de St Denis.9 The compositional feeling is vaguely
connected with that of the wooden choir-stalls from the
château of Gaillon (Normandy), now in the Abbey of St
Denis, outside Paris.10 The particular stylization of the
clouds is a commonplace, but is well exemplified on a
mantelpiece in the Musée de Cluny, Paris.11 The general
scheme of an altarpiece consisting of a single, nearly square,
panel, with a lunette flanked by finials above, is similar to
that of an altar of the Adoration in the church of St Wulfran
in Abbeville.12 A direct comparison of K1961 with the
altarpiece provides, however, a complete confirmation of
all the criticisms levelled above at its lack of proper archi-
tectural programme, for the Abbeville altar is perfectly
regular and logical as a structure, despite the profusion of
transitional Gothic-Renaissance ornament.

While the points of stylistic reference mentioned above
may have a bona fide bearing on the origins of the present
panel, they are so haphazard as to lend themselves to another
interpretation. For they are all chosen from readily available
decorative complexes, celebrated in the last century, which
could well have constituted the sources of inspiration for a
historically-minded pasticheur of that period. The alarm-
ingly serious oddities of the panel might then be explained as
a faux-naïf interpretation of the transitional French
sculptural and architectural style of the early sixteenth
century, that sufficed to deceive contemporaries, but is now
revealed in its true light by better knowledge of the period,
aided by the universality of good photographs of authentic
pieces. Modern sensibilities are better attuned with the
aspirations and achievements of the fascinating, transitional
period to which this piece purports to belong, and refuse to
admit, as authentic, details which do not stand up to a
rigorous examination motivated by a high estimate of the
intelligence and capacity of artists of that time.13

References: (1) Denver Art Museum, Paintings and Sculptures
from the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Denver, 1954, no. 34,
pp. 78-9. (2) Information from Messrs Drey on file at the

**BARTHÉLEMY PRIEUR**

French School. Born about 1540, died in Paris in 1611. He was said to have been pupil of Germain Pilon, with whose family he was, however, on bad terms. First sculptor of the Protestant family Montmorency. He may have been related to the mint-masters of the same name, of his and the preceding generation. His daughter married the great medallist Guillaume Dupré, also a Protestant.

KI256: Figures 165-167

**ALLEGORICAL FIGURE OF JUSTICE.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A61), since 1941.1 White marble statue, 71⅔ x 25⅓ x 19⅜ in. (182.5 x 64.3 x 49.2 cm.). Condition: good; yellowish patina. The front left corner of the base is a replacement. A rectangle of the base at this point had been cut out, in order to fit the figure into an architectural setting. The fingers of the right hand with the olive leaf underneath and part of the index finger of the left are worked separately and attached; they do not seem to be repairs of damages. There are several chips on drapery and toes. Cleaned 1936 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: Count de Montessay, Juvisy-sur-Orge (Seine-et-Oise).2 Jean Esprit Marcellin, Paris.3 Edward M. Hodgkins, Paris.4 Duveen's, New York.4 Kress acquisition, 1941.5 Exhibited: New York, Duveen Galleries, 1940/41.6 Though the figure is not unlike Germain Pilon's Virtus on the tomb of Henri II and Catherine de' Medici in Saint Denis it is much too simple and awkward to be by the same master. A lack of movement of the body, as well of the drapery, a certain stiffness and blandness, a fussy gathering of small detail in certain areas, an emptiness in others seem to be characteristic for Barthélémy Prieur's works, like the tomb-figures of Anne de Montmorency and Madeleine de Savoy (1582 ff.) or the three bronzes from the tomb of the heart of Montmorency (after 1573).10 The figure of the wife of Jacques-Auguste de Thou (d. 1601)11 also can be compared, except that it is much more competently done. At a similar distance from Pilon seems to stand a bronze statue in New York.12 The laurel twig and the sword in the hands of the figure, the leather doublet and the Phrygian cap suggest an allegory of Justice as it appears at the Montmorency monument. Regina Teuwens has discovered a drawing in which our figure appears. It is for a monument for the heart of Henry IV, commissioned from Prieur, which was never finished. Ours seems to be the only part which is known to have survived. The corner cut out from the base is explained by the position of the figure in the architecture.13

ANTOINE COYSEVOX

French School. Born in Lyon in 1640, the son of a wood-carver, he went to Paris when he was seventeen years old and lived there till his death in 1720 except for a short interval between 1667 and 1671, when he worked in Strasbourg. He became the leading sculptor of his generation, and was highly successful. In 1676 he was received in the Academy, in which he held all the places of honour, including, since 1716, that of chancellor. Great part of his activity was in the service of the court. He is well known for his lively and stately portraits and for some splendid sepulchral monuments. In his immense production he had many helpers and followers and through them shaped the style of his period; his tradition was continued by his nephews, the Coustou.

K1841 : Figure 168

LOUIS OF FRANCE, THE GRAND DAUPHIN (called 'Monseigneur'). Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1649), since 1951. Bust on quadrangular base; white marble. With base: 36\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (92.5 cm), without base: 31 \(\frac{1}{8}\) \(\times\) 29 \(\frac{3}{4}\) \(\times\) 13\(\frac{3}{8}\) in. (79 \(\times\) 75.1 \(\times\) 34 cm).

The bust represents a man in middle age wearing a high, curly periwig, locks of which fall about his shoulders. He looks slightly to his left and his left shoulder is drawn back while the right is set forward. He is shown wearing ceremonial armour of a stylized classical type, the breast-plate decorated with rinceaux and the right paldron formed into an open lion’s mouth. A clasp on his right shoulder catches together the ends of a cloak with embroidered edges that covers his left shoulder and breast. Excellent condition. Cleaned by J. Ternbach, 1956.


The pedigree of this bust and its companion (K1842) goes back as far as 1888, when they were exhibited as 'Louis XIV' and the 'Duc d’Orléans' respectively by Sir Richard Wallace in Paris. In the catalogue they are both stated to have come "du château de Cousté", but this has not been verified: they may simply have originated among the collection of the Bourbon-Condé family. The bust called 'Louis XIV' is to be seen in a general photograph of the apartment in rue Lafitte, Paris.7 Because the busts remained in the part of the Wallace Collection that was kept at La Bagatelle and was ultimately purchased in 1914 by Jacques Seligmann, they were lost sight of by most students until they were purchased by the Kress Foundation in 1951.


k1842 : Figure 169

LOUIS, DUC DE BOURGOGNE (?). Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1650), since 1951.¹ Bust on quadrangular base; white marble. With base: 3 3/4 in., (99.2 cm.), without base: 29 1/2 x 29 1/2 x 18 1/4 in. (75 x 75.3 x 46.4 cm.).

The bust represents a young man with long, curly hair (probably his own and not a wig) that falls symmetrically about his shoulders. He is clad in armour which has a lion mask on its left paldron. A plain ribbon runs diagonally across the breastplate and over the right shoulder. At his neck is tied a lace jabot, while a cloak is knotted on the right shoulder, and falls in a curve under the left armpit. Excellent condition. Cleaned by J. Tembach 1956.

Provenance: As for k1841. Kress acquisition, 1951.² Exhibited: As for k1841. no. 72.

For discussion of the pedigree of this bust, see k1841, to which it has always been a pendant. It was identified from its first recorded appearance in 1888 until about 1950 as the Duc d'Orléans. In his article of 1952, Charles Seymour argued as follows:³ the ribbon is that of the Ordre du Saint-Esprit and the mantle signifies supreme military command; these indications, when seen in conjunction with the comparative youth of the sitter, point to a young member of the royal family, who might hold such honours rather prematurely by normal standards. If the bust indeed represented 'Monsieur', Duc d'Orléans, brother of Louis XIV, it would have to date from the 1660s, when he was at the age of the subject here represented. Its style is not however consistent with such an early date and is indeed characteristic of sculpture executed around 1700. 'Monsieur' may therefore be ruled out.

Around 1700 the only candidates from the royal family who would be eligible on grounds of age would be the sons of 'Monseigneur' (the grandsons of Louis XIV), the Duc de Bourgogne and the Duc d'Anjou. Both were made members of the Ordre du Saint-Esprit in childhood and both assumed command of an army in 1702. Of these, the Duc de Bourgogne is the more likely, first on grounds of appearance, for he was thinner in the face, and because of the decorations: after 1700 his brother normally wore, in addition to the Ordre du Saint-Esprit, the Order of the Golden Fleece, in consequence of his title of King of Spain. A comparison with portraits of the Duc de Bourgogne (for example that in the Wallace Collection, London, attributed to Largilière) is suggestive, though not absolutely conclusive.

Seymour notes the obvious derivation of the format of this bust from the bronze by Girardon showing 'Monseigneur', which is lost at present but is known from an engraving of the sculptor's own Cabinet ⁴ and from versions of reduced size. He does not exploit this formal relationship to corroborate his identification of the sitter as 'Monseigneur's' son, the Duc de Bourgogne. Yet what would be more natural and flattering than to employ for the son quite deliberately a form of bust that had been used earlier with such success for the father, even though it was by another sculptor (Girardon)? The changing roles and images of father and son are precisely what formally caused the incorrect identification of k1841 as Louis XIV, instead of his son, 'Monseigneur'. Furthermore, Seymour does not explicitly draw any conclusions from the pairing of the busts, despite the fact that he identifies them independently as father and son. Even though they do not function visually as pendants to one another, the closeness of their dimensions suggest that their pairing in the Wallace Collection in 1888 was not a matter of chance and that they may have been conceived together from the first.

Seymour finds the composition of the Duc de Bourgogne dissimilar from those generally employed by Coysevox. Nevertheless, if one assumes that Girardon's bust of 'Monseigneur' was chosen deliberately as a source of inspiration, this would naturally mask the operation of Coysevox's imagination. While Seymour recognized some connection with Coysevox, he felt obliged to concede that he was unsure which of the younger sculptors in his following might have produced such a bust; he mentions Van Cleve and Robert Le Lorrain as his favourites, while citing a list of other possible candidates for authorship. However, if the busts indeed represent father and son, as Seymour himself claims, if they were carved within three or four years of each other, as he suggests ('Monseigneur' in 1698-1699; Duc de Bourgogne, c. 1702), if it is admitted that they form a pair, as has always been assumed, and if it is agreed that Coysevox is the author of the 'Monseigneur' then the most logical solution to the problem of authorship of the
The bust was purchased as a portrait of the Duc de Chaulnes in 1686–92. It was assumed to be identical with a lost bust of this sitter that is recorded as having been purchased at a sale of the Hertford-Wallace Collection in 1901. However, the inaccuracy of the attribution led to its being identified as a historicizing pastiche of the mid-nineteenth century. Its precise identity then remained uncertain.


FRENCH (?) XIX CENTURY (?)

K1258 : Figure 170

'Monsieur', Duc d'Orléans (?). Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (665), since 1941. White marble, including base, 39.4 x 27.4 x 16.9 in. (99.4 x 69.3 x 42 cm.). The portrait-bust shows a man of about fifty years of age wearing a long wig that falls below the shoulders. He is clad in armour, with a lace jabot tied at the neck and a cloak thrown round his shoulders. He looks to his right, and his gaze is in a direction about forty-five degrees from the front plane of the bust.


The bust was purchased as a portrait of the Duc de Chaulnes by Coysevox (1649–1729). It was assumed to be identical with a lost bust of this sitter that is recorded as having been executed by Coysevox, probably about 1686–92. This attribution, which was never properly argued, has been rightly dismissed by Charles Seymour. He proposed a new identification as Philippe de France, Duc d'Orléans, the younger brother of Louis XIV, known at the time as 'Monsieur' (d. 1701). There seems to be some strength in his argument, which is based on similarities with authentic portraits of 'Monsieur'. Seymour then suggested that the bust might be identical with the only recorded one showing this subject, a posthumous piece executed by Jacques Prou the Younger (1655–1706), that was exhibited at the Salon in 1704. He attempted to reinforce this attribution with stylistic data observable in the few surviving sculptures by Prou. Although Seymour confidently wrote 'every inch of the fine-grained marble carries evidence of first-class late seventeenth century workmanship of the royal ateliers of France', a re-examination of the bust leaves one with certain misgivings. Two specific points of detail betray a misunderstanding of seventeenth-century costume, which is highly unlikely in a competent court sculptor of the epoch. The paldrons come unusually close to each other over the front of the breastplate; although fashion in armour varied to a certain extent, in no actual suit of armour are they as close. The effect could of course have been caused in reality by the wearer hunching both shoulders forward and together, but such an unprepossessing pose for a portrait bust is inconceivable. This irregularity in the shape of the armour is compounded by a detail that is absolutely incorrect. The semi-circular decorations bolted on to the under edge of the paldrons are technically known as pickadils, and were made of leather, often covered for decorative effect with velvet. They function as a membrane between the metal surfaces of the parden and the breastplate to obviate noise and wear when the shoulder is moved. Our sculptor, in his ignorance, has shown a pickadil (immediately below the lace jabot) clearly joining the two rows of semi-circles; that is intentional and not the result of a lack of interest or mere carelessness is proved by the fact that the striations on this pickadil run vertically, instead of nearly horizontally, as they logically would on this segment of the circumference of the paldrons, judging by the direction of adjacent pickadils to each side. In reality, this would link the paldrons firmly together at the front and prevent the wearer moving either shoulder in any direction; in short, he would find himself in a strait jacket. The explanation that this might be a parade rather than true military armour is inadmissible, in view of the plain, unadorned surfaces of metal on paldrons and breastplate. In any case, the wearer would still need to move his shoulders.

The second detail that is suspect, though not demonstrably incorrect, is the way in which two substantial locks of hair from the wig fall over the sitter's forehead. While short curls of hair were used to frame the face in seventeenth-century coiffure, these seem improbably and uncomfortably long, as may be ascertained by an examination of contemporary portraits.

Seymour failed to remark on these irregularities when publishing the bust, but he may have come perilously near the truth as to its period of origin when discussing another version, which he dismissed as a copy, then in private hands in Alexandria, near Washington. The style of the copy, he wrote, 'was that sometimes called "Louis Philippe", roughly 1830–1850'. Unfortunately photographs good enough for reproduction could not be taken and so a comparison between what represented for Seymour a 'copy' and its 'original' cannot be made. However, the inaccuracies in detail pointed out above, are readily explained if the present bust is recognized as a historicizing pastiche of the mid-nineteenth century.
Despite the signature and inscribed date of 1675, the statue has no history prior to 1946, when it was first published. The same is true of several related pieces in marble and terracotta, one of which, a marble formerly in the Rouart Collection, is intitled 'D.J.' and dated 1678.4 No statues of this size and type are recorded among the studio-effects of Dejardins after his decease,4 in eighteenth-century inventories of collections or catalogues of sales6 or in the Comptes des Bâtiments du Roi.7 Even so, the authenticity of this and the related statuettes has never been questioned. Nevertheless, the ungainly pose, finicky treatment of detail and lack of convincing expression serve to put one on one's guard. The small scale for a work in marble is unusual for this period, and also arouses suspicion.8 In any case the medium was never used for presentation models of larger projects, as has been suggested.9

The obvious relationship in composition between the marble statuettes of this type and two large ormolu appliques that appear on a pair of Boulle cabinets in the Louvre was noted as early as 1908.10 The appliques are closely related to the style and oeuvre of Desjardins, particularly to the monumental bronze reliefs of 1679 from the base of the monument to Louis XIV in the Place des Victoires, which are now in the Louvre.11 Both Rouart and Seligman12 regard the marble statuettes as the source for the design of these bas-reliefs and are therefore confirmed in their opinion that the statuettes are of the period. A disinterested consideration shows that the reverse is the case; the awkwardness that has been remarked in the pose of our marble is due to the fact that the sculptor has had difficulty in projecting into the third dimension a composition which only works satisfactorily in two dimensions.13 Clearly, the marble is due to the fact that the sculptor has had difficulty in projecting into the third dimension a composition which only works satisfactorily in two dimensions.13 Clearly, the appliques could have served as a source of inspiration at any subsequent date. That they were popular is proved by the existence of an example in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg;14 and another on a bibliothèque sold in New York in 1952.15

The existence of an extraordinary number of related statuettes of Louis XIV on this unaccustomed scale, none of them with pedigree, suggests that there may have been one or more workshops specializing in this type of historical pastiche, presumably active about the middle of the nineteenth century.16 An analogous marble statue of Louis XIV Triumphant over Heresy in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (A2-1949. Height 81·6 cm.), formerly associated with Louis Lecomte (1639–94), has recently been proved to be by Anton Heinrich Hess (1838–1909) of Munich.17 This historicizing pastiche seems to have been based on an engraving by C. Vermeulen after a statue (at present lost) by Louis Lecomte; it exhibits shortcomings as sculpture in three dimensions similar to those of the Kress piece, owing no doubt to its derivation from a two-dimensional original. The statue by Hess is an example of the 'court style' encouraged by King Ludwig II of Bavaria, who enjoyed flattering comparisons with his illustrious namesake. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to identify the workshop that was responsible for this piece, be it in Munich or Paris.18

**References:**


**FRENCH OR GERMAN (?)**

**XIX Century**

**LOUIS XIV.** Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1651), since 1954.1 Marble, 38½×19½×14 in. (97·5×49·2×35·5 cm). Inscription at the rear of the base DES IARDINS. 1675.

The statuette shows Louis XIV full-length and as a young, though mature man wearing stylized Roman armour. He is uneasily posed, with his right leg forward and his left behind. His right arm is stretched out sideways at an angle of forty-five degrees, to connect with the tip of a club which he holds lightly between thumb and fingers. A thick cloak, embroidered with fleur-de-lis, is draped over this arm and falls to the ground behind the figure, being caught up over his left shoulder. The left arm is akimbo, with the back of the wrist resting on his thrown-out hip, the king glances to his left with an impassive expression. He wears a full-bottomed wig, with ringlets falling round his shoulders, and a laurel wreath. His breast-plate and boots are decorated with lion's heads. The base is flat and has an architectural moulding round its edge; on it lie a sword, helmet and shield. The state of preservation is perfect.

**Provenance:** Maximo Scoièlette, Rio de Janeiro and Paris (c. 1946).2 Kress acquisition, 1954.2

The same is true of several related pieces in marble and terracotta, one of which, a marble formerly in the Rouart Collection, is intitled 'D.J.' and dated 1678.4 No statues of this size and type are recorded among the studio-effects of Dejardins after his decease,4 in eighteenth-century inventories of collections or catalogues of sales6 or in the Comptes des Bâtiments du Roi.7 Even so, the authenticity of this and the related statuettes has never been questioned. Nevertheless, the ungainly pose, finicky treatment of detail and lack of convincing expression serve to put one on one's guard. The small scale for a work in marble is unusual for this period, and also arouses suspicion.8 In any case the medium was never used for presentation models of larger projects, as has been suggested.9

The obvious relationship in composition between the marble statuettes of this type and two large ormolu appliques that appear on a pair of Boulle cabinets in the Louvre was noted as early as 1908.10 The appliques are closely related to the style and oeuvre of Desjardins, particularly to the monumental bronze reliefs of 1679 from the base of the monument to Louis XIV in the Place des Victoires, which are now in the Louvre.11 Both Rouart and Seligman12 regard the marble statuettes as the source for the design of these bas-reliefs and are therefore confirmed in their opinion that the statuettes are of the period. A disinterested consideration shows that the reverse is the case; the awkwardness that has been remarked in the pose of our marble is due to the fact that the sculptor has had difficulty in projecting into the third dimension a composition which only works satisfactorily in two dimensions.13 Clearly, the appliques could have served as a source of inspiration at any subsequent date. That they were popular is proved by the existence of an example in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg;14 and another on a bibliothèque sold in New York in 1952.15

The existence of an extraordinary number of related statuettes of Louis XIV on this unaccustomed scale, none of them with pedigree, suggests that there may have been one or more workshops specializing in this type of historical pastiche, presumably active about the middle of the nineteenth century.16 An analogous marble statue of Louis XIV Triumphant over Heresy in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (A2–1949. Height 81·6 cm.), formerly associated with Louis Lecomte (1639–94), has recently been proved to be by Anton Heinrich Hess (1838–1909) of Munich.17 This historicizing pastiche seems to have been based on an engraving by C. Vermeulen after a statue (at present lost) by Louis Lecomte; it exhibits shortcomings as sculpture in three dimensions similar to those of the Kress piece, owing no doubt to its derivation from a two-dimensional original. The statue by Hess is an example of the ‘court style’ encouraged by King Ludwig II of Bavaria, who enjoyed flattering comparisons with his illustrious namesake. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to identify the workshop that was responsible for this piece, be it in Munich or Paris.18
References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 183; III., 1968, p. 136 (as M. Desjardins). (2) Kress Coll. Cat., 1965, p. 224, no. 89; Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 442 (as M. Desjardins). (3) L. Réau, 'Martin Desjardins', Pro Arte, v, 55, November 1946, pp. 289 ff.; idem, in Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, 1945/6, pp. 145 ff. (4) L. Rouart, Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, 1908, pp. 217–20; Height 1 metre. (5) L. Seelig, 'L'inventaire après décès de Martin van den Bogaert dit Desjardins sculpteur ordinaire du roi (7 août 1694)', in Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, 1972, pp. 161 ff. (6) Written information from Dr Lorenz Seelig, who has recently studied the sculptor; see note 5, above. (7) E. & G. Seligman, The Art Quarterly, xxxi, 3, 1968, pp. 285 ff. (8) This argument is not conclusive, however, for Dr Seelig draws attention to two lost statuettes in marble of Louis XIV by Gobert and Girardon. (9) pace Seligman, i.e., p. 285 and n. 4; the Bouchardon which he cites as an analogy for a model in marble, K1713 Cupid trying his bow, has been proved to be a reduction of a date later than the final statue; see this catalogue p. 102. (10) Rouart, i.e., p. 219. (11) Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, Europäische Barockplastik am Niederrhein: Grupello und seine Zeit, Exhibition 1971, cat. no. 328 (entry by L. Seelig). (12) Seelig, i.e., p. 287. (13) Written analysis by Dr Seelig, agreed by the present author. (14) B. von Rützen-Kositzgau, Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen, 14/15, 1970, pp. 328–30; Height 38.7 cm. (15) Seligman, i.e., p. 295 n. 17; Parke-Bernet, Sale No. 114 (Collection of Comtesse de Cepoy). (16) Similar statuettes in marble exist (a) in the collection of E. Courty, Paris (Height 67 cm.); (b) in the Fakultät des Lettres, Poitiers; and (c) in a private collection, Paris, while three versions in terracotta are known to Dr Seelig. (17) Mr Terence Hodgkinson, Keeper of the Department of Architecture and Sculpture, Victoria and Albert Museum, noticed it illustrated (in reverse) on pl. 17 of the Katalog der Kunstsammlungen ... aus dem von Herrn Commerzienrat Geo Ehni erworbenen benützen Nachlass, sold Stuttgart, 1 October 1888, lot 1180, where the authorship of Prof. Hess is specifically mentioned. (18) This entry has been prepared by Charles Avery on the basis of material supplied by Mr Hodgkinson and Dr L. Seelig.

ROBERT LE LORRAIN

French School. Born in 1666 in Paris, he died there in 1743. In 1684 he entered the workshop of Girardon who then was engaged on the tomb of Richelieu. He received the first prize for sculpture from the École Académique in 1689 and was made a stipendiary of the French Academy in Rome in 1692. After an illness which obliged him temporarily to give up work, he entered the shop of Théodon. Returned to France in 1694, he applied to be received in the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in 1700 and was required to produce as his morceau de réception a marble statue of Galatea (k1651). He was made an academician in 1701, became professor in 1717 and finally rector in 1737. As sculptor to the Crown, Le Lorrain was occupied with work for Versailles and Marly. At Versailles he started with garden sculpture and ultimately was involved alongside his aged master, Girardon, and Coysevox in the sculptural decoration of the chapel. Le Lorrain produced for Marly various garden sculptures, now lost. In 1708 he contracted for the decoration of the Hôtel de Soubise in Paris (now badly weathered and repaired). Soon after he executed for the nearby Hôtel de Rohan his masterly relief composition of The Horses of Apollo, over the entrance to the stables (probably 1712–19). Thereafter, for the same patron, Cardinal Armand-Gaston de Rohan, Grand Aumônier de France and Prince-Bishop of Strasbourg, he decorated the Hôtel de Saverne (destroyed by fire 1779), and a new Hôtel de Rohan in Strasbourg (1731). Le Lorrain was prolific and his sculptures popular, judging from the Comptes des Bâtiments du Roi and eighteenth-century sale catalogues, but much of his work has been lost or remains to be identified.1

K1651: Figure 172

GALATEA. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1629), since 1949.2 Statuette in white marble, 29 1/2 × 14 3/4 × 17 3/4 in. (75.1 × 37.7 × 45.1 cm.). The sculpture, which is conoid in general volume, shows a nearly nude female seated on a rocky promontory with two dolphins at her feet and waves below. Her right leg is drawn back with the foot resting on a dolphin and her left is advanced, resting on an outcrop of rock amidst the waves. Her right hand is lowered and holds the tail of the other dolphin while her left is raised, some drapery in the hand just touching her left breast. She looks pensively to her right. Her features are classical and her hair is centrally parted and caught up behind in all elaborate coiffure, bound with a long plait. The base is a separate piece of pinkish marble. It is inscribed in front: GALATEE and at the back: ROBERT LE LORRAIN sculpt. 1701. The marble of the figure has many impurities. The statuette is in perfect condition. Cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.


The inscriptions leave no doubt that the statue is the morceau de réception which Le Lorrain was required to submit to the Académie Royale after his application for admission on 27 March 1700.5 'La Compagnie ... luy a ordonné faire en marbre de ronde-bosse une Galatée, de proportion telle qu'elle puisse accompagner le Poliphème que M. Van Cleve a donné pour sa réception, duquel ouvrage il rapportera une
exquisite dans un mois.' A preliminary wax model was accepted on 8 May and Le Lorrain was given three months to produce a full-scale model and a year to carve the marble. The large model was approved on 4 September and on 29 October 1701 Le Lorrain officially presented the marble and was received as an academician, with a gratuity of 100 Livres voted for the sculpture. It was described in the following terms by the secretary of the Academy in 1715:6

'24. Figure de marbre, de ronde bosse, de deux pieds quatre pouces de haut. – C'est Galatee, amante d'Acis, mais qui, par cette raison, fut la cause de sa mort; parce que Polyphème qui aima éperdument cette Nymphé, les ayant trouvé ensemble, forcé de jalouse, lança sur eux une pierre de rocher, qui assomma le jeune Amant. Le symbole que ron met icy à Galatee pour la reconnaître est un Dauphin, parce qu'étant une des Néréides elle faisait son séjour sur les bords de la mer . . . Par M. Le Lorrain (Robert), etc . . . .

The Galatee remained in the Académie Royale until after the Revolution, when it was moved to the Museum of French Art in Versailles.7 On 5 October 1819 it was given to Monsieur Maréchal, the sculptor’s grandson, in exchange for a marble medallion of Louis XIV by Girardon.8 From then the sculpture was lost sight of until it was purchased from the descendants of Maréchal by Wildenstein’s, New York, and sold to Samuel H. Kress.

A morceau de réception naturally demanded the exercise of an artist’s highest powers, for it had to be submitted to the criticism of senior colleagues, well qualified to judge it, before the candidate was elected to the Academy. We can therefore be certain that the Galatee represents Le Lorrain at his best in 1700.10 Its technical accomplishment, relaxed composition and charm show that he was indeed a talented sculptor.11


ROBERT LE LORRAIN (?)

K1652 : Figure 175

THE DEW (LA ROSEÉE). Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (16360), since 1949.1 White marble, 71 × 30 1/2 × 26 1/2 in. (180.5 × 77.2 × 67.3 cm.).

A woman in classical drapery is stepping forward in the act of pouring from a little watering-can in her right hand in the direction of a bunch of small flowers held out by a Cupid with butterfly wings at her feet to her left. Above a rectangular plinth, the base is formed into stylized clouds. The woman’s weight rests on her left leg and the right leg is bent behind, the foot resting on a cloud. Her right knee and left breast and both forearms are bare. She looks down towards the Cupid and her left hand is held in a protective gesture over him. The Cupid looks expectantly upwards at the watering-can, holding the flowers in both hands in front of him. His weight rests on his right leg, which is buried in the clouds, the left one overhangs the edge of the plinth. He wears drapery attached by a belt across his chest and coming over his left thigh in a strategic position. Condition: fingers of the woman’s left hand broken and re-attached. Cupid’s left wing and left big toe broken and re-attached. The marble is clouded with grey. Cleaned 1956 by J. Ternbach.


This sculpture bears no signature and its attribution has to rely on stylistic and circumstantial evidence. Its provenance before the collection of Sir Harold Wernher is unknown. It has been suggested6 that it is identical with a statue of Hébé which Robert Le Lorrain carved between 1729 and 1731, originally for the gardens of Marly.7 A final payment was recorded on 16 March 1733.8

'À u s'élorrain, sculpteur, du 16 Mars 1733.
Le parfait paiement d'une groupe en marbre représentant Hébé, déesse de la Jeunesse.
Et une Vase aussi de marbre, pour le jardin du château.
"... has only the faintest similarities and a rather different statue corresponding, from his description, with KI652 in the New Collection..."

References:


---

EDME BOUCHARDON

French School. Born at Chaumont-en-Bassigny in 1698, he died in Paris in 1762. After beginning his training in his father's workshop he went to Paris in 1721 and became a pupil of Guillaume I Coustou. He won first prize in sculpture at the École Académique in 1722 and went to the French Academy at Rome in 1723, remaining there for nine..."
years, copying from the Antique and executing numerous portrait-busts. In 1733 he took up residence in the Louvre and began work on several royal commissions, a statue of Louis XIV for Notre-Dame and some groups for the basin of Neptune at Versailles. In 1736 he was appointed designer to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres for the medals and jettons of Louis XV. In 1745 he belatedly submitted his morceau de réception, Christ carrying the Cross, to the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. He was admitted, and promoted to Professor in 1746. Of his royal commissions L’Amour essayant un arc commencé fait de la masse d’Hercule, of which k1713 is a version, was the most celebrated. For the City of Paris his most important works were the Fontaine de la rue de Grenelle and an Equestrian statue of Louis XV, destroyed in the Revolution.

After EDFME BOUCHARDON

**k1713 : Figures 173, 174**

CUPID TRYING THE BOW WHICH HE CUT FROM HERCULES’ CLUB WITH THE ARMS OF MARS (L’AMOUR ESSAYANT UN ARC COMMENCE FAIT DE LA MASSE D’HERCULE).\(^1\) Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A16179), since 1952.\(^2\) Marble statue, height: 29 in. (74 cm.); diameter of base: 13\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (34.5 cm.). Inscribed on the back of the base BOUCHARDON, 1744. Cupid is shown as a nude, adolescent boy with bird’s wings, his luxuriantly curly hair tied with a ribbon. A strap runs diagonally across his chest to secure a quiver on his back. He stands in a spiralling pose, his weight bearing down in an attempt to bend with his right hand the upper tip of a bow, the centre of which he grasps in his left hand, braced against his left thigh. The bow is shown nearly complete, but with its bottom end still embedded in the tree-trunk club of Hercules. The lion-skin, principal attribute of Hercules, is shown draped over an oval shield (of Mars) that is set behind Cupid’s left leg. On the naturalistic surface of the base lies a string, ready for the bow, and the sword of Mars, which Cupid is using to cut the bow. Well preserved. The bottom part of the quiver is added. Cleaned 1936 by J. Ternbach.


Our statue is a version of one of the sculptor’s most celebrated works, L’Amour essayant un arc commencé fait de la masse d’Hercule.\(^12\) Its provenance can be proved to go back only as far as 1865, when it was lent by Lord Hertford to the Musée Rétrospectif of 1865, organized by the Union Centrale des Beaux-Arts appliqués à l’Industrie.\(^4\) A knowledge of the history of the original commission for a statue of this subject is material to an assessment of the present example.

The initial, tentative order for a sketch-model in terracotta was given by Monsieur Orry, contrôleur général des finances and surintendant des Bâtiments du Roi, between 1737 and 1739, after Bouchardon had had to abandon a statue of Louis XIV which had been intended to replace that by Coysevox in the choice of Notre Dame, Paris.\(^13\) This model was shown in the Salon of 1739, with the following description:\(^14\) ‘Un autre modèle en terre cuite d’une statue qui doit être exécutée en marbre pour le Roi, représentant l’Amour qui, avec les Armes de Mars, se fait un arc de la Massue d’Hercule: fier de sa puissance, et s’applaudit d’avoir démembré deux Divinités si redoutables, le fils de Vénus témoigne, par un ris malin, la satisfaction qu’il ressent de tout le mal qu’il va causer.’ This proves that the terracotta was a trial composition. A commission to execute it in marble depended on its success in the eyes of the surintendant and the king himself. Bouchardon later referred to it as only ‘un premier travail qui ne donnait que le commencement de son sujet et avoir pour sujet la statue de l’Amour essayant un arc de la masse d’Hercule’.\(^15\)

Between 1740 and 1745 Bouchardon was principally involved in two major projects, the Fontaine de la rue de Grenelle for the civic authorities of Paris commissioned in 1739, and the mausoleum for Cardinal de Fleury, commissioned after a competition in 1743.\(^17\) The latter was never executed because the king lost interest, but Bouchardon made several models in 1744 and 1745. These projects presumably caused the delay of five years in the work on the definitive version of L’Amour. According to a mémoire certifié submitted by the sculptor in support of his claim for a final payment in 1753, he began serious work with life drawings and full-scale models only in 1745:\(^18\)

‘En 1740, cette figure fut ordonnée par M. Orry. En 1745, le Ster Bouchardon en commença les études, après s’être rempli de son sujet et avoir assuré sa pensée par une première esquisse en terre. Un grand nombre de dessins d’après nature et d’après plusieurs modèles ont suivi, d’où a résulté un modèle en terre cuite de 2 piés (65 cm.) de proportion et un autre de 5 piés \(\frac{1}{2}\) (179 cm.) de haut, tous deux entièrement faits par l’auteur.'
Ces modèles ont été moulés. On en a tiré des plâtres entiers et par partie et, pour plus de perfection, on a aussi moulé des corps vivant, des bras, des jambes et autres parties, tous travaux indispensables à quiconque veut imiter la nature et ne se point égarer dans l'exécution en marbre, opérations qui ont occupé pendant plus de quinze mois un moulureur et deux manoeuvres.

Ces préparations faites, le travail de marbre a commencé au mois de juillet 1747 et a continué jusqu'au 12 mai 1750 que la statue s'est trouvée finie.'

Eight drawings from a live model now in the Louvre, bear witness to this diligence and to the accuracy of his statement. They seem to be the results of a single campaign and presumably date from 1745. A full-scale plaster was shown in the Salon of 1746, n. 57, with a passage about the subject identical to that printed in 1739, but with the following addition: 'il y a quelques années que l'on a vu dans le Salon un petit modèle en terre de cette Figure, accompagné de la même description; mais ce n'était qu'un premier travail, qui ne donnait que la pensee. Le Modèle qu'on expose aujourd'hui est plus épurée; tout est arrêté et fait d'après nature; et c'est sur ce Modèle que la Statue de grandeur naturelle s'exécute en marbre pour le Roy.'

The block of marble delivered for the statue on 15 April 1747 was found to have a severe fault and part of it was subsequently handed over to Falconet. A new block was ordered on 1 June 1747 and Bouchardon began work in July. The carving was finished on 12 May 1750 and the final payment was made on 29 June 1753. Bouchardon received the enormous sum of 20,000 Livres, when only a few years later, in 1771, 10,000 was regarded as the norm, as appears from correspondence between Cochin and M. de Marigny, occasioned by a claim in excess of this amount by the sculptor Allegrain.

The final marble version, 173 cm. high, signed and dated par EDMÉ BOUCHARDON DE CHAumont en Bassigny, FAIT EN 1750, is now in the Louvre. Originally placed in the Salon d'Hercule in Versailles and later (1752) moved to the orangerie of the Château de Choisy, it was taken to the Louvre in 1778 in order that a cast might be taken and a full size marble copy made by Mouchy for the Petit Trianon. It remained in the Salle des Antiques in the Louvre. No reference to K1713 appears in Bouchardon's own account of the history of the commission submitted with his claim for final payment in 1753. This is disturbing, for his account is detailed, and insofar as it can be checked, accurate about dates and the various stages of preparation for the final marble. A highly finished version in marble dating from 1744 finds no place in the natural and logical order of events described by the sculptor. If the date were correct, it would precede the series of drawings and casts made from a live model in 1745, as well as the full-scale plaster exhibited in the Salon of 1746. This seems to have been overlooked by Roserot, author of the standard monograph on Bouchardon, who regarded the present statue as in some way revealing the quality of the earliest clay model of 1739. Had the sculptor carved K1713 in 1744, he would not have needed to resort to a further series of life-studies to produce his final life-size marble, for the two are identical except in size and certain details that are peripheral to the essence of the composition. Considerable doubt is thus cast on the credibility of the inscription.

It has been suggested that the present statue was commissioned by Madame de Pompadour, since Diderot in his commentary on the Salon of 1765 connected her name with a sculpture of L'Amour by Bouchardon. However, she had not appeared at court in 1739, when the royal commission was initially given and can have had no part in the choice of subject or the early stages of the commission. In any case, it is extremely unlikely that Mme de Pompadour would have been allowed to pre-empt a long-standing royal commission by obtaining privately from the sculptor a finished version six years earlier than the king received his. Finally, on general grounds, a small marble version of a known larger sculpture is nearly always a reduction from it and hardly ever part of the preparations for it.

A clue to the origins of K1713 is given by a photograph showing it in the Hertford room of the Musée Rétrospectif of 1865, it stood on a commode, paired with La Baigneuse débout or Flore by J-B. Lemoyne. That they constituted a proper pair is proved not only by their similiar size (L'Amour, 74 cm., Flore, 75 cm.) but by the identical band of decoration round their bases. The motif is quite different from that on the base of the Louvre version. The Lemoyne, which is the only recorded example of the subject, is signed and dated 1755. It is recorded by Désallier d'Argenville in 1757 and in the Almanach des Beaux-Arts in 1762 as in the collection of the fermier-général Bouret. What is of immediate significance is that in each case the item listed before is L'Amour qui se fait un arc by Bouchardon. It may be presumed that the reduction of Bouchardon’s marble of 1750 was made as a pair to the Lemoyne in 1755 for the fermier-général Bouret and inscribed with the original artist's name and an approximate date, 1744. The Lemoyne is recorded as having been sold on 18 December 1850 at an unspecified sale and it is likely that the Bouchardon passed with it then (or at any rate before 1865) into the hands of the Marquess of Hertford. The Lemoyne was sold presumably by Jacques Seligmann to M. le Baron Edmond de Rothschild, in whose Paris collection it was in 1927. The motif may have been inspired by a composition by Parmigianino, a famous replica of which was at the time in the collection of the Duke of Orléans in the Palais Royal. The idea at the time was severely criticized, among others by Diderot and Voltaire. The ultimate inspiration probably has been a piece of classic statuary, Amor testing the bow, of which a number of versions exist.

References: (1) Such is the title given by Bouchardon in his claim for payment on the original composition, in 1753,

JEAN-PIERRE ANTOINE TASSAERT

French School. Tassaert was born in 1727 in Antwerp, the son of a sculptor. After a few years spent in London he went to Paris to train in the studio of a fellow-countryman, Michel-Ange Slodtz. After working anonymously for many years he was received at the late age of forty-two as associate in the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture (1769), although he never worked for the court. His principal patrons were the fermier-général Bouret and the contrôleur-général des finances, Abbé Terray. In 1774 he was appointed court sculptor to Frederick the Great of Prussia, succeeding Sigisbert Michel (a brother of Clodion), and moved to Berlin in May 1775. After finishing several Parisian commissions, including Painting and Sculpture and Love and Friendship (Pennsylvania Museum of Art, Philadelphia), Tassaert carved many allegorical or mythological statues for Potsdam. His style was particularly influenced by Bouchardon and the paintings of the Boucher. He was the
master of Johann Gottfried Schadow. At the time of his death in 1788 in Berlin, he was director of the Academy of Arts and enjoyed fair financial circumstances.

K1673 : Figures 176, 178, 180

PAINTING AND SCULPTURE. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (Ai636), since 1949.1 Full-round marble group, 38\(\frac{2}{3}\) x 34\(\frac{1}{3}\) x 25\(\frac{1}{3}\) in. (98.2 x 87 x 63.8 cm.). In the centre stands a child, clearly characterized as female by a hairband and coiffure, with her left hand and forearm resting along the top of a rectangular canvas on its stretcher and her right holding a palette and paint-brushes in front of her chest. At her foot lies a mahlstick. She looks downwards to her left at another child, probably a boy, seated on the ground in a cross-legged, recumbent pose and leaning against a block, with his weight supported by both arms, which rest on a bust of a man. He half looks at her canvas. A mallet and a chisel are in his hands and some further chisels lie on the ground below, as well as on the top of the block behind. Behind the canvas held up by the little girl is a heap of papers, perhaps representing drawings and designs. The marble has been pieced in various places; the arm with the mallet, the overhanging right foot, and the toes of the left foot of Sculpture and the right arm of Painting, have all been attached. There are minor damages and repairs to the palette, the mahlstick, the chisels, the dangling foot and the left hand of Sculpture, two fingers of the right hand of Painting, the nose and ear of the bust. There is a small nick in the drapery of Painting above the left knee; a pair of compasses at the back, on the block, is damaged. Repaired and cleaned in 1955 by J. Ternbach.

Provenance: The same as for the following companion piece by Clodion (k1673), Kress acquisition, 1949.2

The history of the piece is the same as that of the following group by Clodion (k1674).3 L’Abbé Terray was an important patron of Tassaert and owned three other statues by him, a Pyrrha (lot 21 of the 1778 catalogue), a Venus Seated on a Shell (lot 31), and a Baigneuse after Falconet (lot 32). We know that he executed the Pyrrha after his departure from Paris in May 1775 to take up his appointment as court sculptor in Berlin.4 He must have carved k1673 in Berlin too, either having taken with him, when he left, the block of marble that had been sent to Clodion, or letting it be sent on afterwards. As with the other groups of children, the death of L’Abbé Terray in 1778 provides a terminus ante quem for the execution of this marble. An identification of the features of the bust on which the allegory of Sculpture rests as those of Diderot5 is ruled out by comparison with Houdon’s portrait of 1771.6,7


CLAUDEmICHEL called CLODION

French School. Claude Michel called Clodion was born in 1738 in Nancy, son of Thomas Michel (first sculptor to the King of Prussia) and Anne Adam, sister of two celebrated sculptors of that name. In 1755 Clodion entered the studio of his uncle Lambert-Sigisbert Adam in Paris and, after his death, worked briefly under J.-B. Pigalle. In 1759 he obtained the Grand Prix and entered the school of the Élèves Protégés. From 1762–7 he was in Rome at the French Academy and then stayed on independently until 1771. The next two decades saw his principal period of activity in Paris, Poetry and Music being one of his earliest sculptures there. In 1773 he was received as associate in the Academy. He retired to Nancy from 1792 to 1798 to avoid the aftermath of the French Revolution but then returned to Paris where he stayed until his death in 1814. Though an accomplished sculptor in marble, Clodion specialized in small-scale terracotta groups of great vivacity.

K1674 : Figures 177, 179, 181

POETRY AND MUSIC. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1622), since 1949. Full-round marble group, 46\(\frac{2}{3}\) x 35 x 23\(\frac{1}{3}\) in. (117.5 x 88.9 x 60 cm.). On the left stands a male putto, nude except for some drapery over his left shoulder; he playfully holds up by its neck a cithern (a kind of guitar) and points to its strings with the other hand. A scroll of music lies between his feet and another on a block in the centre of the composition. On this block another putto, seated on two books lying on the ground, rests his right arm, holding a pencil or stylus in his hand. Across his knees lies unrolled a sheet of paper that trails on the ground; he appears to be pausing to await inspiration. Against the block lean two thick, bound volumes, while on the ground in front lie a wreath and a spray of laurel and a wind instrument with a bell-shaped mouth. The marble has been pieced in various places; the neck of the lute with the arm of the putto holding it, the right thumb of the
Putter, the right hand and the right foot of the seated putto, the corner of the scroll above his left thumb, have all been attached. The mouth of the wind instrument and the scroll next to it have been repaired. Repaired and cleaned in 1955 by J. Ternbach.

**Provenance:** Abbé Joseph Marie Terray, Paris.2 Abbé Cecq di Terray (néphew and heir; Sale, 1779), Paris.3 Marquis Joseph Henri Costa de Beauregard, Château de Beauregard, Savoy.4 Marquis Charles Albert Costa de Beauregard, La Motte-Serveux, Savoy.5 Charles Wertheimer, London.6 David David-Weill, Paris.7 Kress acquisition, 1949.8 Exhibited: New York, Wildenstein and Co., 1940.9

This group, together with Tassaert’s *Painting and Sculpture* (k1673) belongs to a set of four sculptures commissioned in 1774 for his house in Paris by the Abbé Joseph Terray (1715–78), contrôleur-général des finances (1769–74) and directeur-général des bâtiments for about a year before the death of Louis XV (1774). The other two groups, *Geometry and Architecture* by Jean-Jacques Caffieri (dated 1776) and *Geography and Astronomy* by Félix LeComte (dated 1778), are now in the James A. de Rothschild Collection at Waddesdon Manor, Buckinghamshire, England.7 The first reference to the series is in a letter sent by Clodion from Rome on 6 December 1774 to the sculptor Vitale Finelli at Carrara, who had for some time been supplying marble and decorative sculpture on Clodion’s instructions for Terray and other Parisian patrons.8 Clodion asked Finelli to purchase four blocks of marble ‘per li gruppi di puti per Monsieur l’abbé Terray Controleur Générale’, and forwarded sufficient funds to do so. Some six months later, on 13 June 1775, Clodion wrote and thanked his colleague for sending the marble blocks. It may be assumed that Clodion began work immediately, though neither his group nor Tassaert’s is dated. As Tassaert left Paris in May 1775 to take up an appointment in Berlin as court sculptor to Frederick the Great, he must have carved k1673 in Berlin. We do not know whether Clodion in any sense coordinated the designs or was merely charged with ordering the four blocks from Carrara, and we have no particulars about the involvement of Caffieri and LeComte in the commission. In any case, the compositions clearly fall into two pairs, for in the pieces in the Kress Collection the standing children are on the left, while in those at Waddesdon they are on the right. The four groups were listed as two pairs, for in the pieces in the Kress Collection the stand­

Provenance: (2) Catherine II, the Great, of Russia, St. Petersburg.² (2) Prince Potemkin.² Darja Nikolaevna Lopouchina, Moscow.² W. N. Isakoff, Kiev (pre-1904).² D. David-Weill, Paris (pre-1925).³ Wildenstein & Co., New York, 1940.⁴ Kress acquisition, 1949.⁵

The statuette seems to be the imaginative adaptation of an Antique statue in the Uffizi, which shortly before had been published as that of a Vestal.⁶ The statuette has always been connected with the name of Catherine the Great of Russia and it has been assumed that it was ordered on her behalf by Baron Grimm in 1770.⁷ Unfortunately, his celebrated correspondence with Catherine only began in 1774 and so gives no clue about this commission.⁸ Nevertheless, two facts lend support to the theory: the Russian provenance of the piece,² and an entry on a terracotta model in the catalogue of an anonymous sale in Paris on 24 April 1786:⁹ 'Une Vestale, en terre cuite, petit modèle de la figure que Clodion a exécutée pour l’Impératrice de Russie. Hauteur 18 pouces. Vendue 245 livres à Lebrun'. The wording unmistakably implies that Clodion made a larger Vestal for Catherine II, and though it does not specify the medium, marble would be normal. That the present statue may be this piece is established by its correspondence in general composition with Lebrun’s terracotta, which is more exactly described in the catalogue of his sale on 11 April 1791, n. 361:¹⁰ 'Une Vestale voilée et couronnée de fleurs, tenant de la main droite une paire et de la gauche une vase. Près d’elle est placé un trépied de forme antique. Hauteur, 18 pouces; largeur, 7 pouces. Vendue 60 livres.'

As it happens, an autograph terracotta of the right height (19 in., 48·3 cm.) and of the same composition as x1672 has long been known and has recently been purchased by the Museum of Art, Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Ohio.¹¹ Like the marble version, it has an old Russian, aristocratic provenance, from the Stroganoff Collection.¹² This terracotta is signed: ‘CLODION in roma’ and dated 1768,¹³ which would be consistent with its having served as a model for our marble (finished 1770). In any case, this was not Clodion’s first attempt at the subject, for in the catalogue of the sale of effects of M. de Julienne, published in Paris in 1767 (approved by Cochin and passed for printing by De Sartine in December 1766) there appeared as part of lot 1304:¹⁴ 'Une prêtrise couronnée vers sa patère sur l’autel'. It was however only 10 pouces, 6 lignes high, i.e. approximately 10·6 in. (27·cm.), and thus little more than half as high as the terracotta in Lebrun’s Collection which we believe to be identical with that now in the Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh. Furthermore, at the sale of the painter Boucher in 1767 there was also ‘Une Vestale, terre cuite, de 15 pouces de haut, fait a Rome d’après l’antique’.¹⁵ Other terracotta Vestals appear in sales after the date of our marble, in 1778 and 1785.¹⁶ A terracotta of a Vestal Virgin was formerly in the David-Weill Collection.¹⁷ Versions of this composition in other media exist. It was reproduced in porcelain by the Imperial Manufacture of St Petersburg, where the moulds were preserved at least until 1904, and an example was to be seen in the Winter Palace.¹⁸

Several versions of different sizes are known in bronze, but there is no evidence to suggest that any of these date from the eighteenth century and they are probably derivative. (a) Berlin, Staatliche Museen (inv. no. 2751) purchased in London, 1903: Height, 33⅔ in. (85·5 cm.).¹⁹ (b) London, art market, 1903, smaller version mentioned in catalogue entries on (a) above.²⁰ (c) St Petersburg, Adrien Prachoff Collection, 1907: Height 23⅔ in. (65 cm.).²¹ (d) M. Knoedler & Co., exhibition The French Bronze 1500 to 1800, New York, 1968, cat. no. 71: Height 34⅔ in. (87·5 cm.).

A relief of half-length figures of two Vestals, one of which is a variation of our figure, was in the M. Pauline sale.²² Closely related is the bozzetto of a pleureuse in the Victoria and Albert Museum, which is signed and dated: ’ROMA 1766’.²³, ²⁴


Attributed to CLODION

**K1677**: Figure 183

**MADAME ROYALE AN INFANT.**

1 New York, Mrs Rush H. Kress, since 1954. Statuette in white marble, $7^{1/2} \times 5^{1/2} \times 8$ in. $27^{1/2} \times 19 \times 20$ cm. Signed: CLODION and dated 1780 on the back of the square base. A baby girl is seated on two cushions above a square plinth. Her right foot rests on the plinth and she supports her weight with this and her left arm which is stretched out behind. With her right hand she leans forward to touch her left big toe, while looking towards her right. The composition is pyramidal in shape and attention is focused on the face of the child. Good condition but for a few bruises on projecting corners.


The statuette corresponds in composition to a piece in hard-paste biscuit de Sèvres. Emile Bourgeois has mentioned the possibility of attributing the design to Clodion on the grounds of quality and the fact that he is said to have executed a portrait of the sitter in her infancy. However, he admitted that there was no documentary evidence in the archives at Sèvres, because they are incomplete after about 1773. S. L. Boizot was the sculptor who designed the other known biscuit de Sèvres portraits of Marie-Antoinette and her children and there seems to be no reason why he should not have been responsible for the present composition too.

The only reason, apart from the signature, for connecting Clodion's name with this statuette is the presence of a plaster portrait-bust of *Madame, fille de Louis XVI, représentée enfant* among the studio effects that were post-humously offered for sale on 31 August 1814. The appearance and location of this bust are unknown and so its relationship to the head of the present full-length composition must remain in doubt.

The absence of an old provenance for a marble with a subject of this importance is suspicious, while the style and quality of the cutting seem to belie the signature. The statue may have been worked up from the known composition in biscuit de Sèvres, on the strength of Emile Bourgeois' published attribution to Clodion. This would be consistent with its appearance in 1920, or shortly thereafter. The attribution to Clodion has been supported by Georges Giacometti and Georg Swarzenski. The names of A. Pajou and L. F. de La Rue also have been mentioned.

**References:**


**AUGUSTIN PAJOU**

French School. He was born in Paris 1730 and died there 1809. Pajou was a pupil of Jean-Baptiste II Lemoyne and showed sufficient early promise to be sent to the Académie de France in Rome between 1752 and 1756. After his return to Paris, his career was very successful; he exhibited at the annual Salons in the Louvre between 1759 and 1802 and rose steadily in the ranks of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, from member (1760) to professor and ultimately to rector (1792). He enjoyed the favour of Mme Du Barry and received many royal and public commissions, as well as a quantity of private work, until the time of the French Revolution. He excelled in decorative
attributed sculpture such as that in the theatre at Versailles. He was also a highly competent portraitist.

Attributed to PAJOU

KI655 : Figures 184, 185

THE MUSE CALYPSO. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1631), since 1949. Marble statue, 62½ x 23½ x 18¼ in. (158 x 60.6 x 46.4 cm.). The statue shows a tall and well-built female figure in classical robes stepping forward in an easy contrapposto, with her weight on the left and the face, derived from a classical model, wears an impassive expression. Her wavy hair is parted centrally and her right breast and left arm and shoulder are bare and she points with her left index finger to an inscription on the book she holds open with her right hand at waist level. The square base is plain. Condition: good. The marble has flaws and there is a crack, not a break in the back. Cleaned in 1956 by J. Ternbach. Inscribed in Roman capitals on the book:

FA MAE. (I, Queen Calliope, delight of men and of gods, in AGMINA,BEL/LANTUMQUE/ANIMOS

TAS CARMINIS HE/ROI NUMERIS/FULGENTIA/SIGNIS

HOMINUM/DIVUMQUE VO/LUP­

TO INClyTAQUE/AETERNAE COMMI/TTO NOMINA/

FAMAE. (I, Queen Calliope, delight of men and of gods, in the measures of heroic verse sing of hosts with flashing standards and of the high courage of warriors and their battles; and I hand on to eternal fame glorious names.)


The attribution to Pajou, which is based on style alone, remains open to discussion, for similarities with his work are not absolutely conclusive. The documentation previously connected with the statue is not applicable, for it refers to a sculpture executed by Pajou not in marble, but in pierre de Tonnere (close-grained limestone, universally employed for decorative sculpture). This was one of a series of nine muses carved between 1773 and 1774 for the dining-room of the Château de Bellevue, as we know from a letter of 1787 from Pajou himself setting out the terms of the commission and claiming payment. In this document, of primary importance, the material is specified as Pierre di Touaire, and the sculptor’s accuracy on this point cannot be questioned, for the use of marble would have been far more expensive. In any case the use of this particular material is confirmed independently by a document of 1773, cited in the standard work of reference on the Château de Bellevue. Regrettably therefore, the provenance proposed for the present sculpture must be discarded. In the work of Pajou only one statue in marble with a related subject, the Muse Urania, is recorded. In 1763 he submitted an estimate of 10,000 Livres for carving such a figure for the gardens of Choisy, but it is not known if the statue was actually executed. This commission had previously been allocated to Paul Ambroise Slodtz and Falconet in turn, but neither had been able to carry it out. Until the intervention of Pajou the subject had been Minerva: it is therefore just conceivable that a further change in favour of Calliope may have been made. This however is conjectural. A further commission for four muses, including Calliope, was given to Pajou in 1774 by the Prince de Condé. Now lost, they were intended as external decorations of the Palais Royal in Paris and were once again carved in stone and not marble, according to the records, which excludes the present statue from consideration. Though the authorship of Pajou is open to doubt, the statue appears certainly to be a French work of the 1770s or 1780s.


FRENCH: XVIII or Early XIX Century

KI423 : Figures 186, 187

VENUS ON A SHELL AND TWO CUPIDS. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1623), since 1949. Full-round group in marble, 29½ x 28 x 18 in. (74.9 x 71.2 x 45.7 cm.). Venus with a modish hair-style and lightly covered by some drapery is seated on a shell which floats on waves from which the head of a sea-monster emerges. On her left there is a bunch of flowers, and a cupid, who looks up at her. With her right hand she holds two doves by a ribbon; a cupid kisses her hand. Rectangular base. The tips of the wings of the cupid have been pieced. Cleaned in 1956 by J. Ternbach.


There is no documentary evidence as to authorship of this sculpture. The earliest literary reference and attribution
appear in a sale catalogue of 1841\(^3\) which contains the following description of our sculpture: ‘Bouchardon. Groupe en marbre. 119 – Madame de Pompadour sous les attributs de Vénus, assise sur une conque supportée par un dauphin, retient par un ruban deux colombes placées à côté d’elle, et c’est sur cette belle main que l’amour imprime un baiser. Une étoffe légère gète à peine les charmes de son corps, gracieusement posée sur une draperie brochée, où l’on a jété un bouquet de fleurs, comme un hommage, et à laquelle un jeune enfant se cramponne en considérant la favorite avec une tendre admiration. Le ciseau de l’artiste, dans cette composition séduisante, ne laisse rien à désirer; la beauté du dessin répond au fini de l’exécution. Marbre, haut. 78 cent., larg. 46 cent.’ The attribution to Bouchardon finds no support in the style or nature of the group. Subsequently, the unwarranted identification of the features of Venus as those of Madame de Pompadour has led to the suggestion that Falconet, her particular favourite, was its author; this has in turn led to deductions about its date, which would have to be in the decade 1755-65.\(^4\) Unfortunately, the false premise on which these hypotheses are based invalidates these conclusions.

The features of Venus indeed betray something of the specific feeling of portraiture, and Madame du Barry has been suggested as an alternative candidate: this would tend to point towards a different sculptor, perhaps Augustin Pajou (1730-1809), who executed many portraits of her in allegorical guise as well as from the life.\(^5\) Nevertheless, the present group recalls Pajou only in certain details. The subject of Venus seated on a Shell with Doves and Putti was popular in France in the 1770s, for two examples are known, one from a description only; this is listed as lot 31 in the posthumous sale of Abbé Terray in 1779,\(^6\) and described as: ‘M. Tassaert. 31. Vénus assise sur une coquille; d’une main elle tient un carquois rempli de flèches & de l’autre les guides de ses colombes; deux dauphins conduisent son char, & elle est accompagnée de deux enfants, dont un sonne de la conque marine. Ce morceau est de la même grandeur que le précédent, & lui sert de pendant.’ The preceding lot was Bridan’s Arion, with a height of 23 pouces (62 cm.), and a width of 20 pouces (54 cm.). It was thus considerably smaller than our group; and one specific detail of the description of Tassaert’s group, the putto blowing into a conch shell, does not appear in the present composition.

Another rendering of the subject, known from a marble of half-life-size formerly in Schloss Monbijou, Berlin (as late as 1930 but probably destroyed in the war), and a full-size plaster in a park outside Paris, has been attributed to a little-known dilettante sculptor, S. G. J. Pfaff.\(^7\) The photograph of the Berlin group shows a composition similar to our group, though reversed.

The existence of two rather similar compositions on the same theme from the 1770s in itself casts suspicion on the authenticity of a third version, which our piece would constitute if it did date from the period in the eighteenth century which its style suggests. The fact that the style of the piece is so ambiguous that its authorship has thus far eluded connoisseurs of French eighteenth-century sculpture is in itself troubling. It should be borne in mind that the group cannot be traced further back than the Péri­nay sale of 1841 and the possibility of its being an elaborate pastiche of the early nineteenth century cannot be excluded on present evidence.\(^8\)

References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 154; Ill., 1968, p. 137 (as E. M. Falconet). (2) Three previous owners listed in the Kress Coll. Cat., 1951, p. 254 could not be identified. (3) Catalogue des Tableaux . . . composant le Cabinet de M. de Péri­nay, Sale, Paris, Hôtel de la Rue des Jeuneurs, 6–7 April 1841, p. 38 n. 119 (as Bouchardon). (4) Kress Coll. Cat., 1951, op. cit., pp. 254 f. n. 114; Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 449; C. Seymour in Art Treasures, 1961, pp. 185 f., 210, fig. 177 (as E. M. Falconet). (5) H. Stein, Pajou, Paris, 1912, passim. (6) F. C. Joullain fils, Catalogue d’une très-belle collection . . . provenant de la succession de feu M. L’Abbé Terray, Ministre d’État & Secrétaire, Commandeur des Ordres de Sa Majesté. Dont la vente se fera vers la fin de Décembre, ou au commencement de Janvier prochain, rue de Jouy, à l’Hôtel d’Aumont, Paris, 1779, pp. 19–20, n. 31. (7) P. Vitry, La Revue de L’Art ancien et moderne, I, 1898, pp. 135 ff. Vitry’s case for Pfaff’s authorship of the group relies on its alleged similarity in appearance and style to a pendant showing Venus Wringing out her Tresses, which can be satisfactorily proved to be by Pfaff. Both marbles were sold in 1834 to the King of Prussia by a Comte de Pfaffen­hoven, who claimed them as the work of his father, Simon-Georges-Joseph Pfaff (born in Vienna, Baron von Pfaffen­hoven). About 1750, after a duel, he was forced into exile and settled in Abbeville under his assumed, abbrevi­ated name and devoted himself to sculpture, for which he had always had a predilection. The Venus Wringing out her Tresses is mentioned in a letter of 1773 as recently completed, and is described so fully that its identification with the piece formerly in Berlin is beyond doubt. (8) This entry has been prepared by Charles Avery with the help of Terence Hodgkinson.

JEAN ANTOINE HODON

French School. He was born in 1741 at Versailles and died in 1828 in Paris. He received his training under Michel-Ange Slodtz at the Academy and at the École des Elèves Pro­tégés (1761–4). In 1756 and 1767 he won two prizes, and in 1764 he became pensionnaire at the French Academy in Rome. Here he created his first great works. He returned to Paris in 1768 and quickly became the most celebrated por­traitist of his time, even though he obtained few commis­sions from the court. His sitters included members of French society and intelligentsia; he worked in and for Germany, for Russia and other countries. At the same time
he produced important decorative sculpture like his Diana and monumental works like the statue of Washington for the Capitol in Richmond, Va. His activity stretched from the ancien régime through the Revolution into the empire. The two latter eras were not, however, as favourable to him and his art as the first one. After 1814 his artistic activity came to a stop, and he limited himself to teaching in the École Spéciale de Sculpture (1805-23). He had been received in the Academy as agréé in 1769 and as full member in 1777. He revived a practice common in the earlier Renaissance, multiplying some of his works, which often exist in more than one version in marble and in bronze, in plaster and in terracotta.

K1907 : Figures 188, 189

GIUSEPPE BALSAMO, SOI-DISANT COMTE DE CAGLIOSTRO. 1 Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1627), since 1952. 2 Marble bust (without modern base), 24×23×13 in. (62-9×58-9×34-3 cm.). Signed and dated at the back: Houdon F. 1786. The bust is truncated below the chest and half-way down the upper arms, its lower periphery describing a flattened semicircle. The sitter looks sharply to his left and upwards, as though seeking inspiration. The pupils of the eyes are deeply excavated, the nostrils flared and the lips parted. He wears a shirt with a face jabot unfastened to the level of his waistcoat and over that a jacket with a narrow collar. The base with its inscription is of recent date and is well preserved. The upper left tip of the jabot was worked separately, and added. The edge above it is damaged. There are a few knocks on the lower right, and a few rust stains on the stump of the left arm and at the back of the toupee. Interesting is a vertical sign on the back, which seems to be intended as a help to set the bust up in the correct position. Cleaned 1956 by J. Tembach.


This is the better of two known examples in marble of Houdon's portrait of Cagliostro, the magician and charlatan who captivated French society between 1780 and 1786. 15 The other, signed and dated the same way, carved in less good, veined marble, is in the Musée Granet at Aix-en-Provence. 16 Two, or perhaps three, plaster examples are recorded: one, probably Houdon's working model, was among his studio effects in the posthumous sale of 1828. 17 This was probably the bust that features in the paintings of the sculptor's studio by Louis Boilly in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (1803), and in the Musée de Cherbourg (1808). 18 Another was in 1888 in the possession of a Monsieur Storelli of Blois, whose wife was the grand-daughter of Charles Thilorier, the advocate who had successfully defended Cagliostro in the case of the Queen's diamond necklace (L'affaire du collier). Cagliostro was reported to have presented him with the plaster bust in gratitude. 19 It was this information that led to the identification by M. Storelli of K1907 (hitherto unrecognized) when it was lent by Sir Richard Wallace to the Exposition de l'Art Française in 1888. 20 The third recorded plaster (which may or may not be identical with either of the others) was given in 1962 to the Los Angeles County Museum. 21

The identification of K1907 and the Storelli plaster as a portrait of Cagliostro was confirmed in 1888 by comparison with engraved portraits of his. 22 Twenty-seven or more exist in the Cabinet des Estampes in the Louvre, all confirming more or less closely to the present image. One is inscribed Peint par Boudeville, d'après le buste de M. Houdon et gravé par Pariset and is dedicated to the wife of Cagliostro, Seraphina Feliciani. This fully corroborates the verbal evidence of M. Storelli about the identification of his plaster version.

Houdon probably met the sitter through their mutual interest in freemasonry. 23 In 1771 the sculptor had joined the Lodge of the Neuf Soeurs (Nine Muses) which was patronized by other distinguished artists, for instance Vernet and Greuze, and intellectuals, such as Voltaire and Benjamin Franklin. The lodge was perhaps as vital to Houdon's advancement as the Académie Royale. Cagliostro was an important dignitary among the Freemasons, having founded lodges dedicated to the Egyptian rite first in Lyons and then in Paris. From an eyewitness account of 1791, we know that one of the busts of Cagliostro was exhibited in the Egyptian Lodge at Lyons. 24 This is generally thought to be the one now at Aix-en-Provence. At Strasbourg the charlatan had recruited the influential Cardinal de Rohan as a Freemason and the latter is said to have had a bust of his 'divin Cagliostro' in the Bishop's Palace there: 12 it is likely that he had the better of the two marbles.

In view of the date, 1786, inscribed on the busts it seems that Houdon modelled this exceptionally perspicacious portrait during the Affaire du Collier de la Reine, in which Cagliostro and his dupe, the Cardinal de Rohan, were implicated. The sittings probably took place between early February 1785, when Cagliostro arrived in Paris from Strasbourg, and 19 June 1786, when he left France, expelled after having been confined to the Bastille from 23 August 1785 to 1 June 1786. 25 Houdon, on his part, was absent from Paris, on his trip to America from July 1785 till January 1786. 26, 27

**FRENCH: XIX Century**

**K1671 : Figure 190**

A BACCHANTE WITH CLUSTER OF GRAPES IN HER LEFT HAND. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (a1621), since 1949.1 Marble, 63 ½ x 17 ½ x 19 ¼ in. (161.2 x 44.4 x 49 cm). The bacchante is represented at full-length, standing and facing the observer, with her head turned three-quarters to her right and inclined over her right shoulder; her left arm is raised as she holds up a bunch of grapes and lifts her right hand below the fruit as though to save it from falling. Vine leaves and grapes are entwined in her hair. Around her torso she wears a goatskin the head of which hangs below her left armpit. Voluminous, skirt-like drapery, twisted into a loose knot about the pelvis, falls to the ground. The statue rests on an integral base which has its corners rounded off. At the back of the base a bronze plaque is affixed with four bronze screws. It is inscribed:

**BACCHANTE**

Provenant de la Propriété de Madame ÉLISABETH

Sœur du Roi Louis XVI

à VERSAILLES
The piece seems to have been badly banged about, and carefully restored. It is hard to tell whether some of the wide cracks with different-coloured filling are repairs or large veins of the marble. The marble is whitish grey, veined and spotted with blue-grey streaks and spots. It has rust stains on the back of the neck. There were three holes in a widely spaced row down the exposed part of the backbone below the neck, which have been filled with a darker material. A large break through the socket of the figure's left shoulder extends through the ram's skin which is draped under that arm. A large old repair runs across the base of the neck and connects with the previous break in the left shoulder by a whiter marble patch inlaid across the top of the left shoulder. The left fore-arm, the fingers on the right hand, and probably the little finger on the left hand seem to have been broken and replaced or were originally worked separately and pieced. The drapery has been pieced in the front; large cracks or large veins run across the legs and drapery in the lower half of the figure. The figure was washed with clean water in 1972.


The bronze plaque attached to the back of the base seems to refer to the Palais de Montreuil in the domain of Versailles, which was presented to Madame Elisabeth by her brother, Louis XVI, in 1781. Her statues and other works of art were confiscated by the Republican government in 1792 and sold at auction in the following year. The princess was guillotined on 10 May 1793. No corroboration of this provenance can be found, nor is there any evidence that Clodion received a commission for Montreuil. 8 A statue of a bacchantesse by Clodion five feet high was sold in the De Vouge sale, 15 March 1784, 9 its medium and buyer were not specified and there is no good reason, apart from its correspondence in size, to connect this reference with Duveen's, and in the Kress Coll. Cat. of 1951, but cannot at present be further substantiated (see text below). 4 Catalogue of Paintings and Sculpture in the collection of Charles Tyson Yerkes Esq., New York, New York, 1904, no. 86 (III) as by Falconet. 5 Sale of the Samuel Untermyer Collection, 'Greystones', Yonkers, New York, Park-Bernet, 15-17 May 1940, no. 973, repro. as Clodion, and giving provenance 'Collection of Charles T. Yerkes, New York, 1910'. 6 Kress Coll. Cat., 1951, pp. 266-7; Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 465 (as Clodion). 7 R. Cortissoz, New York herald Tribune, 5 Jan. 1941, section vi, p. 8. 8 Information kindly supplied by Mr Terence Hodgkinson, Victoria and Albert Museum. 9 S. Lami, Dictionnaire des sculpteurs de l'école française, XVIIIe siècle, Paris, 1911, ii, p. 149. (10) L. Deshaies, Le Château de Maisons-Laffitte, Paris, 1907, pp. 33; E. André, Les Arts, n. 130, 1912, pp. 16, 21, ill. (11) M. Charageat, in Revue des Arts, iv, 1934, pp. 191-2, fig. 9; H. Thirion, Les Adan et Clodion, Paris, 1885, p. 229 engr.; C. Nordenfalk, Konstrevy, xxx, 1934, pp. 168 ff. (12) R. Wark, Sculpture in the Huntington Collection, San Marino, Cal., 1938, pls. xi-xii, pp. 78-9; R. A. Cecil, in Apollo, lxxxi, no. 40, June 1965, pp. 456-8. (13) F. J. B. Watson, Apollo, lxxxi, no. 40, June 1965, p. 439; G. Seligman, Merchants of Art, New York, 1961, p. 97. (14) Ibid., pp. 434 ff. (15) Terence Hodgkinson, Sculpture (The James A. de Rothschild Collection at Waddesdon Manor), 1970, no. 14. (16) This entry has been prepared by Charles Avery.

A nubile young woman is shown stepping lightly forward with her left foot. In her right hand she holds aloft a bunch of grapes at which she stares, while her left arm is bent sharply at the elbow so that this hand practically touches the shoulder. She is clad in diaphanous drapery, which parts to reveal her left breast and left leg. It is caught together at the waist by the skin of a feline beast (a panther?), and the edges flutter out behind and at the sides to suggest movement through the air. The base is rocky and a tree-stump supports from behind the weight of marble in the statue. The left foot projects strangely beyond the circumference of the round base and is given a rocky ledge to rest upon.

The statue is in fair condition, though the tip of the nose, the left-hand fingers, the right hand and the wreath of vine-leaves in the hair have all been damaged and repaired. Many parts were in the first instance carved from separate pieces of marble and joined on. Particularly round the base, segments have been added on four sides, as though building out from an original rectangular block to form a full circle; most noticeable is the jointing of the forepart of the left foot and the rock below. The cylindrical part of the base, including the upper profile, is new. Cleaned by J. Ternbach 1956.


The composition seems to have been designed to complement that of the companion piece (K1645B) showing Bacchus, which is after Jacopo Sansovino. For instance, the opposite arm is raised, the opposite foot is forward and the stance is generally similar. The Bacchic subject, the voluptuous proportions of the body, the type of female face and the diaphanous drapery are clearly meant to recall the style of French rococo sculpture and particularly the work of Clodion. Nevertheless, comparison of this statue with Clodion’s authentic sculptures clearly demonstrates their incompatibility. In the absence of a reliable and old provenance, there is every reason to associate this pastiche of Clodion with the period approximately a century later when there was a regrettable fecund and trivial revival of interest in the rococo for decorative purposes among the French bourgeoisie. Only in this milieu would the pairing of a pseudo-Clodion female figure with a copy of a male statue from the High Renaissance – so incongruous and distasteful to our eyes – have been a viable commercial proposition. The name of Carrier-Belleuse springs to mind, but his was only the most prolific and successful of the mass-production ateliers of pasticheurs.

References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1966, p. 149. Ill., 1968, p. 132 (as by Clodion). (2) This episode in the provenance, presumably supplied by Wildenstein at the time of the purchase by the Kress Foundation, has proved impossible to verify. (3) The statue did not feature in the principal Maurice Kann Collection sale in 1910, at which most of the sculptures were Italian Renaissance. (4) Files of the National Gallery of Art. (5) Kress Coll. Cat., 1951, pp. 268 f. (n. 121). Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 454 (as by Clodion). (6) This entry was prepared by Charles Avery with advice from Terence Hodgkinson.

Bacchus and Faun. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1619), since 1949. White marble, 67 × 22 × 23 1/8 in. (170.2 × 55.9 × 58.9 cm.).

A youthful, nude man stands with his weight evenly balanced over the left leg, which is slightly behind, and the right leg, which is advanced. The impression is of a momentary pause in a forward movement. This is to be explained by the elated stare which he is directing towards a tazza held aloft in his left hand, from the lip of which some stylized liquid is slopping forward, owing to the arrested forward movement. In the right hand, which is lowered, he holds a bunch of grapes and he has a wreath of vine-leaves in his hair. On the rocky eminence which serves as a base sits a baby satyr, with his back to the calves of Bacchus’ legs. He supports himself with his left hand on the rock and reaches up with his right hand towards the grapes which Bacchus holds. The group is in perfect condition, though some marble was pieced on to the back of the base during production, and the right hand may have been carved separately and attached. There are numerous marks of a pointing machine all over, which proves that the figure was precisely measured from an original (see below). The cylindrical part of the base, including the upper profile, is new. Cleaned by J. Ternbach, 1956.


The composition is that of the Bacchus commissioned in 1511 from Jacopo Sansovino by Giovanni Bartolini for his Florentine palace of Guiafonda. Now in the Bargello, this statue has always been recognized as one of the masterworks of the High Renaissance. It was severely damaged by
fire in 1762 and was subsequently pieced together into its present state.

Two principal differences from this original may be remarked: the base is rocky and is not covered with the comfortable and iconographically correct goat-skin; and the left hand is quite differently designed and holds a tazza with an improbably long stem. In the original the receptacle is a shallow, saucer-shaped bowl. The veristic and totally unconvincing motif of the liquid slopping over the forward edge of the bowl is a novel and regrettable invention. One of Sansovino’s finest passages of carving in his Bacchus was precisely the fingers fanning out beneath the edge of the cup that is furthest away from the figure; the virtuosity with which they are hollowed out in between each finger has rarely been equalled, even in Hellenistic sculpture, and was singled out for praise by Vasari in his biography of the artist.

It is difficult to ascertain whether the forms and dimensions of the group were measured by the pointing machine from the original (or a plaster cast of it), or from a free-hand pastiche. The former seems likely. An earlier attribution to Clodion, presumably based on the style of its pendant (K1645A), which is loosely speaking in his manner, must be discounted for the following reasons. The attitude of mind implied by such direct copying of a classic sculpture is anachronistic for the epoch in which Clodion lived. It would constitute a unique case in his oeuvre of such a direct reproduction. The surface is flaccid and empty, the expression on the face is vacuous and the suggestion of movement is incompetent. Criticisms such as these may never be levelled at authentic sculptures by Clodion. 7

Clodion, attempting to copy this original would have allowed himself to be so obviously defeated by the difficult passage of the hand and cup.

The only explanation that may be offered for the embarrassing relationship of this statue with its original is that it was carved in the second half of the nineteenth century by a pretentious but ungifted ‘marble-man’. One would have little reason to locate its production in France, were it not for the fact that its pendant is obviously designed to recall the work of Clodion. 7


JEAN-BAPTISTE CARPEAUX

French School. Carpeaux was born in 1827 at Valenciennes in northern France. Despite a poor background and rudimentary education he determined at an early age to become a sculptor. He moved to Paris in 1842 and while supporting himself by manual labour or artistic piece-work he attended the Petite École for two years. In 1844 he was admitted as apprentice to the studio of François Rude and to the École des Beaux-Arts, winning a scholarship from the city of Valenciennes, which enabled him to devote all his energies to sculpture. Setting his sights on the Prix de Rome, he left the unorthodox Rude for the more conventional Francisque Duret. In 1853 he received his first official commission and in the following year won the Prix de Rome. After reaching Rome, Carpeaux began to rebel against his academic background. His first sculpture was the Fisherman, and his next, after discovering the genius of Michelangelo, was a group of Ugolino and his Sons (1857), a subject drawn from Dante. Though received enthusiastically in Rome, Ugolino was severely criticized when exhibited at Paris in 1862 and permission to carve it in marble was refused. A bronze cast was ultimately installed in the gardens of the Tuileries. A bust of the Marquise de la Valette, wife of the French Ambassador at the Vatican, so pleased the sitter that on her return to Paris in 1862 she introduced Carpeaux to Princesse Mathilde, cousin of the Empress Eugénie, and thus into the court circles of the Deuxième Empire. This resulted in a number of splendid portrait busts inspired by French rococo sculpture. Official commissions ensued among which the reliefs for the exterior of the Pavillon de Flore at the Louvre (1863-6), La Danse on the façade of the Opéra (1865-9), masterpieces which at the time provoked the sharpest criticism. Following the Franco-Prussian war, Carpeaux retired to England for two years (1871-3). Returning to France in 1873 the sculptor discovered that he had contracted cancer and this began to affect his mental balance; he abandoned his wife and children and led a nomadic existence, staying with friends or patrons. His last great work was the Fontaine de l’Observatoire in Paris (1874). He died near Paris in 1875.

K1259A, K1259B: Figures 193-198

FISHERBOY WITH A SEA SHELL and YOUNG GIRL WITH A SEA SHELL. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A64, 63), since 1941. 1 White marble. 1259A: 36½ x 16½ x 18½ in. (92 x 42 x 47 cm.). 1259B: 40½ x 16½ x 20½ in. (103 x 43 x 52 cm.). The boy is nude and wears a cloth cap over his thick curly hair. He kneels on his right knee and leans his left ear towards a large shell, which he holds in both hands, resting his elbow by his left thigh. Signed on a large shell between his feet: CD(?) CARPEAUX Roma 1861. On octagonal plinth.

The girl is nude. She is perched on an overturned basket from which fish are tumbling and over which a net is draped. Her right hand is raised, her left hand is raised to her chin; with her left she holds a sea shell over her head, teasingly imitating a headdress. Signed to the right of the basket:
We first hear of the composition of a Jeune Pêcheur in a letter from Carpeaux to his friend Charles Laurent-Darragon in Paris, written in Rome, 19 December 1857.12 ‘Votre vieil ami n’est pas perdu. Grâce au ciel le bonheur me revient; la santé et le travail vont à qui de mieux. Jamais je ne me suis senti plus d’ardeur physique et morale. Mes pensées sont aussi fortes que mes membres. Ce qui me fait croire que l’homme malade est peu propre aux productions de l’esprit. Ma figure du Jeune Pêcheur est déjà applaudi de mes collègues; tous m’assurent un succès pour la composition, et j’espère bien mener l’exécution au degré voulu. On vient de Rome pour voir mon œuvre dont on parle beaucoup; le directeur est venu à mon atelier confirmer le bruit de mon début. Enfin, je reprends la vie sur une voie nouvelle. L’expression de la tête plait à tout le monde, car tous disent qu’elle est charmante et vraie.’ A sketch in oils13 may have preceded the plaster model on which he was engaged at this point. Some three months later, Carpeaux wrote to the same friend (27 March 1858), asking him to send a cast of the head of Rude’s Boy with a Tortoise (1831), for comparison with the head of his own Fisherboy: ‘Faites en sorte que je reçoive l’envoi avant le moulage de ma figure, non pour la copier, la mienne est faite.’ This request nevertheless constitutes direct evidence of Carpeaux’s source of inspiration in the seminal work of the older sculptor, who had died two years earlier.14 The composition was received with praise by the director and fellow-students of the Académie de France in Rome, whose attitude to Carpeaux had hitherto been lukewarm. The statue was to be exhibited in the Académie in June 1858 and Carpeaux wrote again to Laurent-Darragon from Rome, in ecstatic terms.15 ‘Rejoignez-vous, mon cher. Votre ami Carpeaux vient de faire une figure qui me vaut tous les suffrages de mes collègues: c’est une victoire qui me découvre un avenir brillant. Dieu aidant, notre vie sera belle, sinon grande. Hébert m’assure que ma statue peut supporter le voisinage de celle de mon cher maître Rude: je n’ose y croire. Pourtant je reçois des compliments, mon atelier est visité si souvent que cela m’empêche de travailler... oh! ami, combien mon cœur tremble de joie, car il y a bien longtemps que je suis ignoré et cependant je sentais que j’avais quelque chose au cœur et à l’esprit...’ The plaster was next exhibited at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris: here the tone of praise was moderated with an official exhortation from the judges ‘d’élèver son style, en exerçant son talent sur de nobles sujets’. Less kind comments seem to have reached the sculptor’s ears too, and he reacted furiously in another letter to Laurent-Darragon.16 ‘Vous devez savoir que je sais exécuter quoique “canaille”. Mais ne l’est pas que veut; et, en art, il y a trop de gens polis – David est canaille, Michel-Ange est canaille. Puget aussi est canaille. Combien je serais heureux d’appartenir à cette famille sublime de canailles!...’ The official criticism was echoed in an article in which Paul Mantz6 attacked the plaster from the point of view of interpretation as well as technique: ‘Ce dernier nous a donné, il est vrai, une production plus personnelle, dans son Enfant au coquillage, modèle en plâtre d’une figure où toute recherche de style a été systématiquement évitée. Un enfant a trouvé un coquillage et il l’applique curieusement à son oreille pour écouter les murmures confus qui bruissent dans la conque marine. Il sourit; malheureusement son sourire va jusqu’à la grimace, et ce petit drôle, qui n’est pas si naïf qu’il voudrait l’être, se contoure et se démène comme un singe qui a volé une noix. Les chairs sont d’ailleurs sans jeunesse et sans fraîcheur. Si M. Carpeaux doit plus tard exécuter sa statue en marbre, il devra la quaiisser son modèle et le simplifier.’ Despite the criticism, the plaster was sufficiently esteemed for the Minister to offer Carpeaux 2,000 francs for it: the latter declined however, for he was already contemplating a cast in bronze and a version in marble. The plaster ultimately reached the Louvre.6 Carpeaux’s fellow-student, Ernest Hébert, the painter, helped to finance the expensive undertaking of having moulds made for casting and the bronze was exhibited in the Salon of 1859,7 gaining a second-class medal.17 Predictably, it was received with continued reservation by Paul Mantz.7 ‘Le Jeune Pêcheur de M. Carpeaux, qui, lui aussi, a grandi à l’école de Rome, nous était déjà connu: nous en avions vu le modèle en plâtre à la dernière exposition de la rue Bonaparte. Il nous paraît alors que cette figure n’était pas sans exagération et sans violence, et que ce petit pêcheur faisait une bien grande dépense de force pour approcher de son oreille un léger coquillage. Devant l’édition définitive de cette statuette, notre sentiment reste le même, bien qu’on puisse reconnaître, après tout, dans l’œuvre de M. Carpeaux, la trace d’une loyale recherche du vrai.’ The casting had proved extremely expensive, but fortunately Baron James de Rothschild stepped in and purchased the bronze for 4,000 francs. By 10 August 1860 the marble version was in hand and Carpeaux wrote to Laurent-Darragon: ‘Le marbre de mon pêcheur est admirable.’ Apparently his confidant then travelled to Italy to assist in the actual execution of the marble.18 The marble is signed and dated 1861, but was first exhibited in the Salon of 1863.8 It was purchased there by the Empress Eugénie and
shown in the Tuileries; subsequently it was lent by her to the Exposition Universelle in Paris (1867).\(^2\)

The composition of the *Girl with a Shell*, designed as a pendant to the *Fisherboy*, is first alluded to in a letter sent by Carpeaux on 27 January 1864 to the Marquis de Piennes: ‘Vous allez me voir à l’œuvre, je me sens une taille de géant, un courage qui touche au désespoir, et dire que c’est une femme, une fleur, un rêve, qui nous transformera ainsi. Quel prodige!’\(^19\) The Comte de Nieuwerkerke visited Carpeaux’s studio and found the composition ‘ravissant’, declared that it was something for the Empress. The plaster was shown in the Salon of 1864,\(^10\) while the marble version was exhibited there in 1867\(^11\) and purchased by the Emperor Napoleon III.\(^20\) The head of the *Girl with a Shell* is ultimately derived from a portrait bust executed at Valenciennes in 1860\(^21\) and shown in a bronze cast in the Salon the same year. It represented Mlle Anna Foucart, daughter of one of Carpeaux’s early patrons. The two statues, particularly the *Fisherboy*, were very popular and exist in many versions in different materials, in variants and reductions to busts.\(^22\) They netted the sculptor a tidy profit.\(^23\), \(^24\)

ENGLISH SCHOOL

ENGLISH: Late XIV Century

K1377: Figure 200

ST GEORGE KILLING THE DRAGON. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A151), since 1944.1 Full-round group in alabaster,2 32×23½×8¾ in. (81·5×60·5×20·5 cm.). St George on horseback pushes his lance into the belly of the dragon who lies curled up on his back under the horse. To the left the princess, much smaller in proportion, is kneeling, and holds a ribbon which circles the dragon’s neck. The stone has a warm yellowish patina. The polychromy is only little damaged. The armour and the saddle are picked out in red and gold, edged with black. The princess’s dress is edged in gold with red dots. The base are picked out in red and gold, edged with black. The polychromy extends to the flatly modelled back of the group. The base is damaged in two places in front. The right fore-arm, the detached pieces of the lance, the sword, and the princess’s head are lost, her hands and the edges of her garment are damaged. Otherwise the piece is in good condition.

Provenance: Dominican Convent of San Juan, Quejana (Province of Alava, Spain).3 Benoît Oppenheim, Berlin.3 Lionel Harris.4 Goldschmidt Galleries.5 Otto H. Kahn, New York.5 Mrs Otto H. Kahn, New York.6 Mogmar Art Foundation, New York.7 Duveen’s, New York. Kress acquisition, 1944.8 Exhibited: Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 1940.9

There is no record of this group before its publication in the catalogue of the Oppenheim Collection in 1911.3 Since then it has been repeatedly mentioned in the literature on mediaeval alabasters. England,9 France, and Spain, 7,10 have at different times been proposed as its country of origin. In the Oppenheim catalogue the piece is said to have come ‘from a church in Quejana in the Province of Bilbao, Spain’. This has subsequently been identified as the Dominican monastery of San Juan, the only important building in this small village in the Province of Alava, south of Bilbao. Founded by Fernan Perez de Ayala, ancestor of the Dukes of Alva, in 1374, the monastery houses a number of tombs with effigies in alabaster,11 the origins and authorship of which do not appear to have been studied. In any case, it is perfectly possible to visualize the present group in this context. It may even have left a slightly later reflection in the not too distant Estella, where in the church of San Miguel there is a large group of St George which has many features in common with ours.12 If the provenance is indeed correct, the foundation of the monastery gives a terminus post quem for our statue of 1374. This is consistent with the approximate date of 1400 that is arrived at by expert examination of the armour won by the saint;13 the same type of armour was in international use at the time and so no deductions may be made as to the country of origin.

The style of the piece is generally admitted to be English, even though a free-standing statue on this scale constitutes a unique survival among the many Nottingham alabasters at present known. The bulk of such alabasters, whether for the home market or for export, consisted of panels in relief, usually set in a wooden frame to form a retable to set on an altar, or effigies of the deceased for the tops of tombs, the sides of which were adorned with panels of mourners in relief. For this reason an expert on alabasters like W. L. Hildburgh believed that the St George was ‘more probably of Spanish origin, under strong influence than purely English’.10 In addition he claimed that the alabaster had a closer-grained and more wax-like quality than the stone normally used in England. The mere fact that the group is carved fully in the round, instead of having the customary flat back, seems insufficient evidence for doubting an English origin. Such a sculpture might have formed some sort of cresting for the normal type of tomb or even have been intended as an independent devotional image. In the first serious study devoted to the St George, Philip Nelson4 assumed it to be English, but he begged the question indeed when he wrote: ‘Would it be too wild a flight of fancy to suggest that this magnificent example of native art was from the workshop of Peter the Mason, of Nottingham, and might originally have been the centrepiece of the great reredos, given 1367 to the Chapel of St George at Windsor Castle by Edward III?’ Such a comparatively early date has been rejected by Terence Hodgkinson, who, while admitting an English origin, prefers a date around 1400.14 C. F. Pitman has supported the earlier dating by pointing to similarities between our piece and the fragment of the Murder of Thomas Becket from Beaufort Abbey;15 he believes both to be by the same hand. A miniature of the saint in the Beaufort Hours16 has been quoted in support of the English origin;17 the comparison, however, is rather too vague to be compelling.18

References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 154; Ill., 1968, p. 136 (as English, early fifteenth century). Wrongly connected with the base of K1376. (2) The similarity with English Midland alabasters has been confirmed in a report of the Depart-

ENGLISH: Beginning of the XV Century

KSF1: Figure 199

EDUCATION OF THE VIRGIN. Claremont, Ca., Pomona College (Kress Study Collection), since 1961. Alabaster relief, 16½ x 10¼ in. (41.3 x 26 cm.). On the left stands St Anne, who wears a kerchief, barb, cloak and robe. In the centre stands the Virgin, who is crowned, reading from a book, which rests on a reading desk on a circular pillar, on which she lays her right hand. On the right stands Joachim, who wears a conical hat, a hooded tippet and a robe, and holds in his left hand a rosary, whilst his right hand rests on a cross-shaft. Condition: the surface of the relief has suffered from the effects of damp; in the upper part of the background several cracks have been repaired. Details such as fingers and noses have been blunted or broken. Otherwise the figures are in a reasonable state of preservation.


In stylistic terms the relief is an ordinary example of English alabaster carving of the late fourteenth century with no specially distinctive features. The subject of the Virgin being taught to read not only by her mother St Anne but in the presence of her father Joachim is unusual; only one other example is recorded, in the Museo Arqueológico Nacional, Madrid. Panels of St Anne and the Virgin alone are relatively frequent. Closely comparable in composition is a panel in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, with St Anne presenting the Virgin to Joachim in the Temple. There, the two adults frame the slim figure of the Virgin just as in the present panel, though they stand on opposite sides, St Anne gently pushing forward the maiden from behind. The two representations are not, however, connected in style.

References: (1) P. Nelson, Archaeological Journal, lxxxiv, 1927, p. 117, pl. iii, x, ill. (2) W. L. Hildburgh, The Antiquaries Journal, iii, 1923, pp. 24 f. (3) P. Nelson, Archaeological Journal, lxxxiii, 1925, p. 27, pl. rx; A. S. Tavender, Speculum, xxx, 1955, p. 67 n. 25. (4) The material for this entry was prepared by Charles Avery in collaboration with Francis W. Cheetham, Director of Museums, Norwich, U.K.
SPANISH SCHOOL

SPANISH:
Late XIII or Early XIV Century

X1376 : Figures 201–204

THE HOLY TRINITY. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A150), since 1944.1 Full-round statue in honey-coloured alabaster2 on an octagonal base of the same material, four sides of which bear a coat of arms with five figleaves. The group: 33½ x 14 x 11½ in. (85.3 x 35.7 x 29.2 cm.), the base: 8½ x 16½ x 12½ in. (22 x 41 x 32 cm.). The head of God the Father was broken and has been re-attached. The tip of the nose is a replacement. The two arms and the tips of the arms of Christ’s cross are missing. Dowel holes in the stumps of the arms have been stopped up; there are many minor surface damages. The base is badly weathered; it does not quite fit. There are traces of colouring in the hair, the eyes, the crown, the halo of Christ.

Provenance: Schultz, Paris.3 Alfredo Barsanti, Rome (after 1920).4 Duveen’s, New York.5 Kress acquisition, 1944.6 The base was presented to the National Gallery by Mario Barsanti in 1950.3

The place and date of origin of this Trinity are problematic; meaningful analogies for the repetitive folds of drapery and the characterization of the head of God the Father and the Christ Crucified, which look rather Romanesque, are hard to find. This, together with a misunderstanding of its modern provenance, an inference based on the material, and a failure to take into account the coats of arms on the base (from which the Trinity had been separated at the time of purchase), has led to a number of ill-founded hypotheses, in particular that of locating the origin of the piece in England.6 The base (which seems to belong) gives an indication. The coat of arms, which is quite unusual, was borne by two or three families: Figueiredo of Portugal, Figueiroa of Galicia, and Figuerola y Argullot, with branches in Spain and the Netherlands.7 This provides incontrovertible evidence of a commission for Spain, though not necessarily of a Spanish origin, for Spain was one of the principal destinations for the export of alabaster sculptures from England.8 In fact, as is generally admitted, the style of this Trinity is quite diverse from that of the alabasters of the Nottingham School that were mass-produced and exported in the late fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. This means that one would have to postulate an earlier date, perhaps around 1300, if the piece were thought to be English. The only serious attempt to locate parallels, made by Swarzenski,9 fails to convince however; the sculptures he cites at Amiens, Westminster and Wells do not seem closely enough related, while the analogy he draws for the Christ Crucified with an Anglo-Scandinavian bone-carving10 is relevant only in so far as the figure has a Romanesque flavour, but does little to further the identification of the place of origin of The Trinity. It seems preferable, in the absence of any convincing parallels in England, to admit the evidence of the coat of arms as pointing towards a Spanish origin. The iconography of The Trinity as shown here is rare in Spanish sculpture, an early predecessor is the capital of the trumeau of the Portico de la Gloria of Santiago Cathedral, dated 1188.11 The closest point of comparison is a Trinity in marble in the parish church of Nuestra Senora de la Granada at Llerena in the Province of Badajoz in Castilian style, this apparently dates from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.12 Although the styles of the two groups of the Trinity are different, their general treatment is not dissimilar, and this gives confirmation of the evidence of the coats of arms.13 A date in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, and an origin from north-western Spain would also explain the style of our piece; it can be compared with that of a tomb of a bishop in the Cathedral of Orense14 and, above all, with that of the tympanum of the main door of the collegiate church of Toro.15 The material does not belie these conclusions, alabaster has frequently been used in Spain. It has been suggested that the missing hands were in precious metal such as silver16 and might have held a shrine of relics. It is more likely that they were worked separately in stone and fastened into the dowel holes in the stumps. Other examples suggest they were either simply held up17 or the right was blessing while the left was holding an orb18 or a book.19, 20

References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 153; Ill., 1968, p. 137 (as English School, early fourteenth century). The base is wrongly mentioned on p. 154 as belonging to X1377. (2) According to a report from the Department of Geology at the University of Nottingham dated 10 March 1972, the material is close in texture to the English Midlands alabaster. But similar alabasters have been found in many different parts of the world. (3) Correspondence in the museum files. (4) Seymour, Masterpieces, 1949, p. 173. (5) Kress Coll. Cat., 1943 (1949), p. 172 (as English, late thirteenth century); Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 382 (as English School, fourteenth century). (6) R. Langton Douglas, Art in America, October 1943, pp. 203-4 (believed to be the
same Trinity that was acquired by the Holy Father in 1382; see A. Gardner, _Alabaster Tombs of the Pre-Reformation Period in England_, Cambridge, 1940, p. 12; R. Langton Douglas, _B.M._, lxxxix, 1946, pp. 83, fig. II d, 85 (as School of Nottingham, late thirteenth century); W. R. Valentinier, _Origin of Modern Sculpture_, New York, 1946, p. 157, fig. 126, p. 165 (as English, fifteenth century); A. M. Frankfurter, _Supplement to the Kress Collection of the National Gallery_, New York, 1946, p. 8, ill. (as Nottingham School, before 1380); _Illustrated London News_, 9 February 1946, p. 161, ill. (as Nottingham School, fourteenth century); H. Swarzenski, _Phoebus_, ii, 1948, pp. 38-40 (as English, second half of the thirteenth century); cf. _Annunciation_, Westminster Abbey; Wells Cathedral; A. S. Tavender, _Speculum_, xxiv, 1949, p. 401 (as English, thirteenth century, related to figures on York Cathedral); C. Seymour, _op. cit._, pp. 12, 43-45, 173 n. 10 (as English, fourteenth century, but not typical of Nottingham mass-production); C. F. Pitman, _Connoisseur_, cxxxiv, n. 338, June 1954, pp. 217, fig. 1, p. 220 (as Nottingham, late thirteenth century); A. S. Tavender, _Speculum_, xxx, January 1955, p. 65 (as English, near 1300); W. R. Valentinier, R. L. Douglas, and G. Swarzenski in ms. opinions (as Nottingham, late fourteenth century or somewhat earlier). (7) J. B. Rietstap, _Armorial Général_, 2nd ed., Gouda, 1884, i, p. 669, _Planches_, p. 323. According to the plates Figueroa has the leaves with the stems up and the tips down, unlike the coats of arms of the base. (8) W. L. Hildburgh in _Antiquaries Journal_, xxiv, 1-2, January-April 1944, pp. 27-37; S. Alcolea, _Archivo Español_, xliii, 1970/71, pp. 137 ff. (9) _I.c._ (10) A. Goldschmidt, _Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der romanischen Zeit_, iii, Berlin, 1923, n. 128. (11) A. Kingsley Porter, _Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads_, vi, Boston, 1923, pl. 833. German de Pamplona, _Iconografía de la Santísima Trinidad en el arte medieval español_, Madrid, 1770, fig. 32, and also figs. 27 ff. (12) Joés Ramón Mérida, _Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando_, 28, iii, Madrid, 1909, pp. 129-32; idem, _Catálogo Monumental de España: Provincia de Badajoz_, 1907-10, Madrid, ii, 1926, pp. 306-7 n. 2759, figs. 317-18; A. D. Sanpere and J. A. De Lasarte, _Escultura Gótica (Ars Hispaniae, iii),_ Madrid, 1956, p. 134, fig. 124; German de Pamplona, _op. cit._, p. 100, fig. 38. (13) It may be relevant to note that in the same province, in the convent of the nuns of Santa Clara at Zafra are buried several members of the Figueroa Family, Counts of Feria (J. R. Mérida, _op. cit._, pp. 445-50 n. 3067-9, figs. 407-13). This convent was in fact founded by the Figueroa in 1428, after obtaining the necessary Bull from Pope Martin V, and a member of the family was its first abbess. The chancel was built by the son of the founders, Don Lorenzo Suarez de Figueroa (d. 1461) and alabaster effigies of him and his wife from a dismantled tomb are set in the wall nearby (J. R. Mérida, _ibid._, n. 3069, fig. 407). The same coat of arms as appears on the base of the Kress Trinity is displayed above them. Though the date suggested by the style of the Trinity is patently earlier than the foundation of the convent, it may nevertheless have been the property of an earlier generation. (14) A. Durán Sanpere and J. Ainaud De Lasarte, _op. cit._, p. 84, fig. 68. (15) _Ibid._, p. 85, fig. 72. (16) G. Swarzenski, ms. opinion; C. Seymour, _l.c._, S. 173. (17) English alabaster reliefs: _Raoil Tolentino Sale_, New York, American Art Galleries, 22-26 April 1924, n. 522, and in the cathedral of Taca (German de Pamplona, _op. cit._, fig. 41). (18) English alabaster relief, W. L. Hildburgh, _Journal of the Walters Art Gallery_, xvii, 1954, pp. 30 ff., figs. 11 f. (19) Miniature of the twelfth century in Perpignan (E. Male, _L'art religieux du XIIe siècle en France_, 2nd ed., Paris, 1924, fig. 140. (20) This entry has been prepared by Charles Avery.
PORTUGUESE SCHOOL

PORTUGUESE (?) : XIX Century (?)

KI614 : Figures 205-207

ST. BARBARA. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A1626), since 1949. 1 Full-round statue in alabaster, 2 47 1/8 x 18 1/8 x 14 1/8 in. (120.6 x 46.1 x 36.2 cm.). The stone is full of black veins and has a deep natural cleft in the back of the figure and smaller crevices elsewhere; it has a brownish patina. The condition is perfect, but for a few damages of the decorated edges of the mantle and the back left corner of the base which is broken and re-attached. The left hand with the chalice is carved from a separate piece of the same material and attached. The whole surface is of utter perfection.


The identity of the saint is established by the towers embroidered on the edge of her garment and by the chalice with the Host in her hand. 6 The style of the figure has not been satisfactorily explained. At present the piece is called Franco-Portuguese, early sixteenth century. 7 It has been called French. 4 A similarity with the school of Troyes has been pointed out; 8 Nicolas Chanterène, a Frenchman, who worked between 1515 and 1551 in Portugal has been quoted. 9 The provenance from that country has led to the search for other related works there and even in Spain. 10 The analogies with this comparative material consist in external only such as the careful technique and the ornate character. Our piece differs substantially from all of them; and it is significant that there is no agreement as to its attribution. 11 Some details are bewildering: it has been pointed out that the shape and decoration of the chalice are unorthodox and correspond to no existing chalice of the period, 12 and that the costume shows inconsistencies, e.g., the illogical combination of two shifts, one with a round, the other with a V-shaped neckline. The ornament is a curious mixture of motifs. The almost classic stance, the free interplay of body and garment, the slightly Nazarene character of the whole, the tempering of a French face with Lauranesque and Greek archaic features, the over-careful execution, and the pristine state of the piece might all point to its being a romantic work of the nineteenth century, possibly made, given the provenance, in Portugal, in imitation of the above-mentioned examples. It would be a masterpiece of its kind. Puzzling also is the similarity with Leonhard Mag's statuettes in Innsbruck (1515-20) and the related productions of the Innsbruck workshop 13 and the contemporary tombs of Philibert of Savoy and Margaret of Austria in Brou, 14 which are fairly isolated themselves. 15

References: (1) N.G. Cat., 1965, p. 156; III., 1968, p. 138 (as Franco-Portuguese School, early sixteenth century). (2) A report from the Department of Geology at the University of Nottingham, dated 10 March 1972, has identified the material, which had always been thought to be marble, as alabaster of a variety totally different from the English Midland alabaster. (3) Kress Coll. Cat., 1951, pp. 240 f. n. 107; Kress Coll. Cat., 1959, p. 426 (as Franco-Portuguese School, early sixteenth century). (4) G. Seligman, Merchants of Art, New York, 1961, p. 28 (as French, sixteenth century) C. Eissler, A.B., xlvi, 1964, p. 117 (as Franco-Portuguese School of the early sixteenth century). (5) Communication from French and Co. on file of the Kress Foundation. (6) L. Réau, Iconographie de l'art chrétien, iii, i, Paris, 1938, p. 173. Here it is stated that the latter symbol which characterizes the Saint as 'la patronne de la bonne mort' is rare in France and more frequent in Flanders and Germany. (7) See notes 1, 3 and 4. (8) See note 3. The Visititation in S. Jean in Troyes (c. 1520) has been quoted (R. Kocchin and J. J. Marquet de Vasselay, La Sculpture à Troyes, Paris, 1900, reprint 1966, p. 140, fig. 54). (9) See note 3. On Chanterene (active 1517-51) see R. Dos Santos, A escultura em Portugal, vol. ii, Lisbon, 1950, pp. 22 ff., pl. xxxii ff.; and the same, Historia del arte portugués, Barcelona etc., 1960, pp. 153 ff. (10) See note 3. E.g. the tomb of Isabel of Portugal in the Cartuja de Mirafloros of 1486 ff. (A. D. Sánchez and J. A. de Lasarte, Escultura Gótica (Ars Hispaniae, vol. viii), Madrid, 1966, pp. 342 ff., figs. 330 ff.; H. Wethey, Gil de Siloe and his school, Cambridge (Mass.), 1936, pp. 1-3; B. G. Hoske, Castilian Sculpture. Gothic to Renaissance, New York, 1951, pp. 66 ff., figs. 31 ff. (11) Even the concept of a Franco-Portuguese School is rather odd; the monuments quoted for comparison differ vastly in date and place. J. Couto, in a ms. communication of 24 July 1954, disagrees with the attribution to the Franco-Portuguese School and supposes that the piece to be French. (12) J. Braun, Das Christliche Allergerät, Munich, 1932, pl. 17 ff. It is true that the hand and the chalice are worked separately; the material and the workmanship indicate, however, that they are original and not a later replacement. (13) E. F. Bange, Die deutschen Bronzestatuetten des 16. Jahrhunderts, Berlin, 1949, pp. 50 ff. ill. 129, pls. 96-118. (14) C. Dianens, Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunsgeschiedenis, xi, 1945/48, pp. 60 ff. See also note 3. (15) Most of the arguments for this entry have been furnished by Charles Avery and his colleagues at the Victoria and Albert Museum.
GERMAN SCHOOL

MASTER ACTIVE IN FRANKFURT

c. 1460 (?)

K2162: Figure 209

ST BARTHOLOMEW. Allentown, Pa., Allentown Art Museum, since 1960.1 Full-round wooden statue, 33 x 17 x 10 in. (134 x 43.2 x 25.4 cm.); hollow. The polychromy is gone but for a few patches of gold on the coat and a mottled leather colour of the bookcover. The blade of the sword is missing.


The figure is related to a stone statue of the same saint,1 formerly on the doorway of the Church of St Bartholomew in Frankfurt (Main), now in the Historical Museum,2 which has been linked with Hans Dirmsteyn, a Frankfurt goldsmith, who is known between 1462 and 1503(?)3 and who in 1473 signed a silver reliquary bust of St Peter in the collegiate church of Aschaffenburg.4 Recently the statue in Frankfurt has been more correctly dated c. 14385 and linked with the altar of the Death of the Virgin of 1434 in the Cathedral of Frankfurt.6 Our statue, though indeed related to them, seems later than these sculptures in Frankfurt. The schematic treatment of its hair, the protruding eyes, the greater bulk and heavier movement of its body relate it more closely to Dirmsteyn’s bust in Aschaffenburg. An intermediate date between 1438 and 1473 might therefore be justified. Whether Dirmsteyn was its author is difficult to tell, particularly since we know him only as a goldsmith.7


HEINRICH YSELIN

School of the Upper Rhine. Probably born in Ravensburg and died 1513 in Constance (Bodensee) where he must have been active since the early seventies of the fifteenth century. He worked together with the carpenter Simon Haider, his father-in-law, the carpenter Hans Haider and the sculptor Hans Henckel his brothers-in-law. They produced altar pieces and choir stalls carved in wood and highly decorated with figures. The workshop must have been very successful and gathered many out-of-town commissions. Yselin eventually became a member of the town council. We are badly informed about his origins; he shows himself as a follower of Nicolaus Gerhaerts and is believed to have been a pupil of his. His share in the production of the workshop is hard to define: parts of the choir stalls in Constance Minster (1467 ff.) and the busts of the dismantled choir stalls of the church of Weingarten (c. 1478) are thought to be his.1 He softened the monumentality of Nicolaus Gerhaerts with Swabian gentleness.

K2163: Figure 208

ST MARGARET. Allentown, Pa., Allentown Art Museum, since 1960.2 Full-round half-figure in polychromed wood, 24 x 16 x 10 in. (61 x 40.6 x 25.4 cm.). Generally good condition. The crown is damaged, the frame of the medallion on her chest was broken and is recomposed. The polychromy has preserved its character, though worn and damaged in places and perhaps partly renewed, e.g. in the face, where two layers of colour are superimposed. The under garment is blue; the belt apparently was silver which has turned dark grey. The mantle is gilt with some tooling at the edges, its lining may have been silver. The hair is brown, the colour of the hands is much worn. The gold of the crown also is worn. The greyish black dragon has a red tongue; the base is blackish.


The bust clearly is in the tradition of Nicolaus Gerhaerts, and is derived from similar busts of his and his followers.3 It is close to the busts of the choir stalls at one time in the Abbey Church of Weingarten,4 on which Yselin worked, together with the Haiders and Hans Henckel, around 1478. It also compares well with the figures of the high altar in the church of Lautenbach5 and the group of the Coronation of the Virgin in the church of Honau6 which have been attributed to Yselin.7

(123)
GREGOR ERHART

Swabian School. Born in Ulm as the son of Michel Erhart (documented from 1469 till 1518), a leading sculptor of his town; died in Augsburg in 1540. The first major work assumed to be his, the high altar of the parish church of Blaubeuren, of 1493/4, may have still been done in the workshop of his father. In 1499 he moved to Augsburg where he assumed to be his, the high altar of the parish church of Blaubeuren, of 1493/4, may have still been done in the workshop of his father. In 1499 he moved to Augsburg where he became one of the leading masters in stone and wood, and has become famous for his complex altarpieces. He must have had a large workshop which made his prodigious output possible. Two of his sons, Georg and Hans also became sculptors; and numerous pupils spread his style through much of Germany. In 1525 Riemenschneider had jeopardized his position by siding with the rebellious peasants in the Peasants War, but he was eventually released from prison, and resumed his activities.

ST SEBASTIAN. Allentown, Pa., Allentown Art Museum, since 1960.\(^1\) Full-round statue in wood, \(40 \times 12 \times 10\) in. (\(101.6 \times 30.5 \times 25.4\) cm). Well preserved polychromy, with only a few repairs and retouchings, perhaps in the flesh-colour. Drapery is gold, lined with blue; hair, tree and fetters are brown; base green; blood red; the arrows missing.


The figure shows a striking similarity to the youth in the small Vanitas group of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, which has been attributed to Gregor Erhart and dated close to 1500.\(^2\) Its facial features are similar to those of the Johannes Evangelista in the centre of the altarpiece of the Blaubeuren high altar, carved by Gregor Erhart in 1493-4.\(^3\) The anatomical treatment agrees in basic features with the Man of Sorrows from the 'Auszug' of the Blaubeuren altarpiece although it is much finer.\(^4\) Our figure has to be considered a work by Gregor Erhart's own hand whereas the Man of Sorrows is a workshop piece only. The same treatment of the nude is found in Gregor Erhart's Man of Sorrows on his tabernacle of 1503 at Donauwörth\(^6\) which is much finer than the Man of Sorrows of the Blaubeuren altarpiece. The left hand of this Christ is a mirror-like simile of the right hand of the Sebastian. The particular feature of the lowered upper lids, is found there too, as it is found in the Johannes Evangelista in the centre of the Blaubeuren altarpiece. Our figure should be dated about 1500.\(^7\)

References: (1) R. Hirsch and F. R. Shapley, The Samuel H. Kress Memorial Collection of the Allentown Art Museum, Allentown, Pa., 1960, pp. 20 ff., 82 ff. (as Gregor Erhart). (2) G. Otto, Gregor Erhart, Berlin, 1943, pp. 36 ff., 88, figs. 54 ff. (3) Ibid., figs. 16, 22. (4) Ibid., figs. 48, 90b. (5) Ibid., figs. 66 ff. (6) Ibid., figs. 68b, 75. (7) This entry has been prepared by Justus Bier. On the indebtedness of Gregor Erhart to his father Michel see the recent book by A. Broscheck, Michel Erhart, Berlin and New York, 1973, pp. 132 ff. Our statue has features, e.g. a certain leanness and angularity, which might point to the father.

TILMAN RIEMENSCHNEIDER

Franconian School. Born c. 1460 in Heiligenstadt (Thuringia), he spent his childhood in Osterode (Harz) and died 1531 in Würzburg, where he is heard of for the first time in 1493 and where he lived and worked ever since. It is not known where he received his training; his style betrays an acquaintance with the art of Swabia (Ulm) and the Upper Rhine (Nicolaus Gerhaerts). He became a leading citizen of Würzburg, of which at one time he even was mayor (1520/1), and the foremost sculptor not only in town, but also in its wider surroundings. He was working in stone and wood, and has become famous for his complex altarpieces. He must have had a large workshop which made his prodigious output possible. Two of his sons, Georg and Hans also became sculptors; and numerous pupils spread his style through much of Germany. In 1525 Riemenschneider had jeopardized his position by siding with the rebellious peasants in the Peasants War, but he was eventually released from prison, and resumed his activities.

ST BURCHARDUS, BISHOP OF WÜRZBURG. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (A152), since 1945.\(^1\) Full-
round half figure, soft linden wood, $32\frac{3}{8}\times 18\frac{3}{8}\times 11\frac{3}{8}$ in. ($82.3\times 47.2\times 30.2$ cm.). Back hollowed out; the modelled slab on which originally must have closed the opening is lost. Probably from the outer a half-figure, which rested on a base which is lost. With it are lost the lower endings of the drapery. The upper parts of the blessing fingers of the right hand, part of the right infusa of the mitre, the crook of the crozier are modern replacements. The rhomboid opening in the chest is probably also later. It must have held a capsule for relics when the bust was used as a reliquary. In its place originally must have been a morse which held the cope together. An old photograph shows jewels on the mitre and in the opening of the chest, and an entire polychromy of uncertain date, but apparently not original. They have been removed and underneath some traces of old colour have appeared. The rhomb on the chest is stained a deep red. Pupils and iris are delicately marked in black.

Provenance: Wilhelm and Jens Sattler, Schloss Mainberg.\(^3\) Benoit Oppenheim, Berlin.\(^4\) Art Market, Munich.\(^5\) H. Goldman, New York.\(^6\) Kress acquisition, 1944.\(^7\) Exhibited: Redern Palace, Berlin, 1906.\(^8\)

This is a well known and much published piece. Its attribution has been frequently reaffirmed.\(^9\) The most authoritative statements are those of Justus Bier.\(^2\) The identification of the saint as St Burchardus is traditional and plausible, though it cannot be proved. The features of the saint occur in Riemenschneider's oeuvre throughout his career. The classic simplicity of the design of the whole, the sober arrangement of the folds, the tranquil mood of the smoothly modelled face, however, find their closest correspondence in his latest works: in the busts of St Kilian and his Companions (1508–10)\(^11\) from the high altar of the cathedral of Würzburg, later in the Neumünster, where they were lost in the conflagration of 16 March 1945, in the latest reliefs of the tomb of Sts Henry and Cunigonde in Bamberg (c. 1510),\(^12\) in the Crucifixion in Dettwang (1512/13?)\(^13\) and, carried to an extreme, in the Deposition in Maidbronn (c. 1519–23).\(^14\) Our bust may have had the same function as the one lost in the Neumünster. There is no reason to assume, as has been done, that it is a fragment of a full length statue.\(^15\)
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St Andrew the Apostle. Atlanta, Ga., High Museum of Art, since 1958.\(^1\) Full-round linden wood statue, $40\frac{1}{4}\times 13\frac{3}{4}\times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in. ($102.8\times 34.2\times 21$ cm.). The statue has lost its polychromy; that at one time it had one is proved by the wormholes. It is hollow and closed at the back by a new board. The parts that have been restored are the bridge of the nose, parts of the top section of the book (its two upper corners, a small strip at the upper edge of the left side of the cover taking in the first pages, and an irregularly shaped small section at the top of the book's back), the back arm of the upper portion of the cross and small sections at its base. At the bottom of the fold, where the right foot should be, there is a replacement. On the other side at the bottom, a piece of drapery missing. The surface is rubbed and stained brown.

Riemenschneider’s authorship has been convincingly proposed by J. Bier. He dates the statue around 1505, pointing to similarities with some stone Apostles from the Lady’s Chapel in Würzburg, now divided between the Cathedral and the Mainfränkisches Museum (1499–1500), and to affinities of style with the altars in Creglingen (1505–10) and in Rothenburg (1501–4). A suggestion that the statue might have been a model for one of the large stone figures is not convincing.


School of TILMAN RIEMENSCHEINER (Master of the Bibra Annunciation, Assistant of Riemenschneider around 1490/92)
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ST GEORGE KILLING THE DRAGON. Birmingham, Al., Birmingham Museum of Art, since 1960. High relief in polychromed wood, 48 × 47 × 124 in. (121.9 × 119.4 × 31.2 cm.). Well preserved; the thumb of the right hand of the saint is a replacement. The spurs are broken, the armours is gold; the saddle gold with a white seat and silver decoration. Flesh-colour is well preserved; hair brown; the headwear multicoloured; the lance apparently old, but lacking the head, striped white and red. The horse is dappled chestnut and has a black mane and tail. The trappings are cut out of white canvas and are decorated with red crosses. The forepiece of the bridle has a monogram which seems to be an ‘A’. The dragon’s back is dark green, shaded into a yellow belly; the inside of his ear, his tongue and mouth are red. The princess wears a blue dress with gold cuffs and collar; her blond hair is in a black net, with a red bow in the back. The ground is dark green, almost black. The lamb at her side grey.


At present the group is localized in the Rhineland and dated around 1470. Possibly a previous suggestion, which tentatively has connected it with Bernt Notke is more to the point. The similarity with Notke’s monumental group of St George in Stockholm (finished 1489) is slight and mainly exists in the identity of subject matter. But in the circle of Notke are found groups of similar character, e.g., a fragment attributed to Henning von der Heiden in the University Museum of Lund, which must have been close in motif and style. The lamb, which is explained as another sacrifice to the dragon also occurs in works of this circle.

References: (1) Richard F. Howard, Birmingham News, 14 Jan. 1969. Richard F. Howard and T. Weeks were kind
enough to complete the description and to furnish the indications of the provenance. (2) W. Paatz, Bernt Notke und sein Kreis, Berlin, 1939, figs. 74 ff. (3) Ibid., fig. 173. (4) L. Réau, Iconographie de l'art chrétien, iii, ii, Paris, 1928, p. 576. (5) W. Paatz, op. cit., p. 71, fig. 74. (6) The entry has been prepared with the kind help of Justus Bier.

TYROLEAN: Early XVI Century
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SEATED MADONNA AND CHILD. Coral Gables, Fla., Joe and Emily Lowe Art Gallery, University of Miami, since 1961.1 Statue in polychromed wood, 38⅕×24⅛×12⅕ in. (98·4×62·2×31·7 cm.). Almost full-round, flattened on back; hollowed out. The base is modern. Polychromy fully recognizable, though badly worn, particularly in the drapery of the Virgin. The under garment of the Virgin is gold, glazed red, the mantle gold, lined blue, the veil white(?); the shoe black; the grapes blue. The crown and crescent gold. The flesh-colour is well preserved; red lips and cheeks; brown eyes; hair gold. The Child’s drapery is of the Virgin. The under garment of the Virgin is gold, glazed red, the mantle gold, lined blue, the veil gold, glazed red, the top garment is gold; the gilding stops in the back. The base is modern. Polychromy fully recognizable, though badly worn, particularly in the drapery of the Virgin. The under garment of the Virgin is gold, glazed red, the mantle gold, lined blue, the veil white(?); the shoe black; the grapes blue. The crown and crescent gold. The flesh-colour is well preserved; red lips and cheeks; brown eyes; hair gold. The Child’s drapery is red(?); His hair brown. The throne is red, marbled; the pillow white with a red pattern.

Provenance: Ahrntal near Bruneck, Tyrol.2 Dr Oertel, Munich.3 Paul Drey, New York. Kress acquisition, 1956.

This group has been connected with the high altar of the church in Heiligenblut (Carinthia) of 1520 and two saints in Berlin.3 It actually belongs with a whole series of works from the following of Michael Pacher scattered particularly over South Tyrol, and dating from the first third of the sixteenth century.4 Connected with it are names like those of Marx Reichlich and Wolfgang Aslinger.5 Our group possibly originally was the centre part of an altar triptych like that in Pinzón.6 A closer similarity to Pacher’s Salzburg Madonna, as claimed,7 does not exist.7


BAVARIAN: around 1525
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ST GEORGE AND THE DRAGON. Denver, Col., Denver Art Museum (8887), since 1963.1 Full-round figure, in polychromed wood. Height, 48 in. (121·9 cm.). The armour was silver now turned black, with some details, like knee and elbow pieces and tips of the shoes gilt. The straps are red. The top garment is gold; the gilding stops at the back. The hair is blackish brown; the face pale with some red on lips and cheeks. The dragon is dark greenish brown.


The figure belongs in the circle of Hans Leinberger and finds its parallels in the work of the Rasso Master, thus called after a statue of St Rasso in the Frauenkirche in Munich,2 particularly in the statue of St Rasso itself. It has a similar stance and costume, a similar modelling of the face and the hair, a similar polychromy, but it is more subdued in character.3


SWABIAN (?) : around 1575
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THE ADORATION OF THE SHEPHERDS. New York, N.Y., Mrs Rush Kress. High relief in polychromed wood, 16×21⅛×11⅛ in. (40·6×54·4×28·3 cm.). This is virtually a crèche, with the full-round figures placed in a setting which consists of the ground and a background composed of two boards to which are attached the figures of the animals and of the shepherd behind the manger. The piece is generally well preserved and still has some of its polychromy: the
tunic of the Virgin is red (mainly lost), her mantle is gold (large patches missing); hair brown; face natural. The Child is flesh-coloured, darkened by dirt; the crib, gilt; the animals, natural colour, dark grey and tan (badly damaged). First shepherd to the left has gold garments (much of the colour missing), face and hair natural; second shepherd has a red garment (much damaged), umber cap, face and hair natural; third shepherd has a red garment with grey lining; a large chip of the colour of the forehead missing. St Joseph’s jacket and cap are gold (much colour missing), the head is well preserved. Ground and background are bluish grey; the hut and the manger brown.¹


It is difficult to find proper comparisons for this exceptional piece; therefore its localization has always been uncertain. It has been called Eastern German³ and more recently Swabian.⁴ A group of the Adoration of the Magi in the Cathedral of Augsburg,⁵ which has been quoted in support of this has a similar arrangement of the figures in space, but has a different style.

References: (1) I have to thank Mr Henry W. Hecht for this careful description. (2) R. Berliner, Die Weihnachtskrippe, Munich, 1955, p. 227, Lieferung, xx, 1. (3) R. Berliner, Denkmäler der Krippenkunst, Augsburg, 1926 ff., fasc. xx, pl. 1. (4) T. Müller, letter of 27 July 1956. (5) R. Berliner, Die Weihnachtskrippe, op. cit., fig. 15.

FRENCH OR GERMAN (?): XIX Century?
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STANDING ANGEL. Birmingham, Al., Birmingham Museum of Art, since 1959.² Full-round statue with flat back, limestone, 35 1/4 x 14 1/2 x 10 in. (90·2 x 35·6 x 25·9 cm.). Condition: generally good; right hand missing, damages to the lower part of the drapery. Traces of polychromy: outside of cloak blue, inside red; tunic yellowish white.

Provenance: Stephan von Auspitz, Vienna.¹ Paul Drey Gallery, New York.² Kress acquisition, 1957.²

The attribution to the Master of Grosslobming³ proposed by some scholars⁴ cannot be sustained. The piece would be in any case much too late for him. The lack of authentic detailing in the costume, the style-less clasp, the strange hair-style and facial type, and the incredible state of preservation condemn the piece as a nineteenth-century pastiche. Its mixture of French and German elements suggest that it might have been produced in France or Western Germany.⁵