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Bernini’s Image of the Sun King

Puis, se tournant vers ceux qui faisaient cercle autour du Roi, il a ajouté: ‘Qu’on ne me parle de rien que soit petit.’

É ben vero, a-t-il dit, che le fabbriche sono i ritratti dell’animo dei principi.


It is well known that Bernini made three major works for Louis XIV: the design for rebuilding the Louvre, which brought him to Paris in the summer of 1665 (Figs. 1, 4); the life-size portrait bust of the king executed while he was in Paris (Figs. 2, 5); and the monumental equestrian statue executed after his return to Rome (Figs. 3, 6). Each of these works has been studied separately, but they have hardly been considered together or appreciated for what they really are, equivalent expressions in different media of the concept held by one man of genius who was an

The main argument of this paper was first presented at a symposium entitled ‘The Ascendancy of French Culture During the Reign of the Sun King’ sponsored by the Folger Shakespeare Library in March 1985; an abbreviated version appeared in French (Lavin, 1987). Some of the material is incorporated in an essay devoted to the relationship of Bernini’s ruler portraits to the ‘anti-Machiavellian’ tradition of political theory and the idea of the prince-hero (Lavin, 1991). These studies and the preceding chapter relate to a series of attempts I have made to describe the nature, meaning and development of ‘illusionism’ in the Italian sculptured bust since the Renaissance (Lavin, 1970, 1975; see further Lavin, 1968, 1970; with the collaboration of M. Aronberg Lavin, 1970, 1972).
I want to emphasize at the outset that although I shall focus mainly on the visual ideas through which this basic concept was expressed, it was not purely abstract or theoretical. On the contrary, the detailed diary of Bernini’s stay in Paris kept by his escort, Paul Fréart de Chantelou, bears witness to the warm personal relationship established between the artist and the king, based on mutual respect and admiration.

The reasons for the lack of a unitarian vision of the three works are complex. Each project had its own dramatic and ultimately abortive history. The design for the Louvre became a scapegoat in the rising tide of French cultural nationalism, and the building never rose above the foundations. The bust, which never received the pedestal Bernini intended for it, was installed at Versailles rather than the Louvre. The equestrian monument met with violent disapproval — including the king’s — when it reached Paris long after Bernini’s death; it too was sent to Versailles, where it was finally installed in the garden, having been converted from a portrait into an illustration of a recondite episode from Roman history. Above all, I suspect that the different media have obscured the common ground of the three works. Within the traditional conventions of art it is practically inconceivable that architectural and figural works might convey the same ideas in the same way — not just indirectly through abstract symbolism but directly through mimetic representation. I believe that this was precisely what Bernini had in mind. This intention explains the paradoxical metaphor he expressed during his visit to Paris: ‘buildings are the portraits of the soul of

1 Some of the thoughts and observations offered here were adumbrated in Fagiolo dell’Arco, 1967, 90 f., and in the valuable studies by Del Pesco, ‘Gli ‘antichi déi’ and Il Louvre, both 1984. I have also profited greatly from the recent monographs by Berger, Versailles and In the Garden, both 1985. For a general account of Bernini’s visit, see Gould, 1982. An excellent summary on the Louvre will be found in Braham and Smith, 1973, 120–49, 255–64; Daufresne, 1987, provides a useful compendium of the many projects for the palace. On the bust of the king and its antecedents, see Wittkower, 1951; I. Lavin, 1972, 177–81, and 1973, 434 ff. On the equestrian monument, see Wittkower, 1961, 497–531, and, with supplementary material on the statue’s reception in France, Berger, In the Garden, 1985, 50–63, 69–74; also Weber, 1985, 288 ff. The history of the work is summarized in Hoog, 1989.

Mai, 1975, considers the bust and the equestrian together in the general context of Louis XIV portraiture.

2 Chantelou, 1885; an English translation by M. Corbett, not always reliable but with excellent annotations by G. Bauer, is now available (Chantelou, 1985).
and it permits us to see his works for Louis XIV as reflections of a single, coherent image that was among his most original creations.

The King, the Sun, and the Earth

The primary component of Bernini’s image of the king was the pre-eminent metaphor of Louis’s reign, the sun — in conformity with the millennial tradition of the *oriens augusti*, ‘the rising of the august one,’ identifying the ruler with the sun. The richness, frequency, and programmatic nature of the theme are illustrated in an engraving published in Claude François Menestrier’s *History of the King* of 1689 (Fig. 7); the emblems linking Louis with the sun in the period from his birth to his majority in 1651 are gathered in a design that itself forms a composite solar emblem. In 1662 Louis adopted as his official device the sun as a face seen high above a spherical earth, with the famous motto *Nec pluribus impar* — ‘not unequal to several (worlds),’ that is, capable of illuminating several others (Fig. 8).

Bernini had had ample experience with such solar imagery long before his visit to Paris. The sun had also been an emblem of the Barberini pope, Urban VIII, one of Bernini’s greatest patrons, and Bernini was intimately familiar with an important document of this association, a frescoed vault in the Barberini palace in Rome, executed by Andrea Sacchi around 1630 (Fig. 9). Divine Wisdom, with an emblem of the sun at her breast, appears
1. Bernini, third project for the Louvre, east facade (from Blondel, 1752–56, vol. 4, pl. 8).
2. Bernini, bust of Louis XIV. Musée National du Château de Versailles
(photo: Alinari 25588).
4. Detail of Fig. 1.
5. Detail of Fig. 2.

6. Detail of Fig. 3.
enthroned in the heavens above the sphere of the earth. Bernini himself had
exploited the image in the allegorical sculpture of Time discovering Truth,
which he began toward the end of the 1640s in response to slanderous
attacks then being made on his reputation (Fig. 10).8 Truth is a splendid
nude whom a figure of Father Time, flying above, was to discover, literally
as well as figuratively, by lifting a swath of drapery. The figure of Time was
never executed, but the whole conceit drew on the traditional theme of
Time rescuing his daughter, who had been secreted by her great enemy
Envy in a dark cavern. Time was shown raising up Truth from the earth,
represented as a craggy peak below (Fig. 11). This tradition is alluded to by
the rocky base on which Bernini’s Truth sits, with one foot resting upon the
globe and an emblem of the sun in her hand. The joy of the occasion is
illustrated by the radiant smile on Truth’s face, the physiognomical equiva-
 lent of the sun’s own beneficent splendor.

The Palace Portrait

Roman antiquity offered three notable instances of solar imagery in
palaces. The imperial palace par excellence, built initially by Augustus on the
Palatine hill, included a Temple of Apollo crowned by a resplendent gilded
sculpture of the Chariot of the Sun (cf. Figs. 32, 33). Solar imagery was
associated with the building itself in the revolving circular dining hall of
Nero’s Domus Aurea and in the heavenly, high-columned dwelling of
Apollo described in Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Following these sources, Louis
Le Vau and Charles Le Brun had introduced the metaphor at
Vaux-le-Vicomte, the great residence of Louis’s finance minister Fouquet, in
the oval salon and in the design for its vault decoration (Fig. 12). Bernini
admired Le Brun’s composition when it was shown to him in Paris except
that, the design being oval, ‘if the palace of the sun represented in it had the
same form, or indeed were round, it might have been better suited to the
palace and to the sun itself.’9

9 The importance of this drawing and the solar symbolism in the French projects for the
Louvre were emphasized by Berger (1970) and developed by Del Pesco (Il Louvre, 1984,
137–72); also Berger, forthcoming.

Cf. Chantelou, 1885, 224, entry for October 11: ‘Come c’est une ovale, il a dit que si le
palais du soleil, qui y est représenté, avait été de même forme ou bien rond, peut-être aurait-il
mieux convenu au lieu et au soleil même.’
The allusion had, in turn, been introduced into designs for the new Louvre proposed by Louis Le Vau and his brother François shortly before Bernini came to Paris. Louis included an oval salon as the centerpiece of the east wing (Fig. 13), and François included a relief showing Apollo in his chariot, as well as the *Nec pluribus impar* motto, in the decorations of the central pavilion (Fig. 14). Bernini must have been aware of Louis Le Vau’s Louvre project, which was sent to Rome as an example for several Italian architects who were to comment and submit designs of their own. The two projects Bernini sent to Paris before his visit develop the oval motif into powerful curves that dominate the designs (Figs. 15, 16); significantly, he emphasized the Sun-Apollo allusion in the architectural form of the projects, while evidently excluding any such imagery from the decorations of the façades.10

Bernini’s distinctive approach to the problem began to emerge in a series of dramatic developments at the outset of his visit. From his first inspection of the Louvre, on June 3, 1665, the day following his arrival in Paris, he concluded that what had already been built — a considerable portion of the palace — was inadequate.11 At their first interview, on June 4, Bernini anticipated some of the allusions he would incorporate in his own designs, telling Louis that he had ‘seen the palaces of the emperors and popes and those of sovereign princes located on the route from Rome to Paris, but the king of France, today, needed something greater and more magnificent than...’
He proposed to demolish the whole building and start over, a drastic solution to which the king acceded only reluctantly. During the next five days, however, Bernini changed his mind. On June 9 he proposed to keep the existing structure and employ the ground floor as the base for the colossal order he envisaged for his own project. In part, this change of heart was a concession to practical necessity and fiscal responsibility; but surely it was also motivated by a new solution, one that would assimilate the flat façade of the traditional French château, resting on the foundation in a moat to the image portrayed by Louis’s solar emblem.

The project Bernini offered the king on June 20 (Figs. 1, 4) represented the royal device in a profound and utterly novel way—not in geometrical design or decorative sculptures but in the very fabric of the structure. The elevation has three main levels: the colossal order that comprises the two upper stories, the ground story with fine horizontal courses of drafted stone masonry, and a massive, irregular foundation level that would have been visible in an open moat. The frequent references to it in Chantelou’s diary show how important this foundation was to Bernini. He first presented his project to Louis in drawings that showed two alternative ways of treating the lowest level, one with ordinary rustication, the other with a rock-like formation that he described as an entirely new idea. When the king chose

---

12 ‘J’ai vu, Sire, a-t-il dit à S. M., les palais des empereurs et des papes, ceux des princes souverains qui se sont trouvés sur la route de Rome à Paris, mais il faut faire pour un roi de France, un roi d’aujourd’hui, de plus grandes et magnifiques choses que tout cela.’ The passage is followed by that quoted in the first epigraph to this essay (p. 524 above), to which the King replied, ‘il avait quelque affectation de conserver ce qu’avaient fait ses prédécesseurs, mais que si pourtant l’on ne pouvait rien faire de grand sans abattre leur ouvrage, qu’il le lui abandonnait; que pour l’argent il ne l’épargnerait pas’ (Chantelou, 1885, 15, June 4).

13 Bernini acknowledged the practical and financial considerations in a memo he read to the king, adding, ‘comme l’étage du plan terrain du Louvre n’a pas assez d’exhaussement, il ne le fait servir dans sa façade que comme si c’était le piédestal de l’ordre corinthien qu’il met au-dessus’ (Chantelou, 1885, 27 f., June 9).

14 The solution perfectly illustrates Bernini’s view that the architect’s chief merit lay not in making beautiful or commodious buildings but in adapting to necessity and using defects in such a way that if they did not exist they would have to be made: ‘...diceva non essere il sommo pregio dell’artefice il far bellissimi e comodi edifici, ma il sapere inventar maniere per servirsi del poco, del cattivo e male adattato al bisogno per far cose belle e far sì, che sia utile quel che fu difetto e che, se non fusse, bisognerebbe farlo’ (Baldinucci, 1948, 146, cf. Bernini, 1713, 32).

15 References to the rustication occur in Chantelou’s diary on June 20; September 22, 25, 26, 29, 30; October 6 (Chantelou, 1885, 36, 176, 179, 182, 189, 192, 203).
the latter, even though it would be more difficult to execute, Bernini was delighted and remarked that few people, even among professionals, had such good judgment. He insisted on providing detailed designs himself, on executing a model so that the workmen might see what he meant, and on supervising the work on the foundations to make sure that the workmen would do it properly. The reason for his care was that in carrying out the rustication Bernini intended for the Louvre, the workmen would be functioning more as sculptors than as ordinary stonemasons.

Rustication, which had a long history, was discussed and its varieties illustrated in the mid-sixteenth century by Serlio, in his treatise on architecture (Fig. 17). Traditionally, although the stones were given a more or less rough surface, they were treated equally, and each stone or course of stones was clearly separated from the next so that a more or less regular pattern resulted. This kind of rustication could become very rough indeed, especially when it was used to evoke primitive or decaying structures, as in Wendel Dietterlin's book of architectural fantasies (1598); but the individual units remained separate and distinct (Fig. 18). Bernini's 'natural' rustica-

---

16 '... un écueil ou espèce de rocher, sur lequel il a fait l'assiette du Louvre, lequel il a couvert d'un papier où était dessiné un rustique, fait pour avoir à choisir, à cause que cet écueil était de difficile exécution, le Roi ayant considéré l'un et l'autre, a dit que cet écueil lui plaisait bien plus, et qu'il voulait qu'il fût exécuté de la sorte. Le Cavalier lui a dit qu'il l'avait changé, s'imaginant que, comme c'est une pensée toute nouvelle, que peut-être elle ne plairait pas, outre qu'il faudrait que cet écueil, pour réussir dans son intention, fût exécuté de sa main. Le Roi a répété que cela lui plaisait extrêmement. Sur quoi le Cavalier lui a dit qu'il a la plus grande joie du monde de voir combien S. M. a le goût fin et délicat, y ayant peu de gens, même de la profession, que eussent pu en juger si bien' (Chantelou, 1885, 36, June 20).

17 On the history of rustication, see most recently Ackerman, 1983, 27 ff.; Fagiolo, ed., 1979. Bernini’s use of rustication has been treated most extensively by Borsi (1967, 29–43), but the nature and significance of his contribution has not been clearly defined.

As far as I can see, the first to note the character and intimate the significance of Bernini’s rustication was Quatremère de Quincy in his Encyclopédie article on ‘Opposition’: ‘Ainsi, des blocs laissés bruts, des pierres de taille rustiquées, donneront aux soubassements d’un monument une apparence de massivité dont l’opposition fera paraître plus élégantes les parties et les ordonnances supérieures. L’emploi de ce genre d’opposition entre les matériaux a quelquefois été porté plus loins. Il y a des exemples de plus d’un édifice, où l’architecture a fait entrer dans son appareil, des pierres tellement taillées et façonnées en forme de rochers, que leur opposition avec le reste de la construction semble avoir eu pour but, de donner l’idée d’un monument pratiqué et comme fondé sur des masses de rocs naturels. Tel est à Rome (peut-être dans un sens allégorique) le palais de justice à Monte-Citorio’ (1788–1825, III, 36). The reference was brought to my attention by Sylvia Lavin.
7. Sun emblems of Louis XIV before 1651 engraving (from Menestrier, 1693, 4).
8. Medal of Louis XIV, 1663.

(photo: Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione E72392).
11. *Time rescuing Truth*  
(Willaert, 1536,  
from Saxl, 1936, fig. 2).

(photo: Documentation photographique de la Réunion des musées nationaux  
68 DN 3160).
13. Louis Le Vau, project for the Louvre, drawing. Musée du Louvre, Paris (photo: Documentation photographique de la Réunion des musées nationaux, Receuil du Louvre I, fol. 5).
14. François Le Vau, project for the Louvre, engraving. 

17. Sebastiano Serlio, varieties of rusticated masonry
(from Serlio, 1562, opp. p. 17).
tion (this term seems most effectively to distinguish it from the traditional ‘artificial’ rustication) had its roots in artificially created natural settings — garden fountains (Fig. 19) and grottoes, for example, which were often conceived as artful accidents in an artificial world — and in such temporary decorations as festival floats (Fig. 20) or theatrical stage sets, especially those depicting the underworld (Fig. 21). Steps were even taken in the sixteenth century to introduce irregular rustication into the permanent urban environment, as in the house of the artist Federico Zuccari in Florence (1579) where rough-cut stones, carefully arranged, decorate the façade (Fig. 22). The stones remain separate and distinguishable, however, fragments from another world introduced not as structural elements but as precious fragments like those from antique sculptures that were displayed symmetrically on the walls of contemporary villas and palaces (Fig. 23).

By and large rustication since the Renaissance had been understood in three ways. From the fourteenth century social value had been attached to the technique because it involved more labor, and therefore expense, than dressed stone. It had also acquired an expressive meaning when Alberti spoke of its capacity to inspire awe and fear — when used in city walls, for example. Finally, rustication had metaphorical significance as an allusion

18 See the chapter on these types in Wiles, 1933, 73 ff. For the fountain illustrated in Figure 195, see Zangheri, 1979, 157 f., and 1985, 38 ff; Vezzosi, ed., 1986, 138 ff.
20 An indicative case in point is the report concerning Filippo Strozzi’s feigned modesty in building his palace in Florence: ‘Oltre a molt’altre spese s’aggiunse anco quella de’ bozzi di fuori. Filippo quanto più si vedeva incitare, tanto maggiormente sembianza faceva di iritarsi, e per niente diceva di voler fare i bozzi, per non esser cosa civile e di troppa spesa’ (Gaye, 1839–40, I, 355; cited by Roth, 1917, 13 n. 22; Sinding-Larsen, 1975, 195 n. 5.
Many passages concerning rustication are assembled in an article by Morolli, in Fagiolo, ed., 1979.
21 ‘There are some very ancient castles still to be seen . . . built of huge unwrought stone; which sort of work pleases me extremely, because it gives the building a rugged air of antique severity, which is a very great ornament to a town. I would have the walls of a city built in such a manner, that the enemy at the bare sight of them may be struck with terror, and be sent away with a distrust of his own forces’ (Alberti, 1965, Bk. VII, ch. 2, p. 135); ‘Visuntur et vetusta oppida . . . lapide astructa praegranti incerto et vasto, quod mihi quidem opus vehementer probatur: quandam enim praecet fert rigiditatem severissimae vetustatis, quae urbibus ornamento est. Ac velim quidem eiusmodi esse urbis murum, ut eo spectato horreat hostis et mox diffidens abscedat’ (Alberti, 1966, 539).
to the work of nature, and this was its meaning in sixteenth century gardens and other nonarchitectural contexts.22

Bernini, in effect, merged this ‘representational’ tradition with that of rustication as a proper architectural mode. In doing so he brought to a mutually dependent fruition the three associative aspects of rustication — the nobility of a magnificently carved, rather than merely constructed, foundation; the expression of awesome unassailability to all but the most perservering and virtuous; and the actual depiction of a ‘natural’ form, the Mountain of Virtue, that served a structural as well as a metaphorical purpose. Significantly, Bernini did not refer to his brainchild by the technical term rustication, but instead called it a scogliera, or rocky mass.

Bernini had long since taken the giant step of creating coherent irregular rock formations and using such wild, natural art works as major monuments in the heart of the city. In the Four Rivers fountain, the centerpiece of the refurbished Piazza Navona, where Innocent X (1644–55) built his family palace, an artificial mountain island supports an obelisk (Fig. 24). Here, too, drawings show how carefully Bernini planned the ‘accidental’ forms, and the sources emphasize his own participation in the actual carving (Fig. 25).23 Because the obelisk was regarded as one of antiquity’s foremost solar symbols, the fountain itself has the same emblematic sense that concerns us here.

A few years later Bernini introduced this idea of a rock-like foundation into a properly architectural context in the façade of the palace, known from its location as the Palazzo di Montecitorio, which he designed for the same pope’s niece and her husband; here he used natural rustication on the

22 On the first of these points see, for example, Serlio’s remarks concerning the mixture of nature and artifice, quoted by Ackerman, 1983, 28: ‘It would be no error if within one manner one were to make a mixture representing in this way partly the work of nature and partly the work of artifice: thus columns bound down by rustic stones and also the architrave and frieze interrupted by voussoirs reveal the work of nature, while capitals and parts of the columns and also the cornice and pediment represent the work of the hand; and this mixture, according to my judgement, greatly pleases the eye and represents in itself great strength.’

On the second point, see Ackerman, 1983, 34.

23 Baldinucci, 1948, 140; Bernini, 1713, 89; for a detailed analysis of these studies see Courtrigh, in Lavin et al., 1981, 108–19.
basement story, beneath a colossal order of pilasters (Figs. 26, 27, and 28). Bernini may have adopted the natural form in the rustication of the new palace for the pope's niece to echo the motif of the Piazza Navona fountain. There may have been other reasons as well. The base of the Piazza Navona fountain portrayed a mountain, after all, and the new palace was situated on a prominence, the Mons Citatorius, that had been an important center of urban life in antiquity. The idea of the Louvre as a palace metaphorically on a mountain top may have germinated here. In the Roman palace the rustication is confined to the strips beneath the outermost pairs of the order of pilasters. These powerful animated bases thus appear as equivalents in ‘living’ rock of the atlantean figures that support the central balcony from which the pope would have greeted the populace (Fig. 29).

Although there is no documentary evidence that Bernini planned a piazza before the new Montecitorio palace, the monumental entrance and balcony would scarcely have made sense without one. Perhaps because of such a plan he first had the idea, to which we shall return, of moving the column of Trajan to form a pair with that of Marcus Aurelius. The place in front of the Montecitorio palace would have been the obvious choice for the new location, especially because nearby portions of a third column were preserved, that of Antoninus Pius. In fact, the name of the area was thought to have derived from the colonna citatoria, so called because it was supposedly used to disseminate public decrees. In studying the ancient columns, Bernini would have become aware not only of their Christianization — to be discussed presently — but also of the unrestored condition of the

---

24 For a brief summary and recent bibliography, see Borsi, 1980, 315. Bernini's original project, identified by the arms of Innocent X over the portal, is recorded in a painting in the Camera dei Deputati, Rome (Figs. 202, 203), often attributed to Bernini's assistant, Mattia de' Rossi (cf. Borsi et al., 1972, Fig. 16).

The palace was left half finished after 1654, following a rupture between the pope and his niece's husband Niccolo Ludovisi; it was finally completed in the early eighteenth century. Only the rusticated strip to the right of the central block was fully 'finished,' along with the rusticated window sills (another striking innovation in the design, which Bernini did not repeat for the Louvre); see now Terracina and Vittorini, 1983.


26 The possibility that this project (for which see further below, pp. 178 and n. 84) originated with Bernini's plans for the Palazzo Montecitorio was evidently first suggested by Capasso in 1966; cited by Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1967, 236 Fig. 47, scheda 201; followed by Krautheimer, 1983, 207.

Aurelian column, which had long been confused with the column of Antoninus. The original facing of the base had been hacked away, leaving only the rough-hewn substructure, the condition recorded in many early depictions. Bernini’s pilasters on rusticated strips were perhaps intended to evoke the destroyed column of Montecitorio by echoing the Aurelian column in its ruinous state, the memory of which was still very much alive. Indeed, the relationship was evidently appreciated by one artist who pointedly juxtaposed the un-restored column with the corner of Bernini’s unfinished palace in an engraved view of the Piazza Colonna published in 1679 (Fig. 30). If a reference to the decrepit triumphal column is thus incorporated into the façade of the building, it may serve, along with the supporting atlantes, to suggest the subservience of the power of antiquity to the New Dispensation represented by the pope.

The pair of colossal figures flanking the doorway was another motif that Bernini transferred from the Palazzo di Montecitorio to the Louvre. In Rome they were ‘subjugated’ to an ecclesiastical context, whereas in the secular domain at Paris they have become great guardian figures of Hercules carrying clubs (cf. Fig. 4). Hercules had long been a favorite antetype of the French kings, and sculptured depictions of Hercules and his Labors accompany the Apollo imagery that decorates the east façade of the Louvre in the project of François Le Vau (see Fig. 14). Early in the century, in the antiquarian Giacomo Lauro’s fanciful recreation of the façade of the Golden House of Nero, situated on the Mons Esquilinus, a pair of freestanding statues of Hercules with clubs had been placed before the central section (Fig. 31). In Bernini’s Louvre, the figures flank the portal, and they stand on rocky bases (on these supports, see p. 603 below); like the dressed masonry behind them, the figures mediate between the rusticated foundation below and the actual dwelling of the king above. In a letter written from Paris, Bernini’s assistant describes the figures as guardians of the

28 The base of the column of Antoninus Pius, now in the Vatican, and a portion of the shaft were excavated early in the eighteenth century, toward the end of which the present installation with the obelisk of Augustus was also created (D’Onofrio, 1965, 238 ff., 280 ff.). Early depictions of the Aurelian column are listed and some reproduced in Caprini et al., 1955, 42; Pietrangeli, 1955, 19 ff.


18. Wendel Dietterlin, fantastic portal (from Dietterlin, 1598, pl. 24).
19. Fountain of Mount Parnassus, destroyed in the eighteenth century; formerly Villa Pratolino, Florence (from Caus, 1616).

21. Scene of the underworld (from [G. Rospigliosi], 1634, pl. 2).
22. Federico Zuccari, the artist’s house. Florence (photo: Alinari 29281).


27. Detail of Fig. 26 (photo: Jack Freiberg).

29. Detail of Fig. 28.
30. Johann Meyer the Younger, view of Piazza Colonna

32. Onofrio Panvinio, Palatine palace and Circus Maximus (from Panvinio, 1642, 49).
33. Giacomo Lauro, Palatine palace and Circus Maximus (from Lauro, 1612-41, pl. 98).

34. Etienne Dupérac, Palatine palace and Circus Maximus (from Dupérac, 1621, pl. 9).
palace, signifying fortitude and labor. He quotes Bernini as explaining that Hercules ‘by means of his fortitude and labor is a portrait of virtue, which resides on the mountain of labor, that is, the rocky mass; and he says that whoever wishes to reside in this palace must pass through virtue and labor. This thought and allegory greatly pleased His Majesty, to whom it seemed to have grandeur and sententiousness.’

Bernini’s statement provides the key to the unity of form and meaning in the project, which incorporated two essential elements of the architectural heritage of antiquity, one affecting the design, the other the significance of the building. The Louvre proposals echo such features as the multistoried façade of open arcades, the curved atrium, and the rusticated base that appear in certain ideal reconstructions of the palace of the Roman emperors on the Palatine, notably those by Onofrio Panvinio and Giacomo Lauro (Figs. 32, 33). Bernini must also have been struck by the images that showed the palace in its contemporary ruinous state atop the rocky promontory (Fig. 34). This association, in turn, may have encouraged Bernini to extend his rocky base to the whole building, so as to underscore the Louvre’s role as a modern reincarnation of the ancient imperial palace, the embodiment of the very name for a royal dwelling, derived from the Mons Palatinus.

Furthermore, Bernini’s explanation of his project as expressing a moral-architectural progression articulated a concept implicit in another illustrious Roman structure, the double temple of Honor and Virtue — so arranged that one had to pass through the one to reach the other. Bernini was certainly familiar with the reconstruction by Giacomo Lauro (see p. 604 f. and Fig. 64 below), whose comments on the monument he seems to have drawn on for the underlying ethical tone as well as several themes echoed in his own ideas for the Louvre. Lauro quotes St. Augustine to the

---

30 ‘... sopra detto scoglio dalle parte della porta principale invece d’adornamento di doi colonne, vi ha fatto due grandi Ercoli, che fingono guardare il palazzo, alle quali il sig. caval. gli da un segnificato e dice Ercole è il retratto della vertù per mezzo della sua forza e fatica, quale risiede su il monte della fatica che è lo scoglio... e dice chi vuole risiedere in questa regia, bisogna che passi per mezzo della vertù e della fatica. Qual’pensiero e alegoria piaque grandamente a S. M., parendogli che havesse del grande e del sentesioso’ (Mirot, 1904, 218n., Mattia de’ Rossi, June 26).

31 Millon, 1987, 485 ff., has recently discussed the relationship between Bernini’s designs for the Louvre and the early reconstructions of the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine. Professor Millon very kindly shared with me the Palatine material he collected.

32 On the history of this view of the Palatine, see Zerner, 1965.
effect that in the ingenious disposition of the temple the ancient Romans taught that no one should be honored, or desire honors, who has not entered and long dwelt with profit in the virtues. . . . Princes should take this occasion to construct in their spirits similar temples of honor and virtue...exactly as did a number of ancient emperors . . . who never would accept the title of Maximus if they had not first earned it through virtue,’ as did Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, whose virtuous actions have been ‘preserved unharmed against the violence of time, war, and public calamities, as one may understand from the most beautiful columns constructed in their honor’ (on the columns see pp. 602 ff. below). Bernini must also have drawn on the one important precedent for relating this idea of a moral progression in architecture to that of a physical progression to the top of a rocky peak: a fresco made about 1600 by Federico Zuccari to decorate his own home in Rome (Fig. 35), in which the two temples, linked in turn to the temple of Fame, are perched on a high promontory reached by a tortuous path.

In sum, Bernini developed a whole new mode of architectural expression at the Louvre to convey Louis XIV’s adaptation of the traditional orien Augusti theme to himself as the Sun King. Bernini’s project created a summa of the major ancient Roman ‘solar’ palaces, merging them with a quasi-religious notion of ethical achievement expressed through architecture. These...
traditions, in turn, he associated with the equally venerable metaphor of the ruler as Hercules reaching the summit of the Mountain of Virtue. The visual, structural and metaphorical basis for these relationships was Bernini’s beloved scogliera, the invention of which, I am convinced, was the underlying motivation for his sudden willingness to abandon his earlier plans. This revolutionary form enabled him to envisage in his design for the Louvre the power of virtue and order to triumph over brute chaos.

The Bust Portrait

The bust of the king (Figs. 2, 5) is a ‘living’ metaphor that embodies two major themes, the royal medallic device and the imagery of Alexander the Great. In a sense, the merger simply vested in Louis XIV the ancient conflation of Helios and Alexander that had been the mainspring of the Sun King tradition itself.35 These references help to explain some of the work’s conspicuous differences from its nearest ancestor, Bernini’s portrait of Francesco I d’Este, duke of Modena, of the early 1650s (Fig. 36). Louis’s great wig engulfs his head with twisting lambent curls that are deeply undercut by corruscating drillwork; they recall Alexander’s ‘leonine mane’ and, in an uncanny way, suggest the flaming locks of the sun god, Helios (Fig. 37). The king’s forehead rises from heavily padded brows, and the vigorous sideward turn of the head and glance has a distinct upward cast suggestive not of arrogance but of a far-sighted, ardent and noble hauteur that is reminiscent of the ancient portrait type of the divinely inspired ruler. Bernini commented on these details, observing that ‘the head of the king has something of that of Alexander, particularly the forehead and the air of the face.’36 In other words, Bernini saw the features of Alexander in those of the king, and he reported more than once that people saw this resemblance in the bust itself: visitors, he said, were reminded of the medals and the ‘beautiful heads’ of Alexander.37 An antiquarian and collector of medals,

35 On Alexander, Helios, the divinely inspired ruler and the idea of apotheosis in ancient portraiture, see L’Orange, 1982, 34–36.
36 ‘Le Cavalier a dit . . . que la tête du Roi avait de celle d’Alexandre, particulièrement le front et l’air du visage’ (Chantelou, 1885, 99, August 15).
37 ‘. . . il m’a dit . . . qu’il venait de sortir un évêque, qui lui avait dit que son buste ressemblait aux médailles d’Alexandre, et que de lui donner pour piédestal un monde, il lui en ressemblait encore davantage’ (Chantelou, 1885, 178). ‘Il a ajouté que plusieurs avaient trouvé que le buste avait de ces belles têtes d’Alexandre’ (Chantelou, 1885, 187, September 27).
Pierre Seguin, also noted the strong Alexandrine ‘air’ of the bust, which ‘turned to the side as one sees in the medals’. Since the numismatic portraits of Alexander that can be identified with certainty are all in profile, the latter reference was probably to Greek coins of Helios with a three-quarter face or to a rare Roman type in which the head is turned up and to the side, and the neck and part of the chest are included to convey the torsion (Fig. 37). The beautiful heads must be the noted sculptures in Florence (Fig. 38) and Rome (Fig. 39) then universally identified as Alexander. The Roman version was associated with the group popularly known as the Pasquino; Bernini admired this pathetically mutilated work, which was thought to portray the death of Alexander, more than any other ancient sculpture. Both the head and the movement of the figure — one shoulder forward in the direction of the glance, the arm wrapped round the body in a powerful contrapposto — recall Alexander as he had been portrayed in a painting by Giulio Romano (Fig. 40). Giulio himself had adopted the pose of the Greek hero from that of Julius Caesar in Titian’s series of the Twelve Roman Emperors (Fig. 41). In Bernini’s sculpture the implied reversal of the lower right arm checks the forward thrust suggested by the movement of the upper torso and the drapery, a notable difference from the d’Este bust

---

38 ‘... le buste a beaucoup de l’air d’Alexandre et tournait de côté comme l’on voit aux médailles d’Alexandre’ (ibid., 183, September 26).

39 On the relationship to ancient Alexander portraiture, see Lavin, 1972, 181 n. 71. On the coin of Vespasian reproduced here, see Vermeule, 1986, 11; I am indebted to Dr. Vermeule for kind assistance in the numismatics of Alexander. M. J. Price brought to my attention a coin of Alexander of Pherae in which a three-quarter head of Hecate appears on the obverse (Gardner and Poole, 1883, 47 no. 14, Pl. X Fig. II). The relationship to Alexander and allegorical portraiture generally was formulated perfectly by Wittkower (1951, 18): ‘... Bernini rejected the popular type of allegorical portraiture then in favour at the court of Louis XIV which depicted le Roi Soleil in the guise of Apollo, of Alexander, or of a Roman Emperor. Bernini’s allusion to Alexander was expressed by physical and psychological affinities, not by external attributes.’ Allegory was confined to the base, which also reinforced the allusion to Alexander; see 573 ff. below).

40 On the work shown in Fig. 38, see Haskell and Penny, 1981, 134–36; on that in Fig. 39, see Helbig, 1963–72, II, 229 f. (the head has holes that served to hold metal rays).


42 Cf. I. Lavin, 1972, 180 n. 67; on the treatment of the arms generally, 177 ff. Vergara, 1983, 285, has also seen Bernini’s reference to this model, perhaps through the intermediary of one of Van Dyck’s series of portrait prints, the Iconography, in adopting the pose Van Dyck similarly raised the head and glance to suggest some distant and lofty goal or vision.
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whose significance will emerge when we consider the equestrian portrait of Louis.

The extraordinary drapery and Bernini’s special concern that it seem to be flowing freely in the wind may also be understood in the context of exultation and exaltation all’ antica. The use of drapery to ‘carry’ a portrait bust was derived from an ancient funereal tradition in which a portrait of the deceased was placed against a cloth of honor. Bernini adapted this device for certain memorials of the 1630s and 1640s, transforming the hanging cloth into a billowing swath of drapery (Fig. 42). The drapery of Francesco d’Este actually flutters upward and wraps around the torso, Christo-like, so as to suggest the lower silhouette of a portrait bust wafted into the empyrean. Bernini surely devised this mixture of objectivity and metaphor to give form to a train of political thought, particularly strong among the Jesuits, in which the ideal ruler was conceived as a hero, both human and divine. The concept of the monarch as a demigod-like prince-hero had been formulated with respect to Francesco I himself, shortly after his death in 1658, in a commemorative volume by a leading Jesuit of Modena, Domenico Gamberti, that actually celebrates Bernini’s portrait of the duke (Fig. 43). The sculpture thus represents what it is, an honorific
monument of heroic apotheosis. In the bust of Louis, Bernini carried this conundrum a significant step further. Louis’s drapery gives no hint of the lower edge of the torso, so that the figure appears to be what the sculpture represents, a living human being. Moreover, the cloth blows freely to the side, and Louis’s cloak becomes a kind of magic carpet, the sartorial equivalent of the cloud formations above which the emblematic sun appears to float.

The king’s device and the imagery of Alexander also coincided in the treatment of the pedestal, a final point of difference from the d’Este portrait. Chantelou records that Bernini intended to place the bust of the king on a terrestrial globe of gilded and enameled copper bearing the ingenious inscription *Picciola basa*, ‘small base’; the globe rested on a copper drapery emblazoned with trophies and virtues (these last were essential attributes in Bernini’s conception of the ideal ruler, as we shall see); and the whole was set on a platform. It was a common device to portray a monarch perched on an earthly sphere; a specifically French typology had been established by images in which Henry IV was shown thus, both as a standing figure and as an equestrian mounted on a rearing Pegasus.\(^{46}\) There was also an ancient tradition of portrait busts mounted on a (celestial) globe to suggest apotheosis (Fig. 44). A bust-monument of the emperor Claudius included a pedestal with a globe and military spoils that in the mid-seventeenth century had been placed on a sculptured platform (Fig. 45). Bernini may have been inspired to apply these ideas to Louis by another invention of Le Brun’s, perhaps again for Fouquet. I refer to a tapestry door covering, or portière, in which the crowned face of the sun shines above the arms of France and Navarre; below, a terrestrial globe rests on a panoply of military spoils (Fig. 46).\(^{47}\) It is indeed as though Le Brun’s magnificent and emblem-
atic armorial display had suddenly come to life. The motivating force was evidently Plutarch’s familiar description of Lysippus’s portrait of Alexander, which combined the upward and sideward glance with a reference to the earth below: ‘When Lysippus first modelled a portrait of Alexander with his face turned upward toward the sky, just as Alexander himself was accustomed to gaze, turning his neck gently to one side, someone inscribed, not inappropriately, the following epigram: ‘The bronze statue seems to proclaim, looking at Zeus: I place the earth under my sway; you O Zeus keep Olympos.’ These references were quite evident to contemporaries. When Bernini described his idea for the base, Chantelou drew the analogy with the king’s device. Another witness, no doubt aware of the passage in Plutarch, perceived the link between the royal emblem and the ancient monarch, remarking, as Bernini himself reported, that the addition of the world as a base enhanced the resemblance to Alexander.

The multiple allusions to the royal device and to the Helios-Alexander tradition fill the bust with meaning; they contribute as well to its expressive intensity and to the sense of supernatural aloofness it conveys.

The Equestrian Portrait

The bust of Louis is itself without any allegorical paraphernalia: the king is shown wearing his own — not classical — armor, and his own Venetian lace collar, in a vivid likeness with lips poised at the moment Bernini described as just before or after speaking; one observer thought Louis looked as if he were about to issue a command. All this was

48 Bernini visited the Gobelin tapestry factory and greatly praised Le Brun’s designs on September 6 — ‘Il a fort loué les dessins et tableaux de M. Le Brun et la fertilité de son invention’ (Chantelou, 1885, 140) — four days before he designed the pedestal for the bust (see n. 50 below).

49 Pollitt, 1965, 145.

50 ‘Je lui ait dit que sa pensée se rapporte encore heureusement à la devise du Roi, dont le corps est un soleil avec le mot: Nec pluribus impar’ (Chantelou, 1885, 150, September 10); cf. also Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, 153 n. 16).

51 See n. 37 above.

52 For all these points, see Wittkower, 1951, 16, 17, 18.

The passage in Chantelou concerning the subtle expression of the mouth is worth quoting: ‘Le Cavalier, continuant de travailler à la bouche, a dit que, pour réussir dans un portrait, il faut prendre un acte et tâcher à le bien représenter; que le plus beau temps qu’on puisse choisir pour la bouche est quand on vient de parler ou qu’on va prendre la parole; qu’il cherche à attraper ce moment’ (Chantelou, 1885, 133, September 4).
changed in the equestrian monument, where the king was shown in antique guise, his features, as we know from the sources, utterly transfigured into those of a radiant, smiling youth (Figs. 3, 6). Functionally, Bernini’s project took up an old tradition — which had been followed by Francois Mansart, Pierre Cottard, and Charles Perrault in their projects for the Louvre — of equestrian statues of French kings in their residences; Bernini’s was evidently the first such monument in France with a rearing horseman, and freestanding rather than attached to the building. The precedent in both these respects was Pietro Tacca’s sculpture of Philip IV in the garden of the Buen Retiro at Madrid (1642), the first monumental rearing equestrian in bronze since antiquity (Fig. 47); the apparent emulation reflects the notorious French rivalry with Spain, further repercussions of which will emerge presently.

In form, Bernini’s work was intentionally related to but also, as he himself reported, completely different from his earlier equestrian monument of the emperor Constantine in Rome (Fig. 48). Both horses rear in strikingly similar poses, and the riders mount, miraculously, without reins or stirrups. But whereas the glance and gestures of Constantine are raised to convey his spiritual bedazzlement at the vision of the Holy Cross above, those of Louis are earthbound and convey his mundane power in what Bernini called an ‘act of majesty and command.’ The phrase should not be taken as referring to a military directive, as in Donatello’s Gattamelata — an interpretation Bernini abjured (see below). Instead, he adapted the gesture of Verrocchio’s Colleoni or Francesco Mochi’s Alessandro Farnese in Piacenza (Fig. 49) to suggest that this ruler leads by sheer force of being. And whereas Constantine springs from an abstract architectural base, Bernini gave Louis a new form of support reminiscent of the substructure of the Piazza Navona fountain and echoing that of the Louvre itself (Fig. 50). The base portrayed a craggy peak and the image as a whole recalled that of

---

53 On the French tradition, see M. Martin, 1986; Prinz and Kecks, 1985, 252–61; Scheller, 1985, 52 ff. The Louvre projects with equestrian statues mounted on the façade are conveniently reproduced in Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, Figs. 56, 57, 61.

54 See J. Brown and Elliott, 1980, 111 ff.; Torriti, 1984, 50 ff. But see also n. 72 below

55 See p. 594 and n. 73 below. On the Constantine and on its relation to the Louis XIV monument see now respectively Marder, 1992, and Fumaroli, 1994.

56 On these gestures, see Lavin, ‘Duquesnoy’s ‘Nano di Créqui,’, 1970, pp. 145 f., n. 78.
47. L. Meunier, entrance to Buen Retiro, Madrid, engraving. 
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49. Francesco Mochi, equestrian monument of Alessandro Farnese. 
Piazza dei Cavalli, Piacenza (photo: Manzotti, Piacenza).
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50. Bernini, study for the equestrian monument of Louis XIV, drawing.
Museo Civico, Bassano.

52. Achille Bocchi, “Felicitas prudentiae et diligentiae est” (from Bocchi, 1555, p. CLXXVIII).
Pegasus atop Mount Parnassus (see Fig. 19). In the final version a swirl of windblown flags symbolized the conquest of the summit; like the drapery of Louis's bust, the unfurling banners seemed to bear the portrait aloft (see Figs. 56, 57).

When the work was recut to represent Marcus Curtius hurling himself into the fiery abyss, two major changes were made. The flowing hair at the back of the head became the casque of a crested helmet, and the flags were transformed into a mass of flames. I do not believe the expression was radically altered, since one of its most distinctive features, its benign smile, must have seemed appropriate to the new subject; the theme of heroic self-sacrifice preserved, as we shall see, an essential element of the meaning Bernini intended for the work. The smile echoed the resplendent visage of Bernini’s own image of Truth. The smiling sun was a traditional metaphor, of course, and Bernini was not the first to portray Louis this way; the image of radiant youthful benignity had appeared a few years earlier, for example, in a portrait of the king as Jupiter, victorious after the rebellions of the Fronde (Fig. 51). Also relevant, perhaps, was the description of an equestrian figure of the emperor Domitian by the poet Statius, who expresses the

---

57 The analogies with the Piazza Navona fountain and the Louvre rustication were also observed by Bauer, in Chantelou, 1985, 37 f., n. 115. Wittkower (1961, 508 ff.) discussed the relationship with the Pegasus-Mount Parnassus theme, which was often conflated with that of Hercules at the Crossroads.

58 Wittkower (1961, 502–5) argues convincingly that the smile and the victory flags were introduced late in the execution of the work, following Louis’s victorious campaign in Holland in the spring of 1672.

59 The only records of the original face, two medals by Antonio Trevani of about 1680 (cf. Figs. 56, 57), seem to me quite compatible with the face as we have it now (the replaced nose notwithstanding). Nor do I consider contradictory to this idealization Elpidio Benedetti’s statement in September 1672 that the face closely resembled that in other portraits of the king that had been sent to Rome (see Wittkower, 1961, 504 n. 21, 525, no. 47). On the youthfulness of the face, see also Berger, In the Garden, 1985, 107 n. 11.

I might add that there is no real evidence that the smile itself was found offensive. The specific objection raised by a Frenchman, to which Bernini’s reply is quoted in the text, was that the smile was inappropriate to the military bearing of man and horse. Domenico Bernini reports the episode as a misunderstanding of Bernini’s intention, based on a conventional view of the king and army commanders (the passage is quoted in full in n. 63 below). There was, incidentally, a venerable equestrian monument with a smiling rider, Cangrande della Scala at Verona (Panofsky, 1964, 84, Figs. 385, 387).

60 Cf. The Sun King, 191 no. 20; Berger, In the Garden, 1985, 10, Fig. 7.
joy of contemplating a face in which are mixed the signs of war and peace.\textsuperscript{61} To convey Bernini’s thought, however, I can do no better than to quote his own words:

I have not represented King Louis in the act of commanding his armies. This, after all, would be appropriate for any prince. But I wanted to represent him in the state he alone has been able to attain through his glorious enterprises. And since the poets imagine that Glory resides on the top of a very high and steep mountain whose summit only a few climb,\textsuperscript{62} reason demands that those who nevertheless happily arrive there after enduring privations [superati disaggi], joyfully breathe the air of sweetest Glory, which having cost terrible labors [disastrosi travagli] is the more dear, the more lamentable the strain [rincescevole . . . stento] of the ascent has been. And as King Louis with the long course of his many famous victories has already conquered the steep rise of the mountain, I have shown him as a rider on its summit, in full possession of that Glory, which, at the cost of blood [costo di sangue], his name has acquired. Since a jovial face and a gracious smile are proper to him who is contented, I have represented the monarch in this way.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{61} ‘Iuvat ora tueri mixta notis belli placidamque gerentia pacem’ (\textit{Silvae}, I, 1, 15–16; Statius, 1928, I, 6).

\textsuperscript{62} The \textit{locus classicus} of the theme is in Hesiod’s \textit{Works and Days}, lines 289–91: ‘. . . between us and Goodness the gods have placed the sweat of our brows: long and steep is the path that leads to her, and it is rough at first; but when a man has reached the top, then she is easy to reach, though before that she was hard’ (Hesiod, 1950, 24 f.). Bernini’s notion of Glory at the apex of the mountain as the reward of virtue depends on a tradition stemming from Petrarch (cf. Wittkower, 1961, 507 f.). See also 606 f., 618 f., 621 f. below.

\textsuperscript{63} The translation, with some alterations, is from Wittkower, 1961, 503. I quote the whole passage, which concerns an ‘ingegnoso cavalier Francese, che assuefatto alla vista del suo Rè in atto Maestoso, e da Condottiere di Eserciti, non lodava, che quì allora coll’armatura pur’indosso, e sopra un Cavallo medesimamente guerriero, si dimostrasse nel volto giulivo, e piacevole, che più disposto pareva a dispensar grazie, che ad atterrir’inimici, e soggiogar Provincie. Poiche spiegògli a lungo la sua intenzione, quale, benche espressa adeguatamente ancora nell’Opera, tuttavia non arrivò a comprendere il riguardante. Dissegl dunque, \textit{Non haver’egli figurato il Rè Luigi in atto di commandare a gli Eserciti, cosa, che finalmente è propria di ogni Principe, mà haverlo voluto collocare in uno stato, al quale non altri, che esso era potuto giungere, e ciò per mezzo delle sue glorioshe operazioni. E come che fingono i Poeti risieder la gloria sopra un’altissimo, ed erto Monte, nella cui sommità rari son quelli, che facilmente vi poggiano, ragion vuole, che quei, che pur felicemente vi arrivano doppo i superati dis-}
The equestrian *Louis XIV* went through several stages of development and incorporated many ideas and traditions, of which I want to consider only a few. An important, though heretofore unnoticed, idea is reflected in an emblem book published by a learned Bolognese antiquarian and historian, Achille Bocchi, in 1555 (Fig. 52). One of Bocchi’s devices shows a horseman, Diligence, striving up a high peak to receive from Felicity a crown ornamented with fleurs-de-lys. The caption reads, ‘Happiness is the ultimate reward of prudence and diligence.’64 Once again Bernini merges the image of the rustic mountain of glory scaled by the assiduous labors of virtue with that of the radiant and beneficent sun shining brightly above the earth.

What might be called the physical character of the monument — its size and technique — is an essential part of its meaning. As far as I can determine Bernini’s *Louis XIV* is the first monumental, free-standing, rearing equestrian statue executed in stone since antiquity. It was, moreover, carved from a single block, ‘larger than the Constantine,’ ‘the largest ever seen in Rome,’ ‘the largest ever struck by chisel,’ according to the early biographers.65 The whole enterprise, especially considering the mountainous base,
reminded one contemporary of the architect Dinocrates who, in the guise of Hercules, proposed to carve a statue of Alexander the Great from Mount Athos. The operative factor here was the ancient mystique, emulated by

(1713, 107) reports that the Constantine was carved from a block of 30 carretate, or 30 x 362.43 cm.\(^3\) = 10.87 m.\(^3\) (cf. Zupke, 1981, 85; Klapisch-Zuber, 1969, 72 f.). The equestrian Louis XIV measures cm. 366h x 364l x 150w = 19.98 m.\(^3\). These claims evidently discounted the ancient tradition that the much larger Farnese Bull was made ex uno lapide (see below).

The feat of carving a life-size free-standing equestrian statue from a single block was extolled in the fourteenth century, with reference to the monument of Bernabò Visconti in Milan (Pope-Hennessy, 1972, 201).

66 Vitruvius, 1931–34, I, 72 f. Dézallier d’Argenville, 1787, I, 220–22, refers the Alexander story to Bernini’s sculpture, citing Jean Barbier d’Aucour (1641–94). It should be borne in mind that metaphorical mountains generally were then much in vogue in Rome, mountains forming part of the family arms of Fabio Chigi, the reigning pope Alexander VII (1655–67). The story was applied to the pope in a composition by Pietro da Cortona (cf. Noehles, 1970, 16, 36, Fig. 27; Körte, 1937, 305 f.; Fagiolo, in Bernini in Vaticano, 1981, 159 f.; see also n. 75 below. Recent contributions on the Dinocrates theme are Oechslin, 1982; Meyer, 1986.

The size of Bernini’s sculpture and the reference to Alexander and Mount Athos are the main theme of a poem eulogizing the work written by the great Bolognese art critic and historian Carlo Cesare Malvasia, printed as a broadside in 1685. As far as I know, the text has never been cited in the literature on the sculpture. I reprint it here, in extenso, from a copy in the Princeton University library:

PER LA STATUA EQUESTRE
DEL RE CHRISTIANISSIMO
COLOSSEO MARMOREO
DEL FIDIA DE NOSTRI TEMPI
IL SIG. CAVALIER BERNINI
ALL ILLUSTRISS. ET ECCELLENTISS. SIG. IL SIG.
MARCHESE DI LOVVOIS.

Questa di bel Destrier Mole fastosa
In sostener del RE l’Imago viua,
E la più del Bernini opera famosa,
Ch’eterna lode al suo gran nome ascriva.

Con essa mai di gareggiar non osa
Greco scalpello, e non mai lima Argiua;
E vinta è quell’idea sì ardimentosa,
Che far di vn monte vn’Alessandro ardiua.

Pure al degno lauor nega, ò contrasta
La penuria del marmo il pregio intiero,
Quasi picciola sia mole si vasta;

Che il Colosso à formar del RE GVERRIERO,
Maggior di vn Alessandro, oggi non basta
55. Andrea Rivalta, equestrian monument of Vittorio Amadeo I of Savoy.
Palazzo Reale, Turin (photo: Aschieri, Turin).
56. Antonio Travani, medal of Louis XIV.  
Vatican Library, Rome.

57. Antonio Travani, medal of Louis XIV.  
Vatican Library, Rome.
58. Antonio Travani, medal of Louis XIV, reverse of Fig. 56. Vatican Library, Rome.

60. Ancient (?) relief linking Apollo and Hercules. Formerly Villa Mattei, Rome (from Kircher, 1650, 236).
61. Catafalque of Francesco I d’Este
(from Gamberti, 1659, opp. p. 190).
sculptors since the Renaissance, of large-scale monolithic sculpture as testimony to the prowess of both the artist and the subject.67

Bernini's concept for the marble group had several notable precedents in purely secular contexts, in Rome, and in Florence and Turin, where the artist was received at court in grand style as he traveled to Paris.68 First and foremost was the so-called Farnese Bull, representing the Fable of Dirce, now in the Archeological Museum in Naples (Fig. 53).69 In Bernini's time it was to be seen in Michelangelo's Palazzo Farnese in Rome, having been discovered in the Baths of Caracalla in 1545 and identified as a Labor of Hercules, the heroic ancestor of the Farnese family. One of the most prominent of all ancient sculptures known in the Renaissance, a few months before Bernini's visit to Paris, Louis had sought more than once to acquire the piece for himself. The significance of the sculpture was partly a matter of scale and technique — a huge 'mountain of marble,' as it was called, with multiple figures carved, it was also said, from a single block; the work was mentioned for precisely these reasons in a discussion of important antiquities during Bernini's stay at the French court. Furthermore, from Bernini's point of view, at least, the epithet 'mountain of marble' could be taken literally, offering classical precedent for the unorthodox pedestal he envisioned for his own group. Finally, the great work had been the motivation for an ambitious project of Michelangelo, described by Vasari, for the Farnese palace then under construction. Michelangelo would have made the sculpture the focal point of a vista extending from the square in front of

D'Ato e di Olimpo il doppio giogo altiero.
Humiliss., e Deuotiss. Seruitore
Carlo Cesare Malvasia.
IN ROMA, Nella Stamperia della Reuerenda Camera Apostolica.
M.DC.LXXV.
CON LICENZA DE'SUPERIORI.
(The broadside is part of a collection mentioned by Lindgren and Schmidt, 1980, 187.)
68 On his way north Bernini stopped in Florence for three days and in Turin for two. His regal treatment by Ferdinando II of Tuscany and Carlo Emanuele of Savoy is described by Baldinucci, 1948, 117 f., and Bernini, 1713, 125. Bernini also stopped in Turin on his way back to Rome (cf. Mirot, 1904, 260 n. 2); a product of this visit was his role in an imaginary dialogue describing the ducal hunting lodge published by Di Castellamonte, 1674, see ‘Madama Reale’ prologue; further, Clarettia, 1885, 517 ff.; Cavallari-Murat, 1984, 347 ff.
69 For the facts presented here see Haskell and Penny, 1981, 165–67, with references, and the important results of the recent restoration of the group in Il Toro, 1991. The Farnese Bull measures cm. 370h x 295l x 293w = 31.98 m.3.
the Farnese palace, through the building itself to the courtyard in the rear, where the group would have been installed as a fountain, and beyond along a new bridge across the Tiber to a Farnese garden and casino on the other side of the river. The challenge of the heroic sculptural feat of the ancients, the bold idea of a naturalistically carved base that served to raise the figure to the summit of the earth, and the prospect of integrating the sculpture along a grandiose urban, architectural and landscape axis — all these features associated with the Farnese Bull were emulated in Bernini’s plan to locate his monolithic, multfigured, mountain-top monument in the space between the rear façade of the Louvre and the Tuileries palace.

No less essential to Bernini’s thought was an equestrian monument of sorts that had also been carved from a single, if considerably smaller, block: Giovanni Bologna’s Hercules overcoming a Centaur, dated 1600, in the Loggia dei Lanzi in Florence (Fig. 54).70 The group was intended to glorify Ferdinando I and the Medici dynasty of Tuscany, which more than any other set the direction for the European monarchic style that Louis XIV would follow. The relevance of the work lay partly in its form and material (especially the idea of using the rocky base to support the animal’s belly) and partly in the way the Herculean theme was interpreted — not simply as a victory but as a labor, an obstacle overcome on the road to glory. This message was spelled out on a commemorative medal, inscribed Sic itur ad astra, ‘thus one reaches the stars.’71 Giambologna’s sculpture itself, the medal, and the inscription were all to be reflected in Bernini’s work.

In certain respects the nearest antecedent for Bernini’s idea was the equestrian statue of Vittorio Amadeo I of Savoy, which had been installed just a year before Bernini’s visit in a niche in the grand staircase of the Palazzo Reale in Turin (Fig. 55).72 This mixed-media work by Andrea Rivalta — the horse is of marble, the rider and supporting figures of bronze — must have raised the prospect of a rearing equestrian portrait in stone as

70 I am indebted to Signoria Nicoletta Carmiel of Florence, who helped with the recent restoration of the group, for obtaining its dimensions: cm 285h x 200l x 130w = 7.41 m³ (cf. n. 65 above); Avery, 1987, 117 f.
72 See most recently, Viale, ed., 1963, II, 25 f. Rivalta’s horse was itself a substitute for an unexecuted project of 1619 by Pietro Tacca that would have preceded the Philip IV in Madrid as the first modern rearing equestrian monument in bronze (cf. Torriti, 1984, 31 ff.; K. J. Watson, in Avery and Radcliffe, eds., 1978–79, 182 f.).
a royal monument, perhaps to reinforce visually Louis's political hegemony over the north Italian duchy. Taken together, the Giambologna and Rivalta sculptures foreshadowed Bernini's conception of a monolithic freestanding rearing equestrian portrait and the idea of a royal equestrian monument with a Herculean theme.

In the religious, or quasi-religious sphere, the monument responded to a specific request from Colbert that it be similar but not identical to Bernini's own portrayal of the first Christian emperor, situated at the junction between the narthex of St. Peter's and the Scala Regia, the Royal Stairway to the Vatican palace. The allusion was doubly significant in view of the association the French must have made between the statue in Rome and the many equestrian figures, often identified with Constantine and his Frankish reincarnation Charlemagne, that decorate the entrance portals to French medieval churches. The reference served to assimilate Louis to the venerable tradition identifying the French monarchs as the defenders of the faith and true successors to the Holy Roman Empire.73

The secular and Christian themes conveyed by Bernini's sculpture were epitomized in two medals struck in Rome about 1680, doubtless under the aegis of the pope, reproducing the final design.74 One medal (Fig. 56), which is monoface, bears the inscription \textit{Hac iter ad superos}, 'this way to the...

73 Colbert asked Bernini to 'faire la figure du Roi de la manière de celle de vostre Constantin, en changeant neantmoins quelque chose dans l’attitude de la figure et du cheval en sorte que l’on ne puisse pas dire que s’en est une Coppie, et que d’ailleurs ce bloc de marbre a l’estendue et les mesures necessaires pour cela . . .' (letter of December 6, 1669, quoted in part by Wittkower, 1961, 521, no. 23); Bernini responded, 'Questa statua sarà del tutto diversa a quella di Costantino, perche Costantino stà in atto d’amire la Croce che gl’ap-parve, e questa del Rè starà in atto di maestà, e di comando, nè io mai havrei permesso, che la statua del Rè fosse una copia di quella di Costantino' (December 30, Wittkower, 1961, 521, no. 24, cf. p. 501).

On the equestrian figures of Constantine-Charlemagne, Seidel, 1976. Bernini had planned a correspondence between the rulers in the piazza of St. Peter's: a schematic note shows them derived from the ‘metamorphosis’ of Peter (Menichella, 1987, 15 f., Fig. 25; Morello, 1992, 206, with attribution to Alexander VII). In a letter of 1550–60 Guglielmo della Porta recalled a proposal under Clement VII (1523–34) for a pair of equestrian monuments of the emperor Charles V and the ‘Re Christianissimo’ Francis I, defenders of the faith, to be placed before the portico of St. Peter’s (Gramberg, 1964, 120; cf. Mockler, 1967, 172).

74 The medals, by Antonio Travani, were first published by Dworschak, 1934, 34 f.
This was a preeminently Herculean sentiment, associated especially with the theme of Hercules at the Crossroads; the hero chooses the difficult path of righteousness over the easy road to pleasure, thereby expressing the supreme Stoic virtue, conquest of the self. The other medal (Fig. 57) shows the sculpture on the obverse, with two inscriptions. The legend *Lud(ovicus) magn(us) rex christianissimus* describes Louis as 'the Great' and as 'Most Christian King' — both early epithets adopted by Louis in reference to the secular and religious titles by which the French kings traced their authority back through Charlemagne to Constantine the Great. The motto on the flags, *Et major titulis virtus*, ‘virtue is greater than titles,’ emphasizes the moral, as distinct from the feudal, basis of Louis's claims to the titles, a crucial point to which we shall return presently. The reverse of the medal (Fig. 58) has an allegorical composition in which Victory and Religion triumph over Heresy — an obvious reference to the Huguenots — with the motto *Vicitore rege victrix religio*, ‘victorious the king, victorious religion.’

75 The same motto had been used by Stefano della Bella in an allegorical composition of 1661 showing the Chigi mountain emblem (cf. n. 66 above) as the Mountain of Virtue whose tortuous path is recommended by the Wise Men of antiquity and the prudent Hercules: ‘Per salebrosus Montium anfractus certissimum esse Virtutis, ad Beatitudinem, ac ad Superos iter, fuit commune Sapientiorum judicium, prudens Herculis ad posteros documentum’ (Donati, 1939; cf. Bernini in Vaticano, 1981, 162; Massar, 1971, 61 f., no. 69, Pl. 25).

According to Cureau de la Chambre (1685, 23), the statue was to have been inscribed with the motto *Per Ardua*: ‘Il doit y avoir un inscription Latine au bas, qui en deux mots renferme tout ce qu’on peut dire sur un sujet si heroique. PER ARDUA. Le depart de cette Statue a donne lieu de supposer un Dialogue . . .’ This passage was added to the version of the ‘Eloge’ printed in the *Journal des sçavans* in 1681, for which see Wittkower, 1961, 529.


77 This medal is reproduced by Menestrier, 1693, Pl. 29, no. CLII, with the following caption: ‘La Ville de Rome a consacre ce Monument au zele DU ROY TRES CHRESTIEN LOUIS LE GRAND, PLUS GRAND ENCORE PAR SA VERTU QUE PAR LE RANG QU’IL TIENT et la Victoire qui eleve la Couronne Royale au dessus de la Croix que tient la Religion et qui a l’heresie sous ses pieds, assure que PENDANT QUE LE ROY SERA VICTORIEUX, LA RELIGION TRIOMPHERA.’

On the French king as *Rex Christianissimus*, see De Pange, 1949. In connection with this epithet, Fumaroli has emphasized the sacerdotal nature of Louis’s conception of kingship (see Fumaroli, 1986, 108 ff.). The tapestry series of the life of Constantine, begun by Louis XIII and completed by Urban VIII had drawn a connection between the French king Constantine and the pope (Dubon, 1964).

Louis adopted the title Magnus only in 1672 (see Jacquiot, 1967, 190 n. 1).
63, Domenico Fontana, catafalque of Pope Sixtus V
(from Catani, 1591, pl. 24).
64. Giacomo Lauro, *Temple of Honor and Virtue*
(from Lauro, 1612–41, pl. 30).

65. Allegory of the Peace of the Pyrenees
(from Menestrier, 1660, opp. p. 54).
66. Workshop of Bernini (?), project for the stairway to Trinità dei Monti, drawing.
MS Chigi P. VIII. 10, fols. 30v–31, Vatican Library, Rome.

67. Detail of Fig. 66.

70. Etienne Dupérac, Michelangelo’s project for the Campidoglio, engraving.
71. Emblem of Gregory XIII’s Palazzo Quirinale (from Fabricii, 1588, p. 308).
The pedestal of Bernini’s sculpture was to have borne the inscription *Non Plus Ultra*, and it would have been flanked with two great columns alluding both to the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius in Rome and to the Pillars of Hercules (cf. Fig. 59). To my knowledge, these potent symbols, real and mythical, of ancient imperial and Herculean triumph were here linked for the first time. The idea of a portrait of the Sun King placed between the Pillars of Hercules may have derived from an ancient devotional

78 ‘... il lui était venu dans la pensée de faire dans cet espace deux colonnes comme la Trajane et l’Antonine et, entre les deux, un piédestal où serait la statue du Roi à cheval avec le mot de *non plus ultra*, allusion à celle d’Hercule’ (Chantelou, 1885, 96, August 13). The project is reflected in the medal of Charles VI of 1717 illustrated in Fig. 59 (Koch, 1975—76, 59; Volk, 1966, 61); here, however, the equestrian group, the pedestal, the columns, and the motto are all returned to their traditional forms and reconverted to the traditional theme of Hapsburg imperialism. For more of the legacy of Bernini’s idea, see n. 79 below.

Combinatory thinking as a means of superseding the great monuments of antiquity also underlies Bernini’s alternative project for the area between the Louvre and the Tuileries — a double structure for spectacles and stage performances, joining the Colosseum to the Theater of Marcellus (Chantelou, 1885, 96, August 13 — perhaps reflected in a later project reproduced by Del Pesco, *Il Louvre*, 1984, Figs. 43; cf. pp. 42, 49 n. 22).

79 A certain precedent is provided by Roman sarcophagi in which the labors of Hercules are placed between columns with spiral fluting (cf. Robert, 1969, part 1, 143 ff., Pls. XXIV ff.) and in works like the Hercules fountain in the Villa Aldobrandini at Frascati, where water descends around the pair of columns in spiral channels (D’Onofrio, 1963, Figs. 78, 82, 86, 90; Fagiolo dell’Arco, 1964, 82 ff.; R. M. Steinberg, 1965). The columns of the Hapsburg device, often shown entwined by spiraling banners, were identified by Rubens (J. R. Martin, 1972, Pl. 37) with the twisted columns in St. Peter’s in Rome, supposedly brought from the Temple of Jerusalem by Constantine the Great; see also a painting of Augustus and the Sibyl by Antoine Caron (Yates, 1975, 145, Fig. 21). Yet, none of these cases involved Bernini’s clear and explicit conflation of the triumphal and Herculean columns.

Perhaps Bernini was himself alluding to the pair of columns erected by Solomon before the Temple of Jerusalem (1 Kings VII, 14–22; 2 Chron. 3:17); these were frequently associated with the twisted columns at St. Peter’s, an association that had played an important role in Bernini’s designs for the crossing of St. Peter’s. (Lavin, *Bernini*, 1968, 14 ff., 34; the paired columns of Perrault’s Louvre façade have been linked to the Temple of Solomon by Corboz, 1984). If so, Bernini would have been the first to extend the association to the imperial spiral columns, an idea that was then taken up by Fischer von Erlach in the St. Charles Church, Vienna, built for Charles VI: the pair of columns flanking the façade is identified in one source as Constancy and Fortitude, in reference to the biblical names of Solomon’s columns, Jachin and Boaz, meaning ‘He shall establish’ and ‘In it is strength’ (cf. Fergusson, 1970, 321 ff.; further to Fischer’s columns in Chabrowe, 1974). Fischer seems also to echo the design and the themes of Giacomo Lauro’s reconstruction of the ancient temple of Honor and Virtue in Rome, to be discussed presently.
relief much discussed by contemporary antiquarians as an epitome of classical mythological symbolism (Fig. 60). A radiate bust of Apollo appears between a pair of Herculean clubs resting on rocky bases that anticipate the supports of the Hercules figures flanking the entrance in Bernini’s third Louvre project (see Fig. 4). The relief which was in the Mattei collection in Rome, had been illustrated and interpreted by the great Jesuit polymath Athanasius Kircher, who had worked closely with Bernini on the Piazza Navona fountain, in a learned book on the fountain’s obelisk. Rearing equestrian portraits and twisted columns had appeared together on the catafalque of Francesco I d’Este (Fig. 61); Bernini had once engaged to provide the model of a commemorative equestrian monument of the duke for the Piazza Ducale at Modena. Paired columns representing the pillars of Hercules and associated with the motto Non Plus Ultra were a common emblem that might refer either to an unsurpassable achievement, physical or spiritual, or a limitation imposed by prudence. Associated especially with the Hapsburgs, the device also connoted the geographical extent of the empire.

Kircher also wrote a book on the Piazza Minerva obelisk erected by Bernini shortly after his return from Paris (Heckscher, 1947); in certain workshop studies for the monument the obelisk is held up by allegorical figures posed on a rocky base (Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, Pls. 176, 177b; cf. also D’Onofrio, 1965, Fig. 134 opp. p. 235). Bernini’s preoccupation at this period with the theme of the rocky mountain of virtue is expressed also in a series of drawings of devotional themes, which evidently began during his stay in Paris. The compositions portray penitent saints kneeling and ecstatically worshiping a crucifix that lies prone before them; all portray the event taking place atop a rocky peak. See Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, 151 ff.; Blunt, 1972.

All these associations converged in Bernini’s mind with a stunning proposal he had evidently made to Pope Alexander VII in Rome before his trip to Paris. The family of the pope in 1659 had acquired a palace on the Piazza Colonna, immediately adjacent to the still unfinished Palazzo di Montecitorio, which Bernini had designed for Alexander’s predecessor. Bernini suggested moving the column of Trajan from the Forum, presumably to the Piazza di Montecitorio, to make a pair with the column of Marcus Aurelius. This arrangement would have created an explicit reciprocity between the columns in the Montecitorio-Colonna area, and the two papal palaces would have been linked by the city’s most grandiose public square after that of St. Peter’s itself. Thus paired, the columns would have suggested the columns and metas marking the spina of an ancient circus, and the whole arrangement would have recalled that at Piazza Navona (Fig. 62) — the ancient stadium of Domitian — as well as the disposition of the Vatican Palace beside the circus of Nero. The connection of palace and circus evoked an ancient tradition of imperial, Herculean triumph, based on the juxtaposition of the palace of the emperors on the Palatine and the Circus Maximus (see Figs. 32, 33). The ancient columns had been paired spiritually, as it were, ever since Sixtus V had crowned them with statues of Peter and Paul, patrons of the Holy See. Sixtus also restored the badly damaged column of Marcus Aurelius, and the inscription on the new base refers to the triumph of Christianity over paganism. The ancient spiral columns had also been brought together physically as trophies on the catafalque erected for Sixtus’s funeral in 1591 (Fig. 63) and as background

83 See most recently Krautheimer, 1983 and 1985, 53 ff.
84 Bernini recalls his project on two occasions recorded in Chantelou’s diary: ‘Il a parlé ensuite de la proposition qu’il avait faite au Pape de transporter la colonne Trajane dans la place où est la colonne Antoniane, et d’y faire deux fontaines que fussent baigné toute la place; qu’elle eût été la plus belle de Rome’ (Chantelou, 1885, 40, June 25); ‘Il a dit qu’il avait proposé au Pape de la transporter dans la place où est l’Antoniane, et là, faire deux grandes fontaines, qui auraient noyé la place en été; que c’eût été la plus magnifique chose de Rome; qu’il répondait de la transporter sans la gâter’ (Chantelou, 1885, 249, October 19).

A legacy of Bernini’s idea, and an echo of his linking it to France, are evident in the pair of monumental spiral columns that formed part of the temporary decorations erected in the Piazza Navona to celebrate the birth of Louis XIV’s successor in 1729 (Kiene, 1991).
85 The ancient tradition, admirably sketched by Frazer, 1966, was revived in the palace architecture of the popes in sixteenth-century Rome, for which see Courtright, 1990, 119 ff.
86See Pastor, 1923–53, XXI, 239 ff.; the inscriptions are given in Caprini et al., 1955, 41 ff.
for Giacomo Lauro’s ideal reconstruction of the Temple of Honor and Virtue in Rome (Fig. 64). Bernini’s project for the Piazza Colonna would have referred these themes specifically to the Chigi papacy. By shifting the ideas of religious and moral victory to the Louvre and associating the Roman triumphal columns with the Pillars of Hercules, Bernini would have endowed Louis with the same claim to superiority over the ancients in the secular sphere. In the Louvre project, however; this notion acquires a different and unexpected aspect, owing to the repercussions of a great historical event that must have played a considerable role in Bernini’s thinking.

In 1659 the Treaty of the Pyrenees was signed by France and Spain, whose power was broken. The treaty established the boundary between the two countries, with the victorious Louis agreeing not to pursue his expansionist designs beyond the Pyrenees. Louis’s marriage the following year to Maria Theresa of Austria, daughter of Philip IV and queen of León and Castile, forged a new link between the two countries. The spirit of peace and reconciliation heralded by these events was invoked in a tract published in 1660 by Bernini’s own nephew; Father Francesco Marchesi, a devout and learned member of the Oratorio of San Filippo Neri. This massive work, dedicated to the respective protagonists, Cardinal Mazarin and the count-duke of Olivares, extolls the treaty and marriage as the culmination of the entire millennial history of the relations between the two countries. Bernini was extremely attached to his nephew, and recent research has shown that

87 On the catafalque, cf. Berendsen, 1961, 110 ff., no. 10, 166 ff. The columns are often shown together in the imagery of Sixtus V (D’Onofrio, 1965, Fig. 63 opp. p. 149, Fig. 89 opp. p. 187; Fagiolo and Madonna, eds, 1985, Fig. on p. 199). The temple (Lauro, 1612–41, Pl. 30) is cited by Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, 147 f., and idem, ‘Una fonte,’ 1984, 424 f. Lauro’s reconstruction had been compared to Bernini’s Santa Maria dell’Assunta in Ariccia by Hager, 1975, 122 f.; also Marder, ‘La chiesa,’ 1984, 268.

88 The force of the ecclesio-political associations evoked by the columns is witnessed by another project from the time of Alexander VII (published by Krautheimer, 1983, 206, and idem, 1985, 58 f.) that envisaged making the column of Marcus Aurelius the mast of a fountain in the form of a ship — the navicella of St. Peter, the ship of the church. Although related to a specific boat-fountain type (for which see Hibbard and Jaffe, 1964), the project obviously revives a proposal made by Papirio Bartoli early in the seventeenth century to create a choir in the crossing of St. Peter’s in the form of a ship whose mast was a bronze version of the column of Trajan, with reliefs of the Passion (Hibbard and Jaffe, 1964, 164; Lavin, Bernini, 1968, 43); the spiral column also recalls the Solomonic twisted columns that decorated the Constantinian presbytery at St. Peter’s.
Marchesi was an important influence on the artist in his later years.89 No doubt in this case Marchesi’s views prepared the way for Bernini’s subsequent adaptation for his equestrian project of another work in which essentially the same attitude was expressed emblematically.

The political implications of the pact were illustrated in a great tableau used in the celebration at Lyon in 1660 of Louis’s marriage to Maria Theresa (Fig. 65).90 A personification of war stood on a pile of military spoils that bore the inscription Non Ultra, between two columns to which her arms are bound by chains. One column was decorated with the emblem of France, the other with those of León and Castile, and the whole was placed atop a craggy two-peaked mass referring to the Pyrenees. Menestrier included the device in another publication with a commentary that explains Bernini’s conceit, which radically reinterpreted the traditional notion of an equestrian monument.

It is often desirable for the glory of heros that they themselves voluntarily put limits on their designs before Time or Death does so of necessity. . . . The grand example [of Hercules who raised the columns, then stopped to rest after his victories] makes all the world admire the moderation of our monarch, who, having more ardor and courage than any of the heros of ancient Greece and Rome, knew how to restrain his generous movements in the midst of success and victories and place voluntary limits to his fortune . . . The trophy that will render him glorious in the history of all time will be the knowledge that this young conqueror preferred the repose of his people.

89 Marchesi, 1660; the work was published under the pseudonym Pietro Roselli. The importance of Bernini’s relationship to his nephew, first emphasized by Lavin (1972), has been greatly expanded by the recent studies of Marchesi’s ambitious project for a charitable hospice for the indigents of Rome, for which Bernini’s last work, the bust of the Savior, became the emblem; see the essays by B. Contardi, M. Lattanzi, and E. Di Gioia, in Le immagini, 1988, 17 ff., 272 ff. (cf. p.273 on Marchesi, 1660), 285 ff.

90 Menestrier, 1662, opposite p. 54. The print was first related to Bernini’s project by K. O. Johnson, 1981, 33 f., followed by Petzet, 1984, 443, and Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, 150; Johnson drew no implications concerning the interpretation of the statue, but he clearly understood the Bernini project in the light of current political repercussions of the treaty. A confusing error by Vivanti, 1967, Pl. 21e, concerning the print, was corrected by Johnson, 40 n. 12.
over the advantages of his glory and sacrificed his interests to the tranquility of his subjects.\footnote{Menestrier, 1662, 129 f.: ‘Il seroit souvent a souhaiter pour la gloire des Heros qu’ils missent eux mesmes des bornes volontaires à leur desseins avant que le Temps ou la Mort leur en fissent de necessaires . . . c’est ce grand Example, qui doit faire admirer à tous les Peuples la moderation de nostre Monarque qui ayant plus d’ardeur & de courage que n’en eurent tous les Heros de la vieille Grece & de Rome, à sceu retenir ces mouvements genereux au milieu du succez de ses victoires, & donner volontairement des bornes à sa fortune . . . Ce sera aussi ce Trophée qui le rendra glorieux dans l’histoire de tous les siecles, quand on sçaura que ce ieune conquerant à préferé le repos de ses Peuples aux avantages de sa gloire, & sacrifié ses interests à la tranquillité de ses Sujets.’}

Precisely the same sentiment introduced the commemorative inscription on a copper tablet that was immured by the king with the foundation stone of the Louvre itself in a ceremony shortly before Bernini left Paris:

\begin{quote}
Louis XIII
King of France and Navarre,
Having conquered his enemies and given peace to Europe
Eased the burdens of his people.\footnote{Louis XIIIi\textsuperscript{e}
Roy de France et de Navarre,
Après avoir dompté ses ennemis, donné la paix à l’Europe,
A soulagé ses peuples.}
\end{quote}

The themes of virtue and self-mastery as the true basis for rule were also the leitmotif of Le Brun’s great series of paintings from the life of Alexander executed for the king beginning in 1661. Bernini, who saw and greatly admired two of the compositions during his stay in Paris,\footnote{Chantelou, 1885, 219, October 10; on Le Brun’s paintings see Hartle, 1957, 93f; Posner, 1959, 240 ff.; Hardle, 1970, 393 ff., 401 ff., and \textit{idem}, 1985, 109. Rosasco, 1991, has shown that the same idea subsequently played an important role at Versailles. For other aspects of the theme of Alexander as the self-conquering hero, see also, concerning an opera first performed in Venice in 1651, Osthoff, 1960; Straub, 1969, 201–9.} took up this...

Salon de la Guerre, Versailles (photo: Giraudon 16915).
75. Jean Warin, bust of Louis XIV. Musée National du Château de Versailles (photo: Documentation photographique de la Réunion des musées nationaux 74 Dn 2415).

76. Anonymous, Louis Le Vau’s original project for the west façade of Versailles. Musée National du Château de Versailles (photo: Documentation photographique de la Réunion des musées nationaux 84 EN 3116).


82. Projects for the Louvre, 1624-1829, engraving.
83. I. M. Pei, entrance to the Louvre, Paris (photo: Stephen Rustow).

84. I. M. Pei, entrance to the Louvre, Paris (photo: Stephen Rustow).
85. I. M. Pei, illustration of derivation of the geometric configuration of Le Notre's garden parterre of the Tuileries (diagram at upper left) and axial displacement, December 29, 1989, drawing. Collection of the author.
86. I. M. Pei, lead cast of Bernini’s equestrian statue of Louis XIV. Louvre, Paris (photo: Stephen Rustow).

87. I. M. Pei, plan of the entrance to the Louvre indicating the siting of the equestrian Louis XIV (photo: office of I. M. Pei, redrawn by Susanne Philippson.)
idea, combining the image from the Lyon festival with the centerpiece of another project celebrating the Peace of the Pyrenees to which he himself had contributed. To commemorate the event and further humiliate Spain in Rome, the French minister proposed to create an elaborate stairway up the Pincian hill from the Piazza di Spagna to the French enclave at Trinità dei Monti. Bernini made a model for the project, and his idea may be reflected in several drawings that include an equestrian monument in which the king is shown charging forward with drapery flying (Figs. 66, 67). The conception seems to anticipate the work Bernini made for the Louvre, but it is far more aggressive. Indeed, Bernini may well have been referring to this project when he pointedly remarked that he would not show Louis commanding his troops (see p. 583 above).

Menestrier's comment on the image from Lyon explains Bernini's emphasis on the 'privations,' the 'terrible labors,' the 'lamentable strain,' and the 'cost of blood' Louis suffered for his greatness. Bernini universalized the idea; the Pyrenees became the mountain of virtue, and territorial containment became victory over the self. He thus managed to embody both meanings of the Non Plus Ultra/Pillars of Hercules tradition, expressing Louis's attainment of the extreme limit of glory through victories achieved at great self-sacrifice. The essence of Bernini's conceit lies in the profound irony of the great hero reaching the heights of spiritual triumph by limiting earthly ambition. The equestrian monument becomes thereby an emblem.
not only of military but of moral force, a vehicle not only of political but also of ethical precept. Bernini’s image, above all, is that of potentially overwhelming power held in firm and benign restraint.

The King, Rome, and the Pope

All three works by Bernini for Louis XIV were composed of essentially the same three elements, which serve in each context to create a form of visual apotheosis: a lower realm of the natural earth; an intermediate, man-made, Herculean domain of dressed stone or providentially arranged drapery; and an upper level inhabited by the king. The community of Bernini’s projects was clearly understood by his astute assistant Mattia de’ Rossi, whose report from Paris, quoted on p. 547, 558 above, gave Bernini’s own interpretation of the equestrian monument. A design signed by de’ Rossi (Fig. 68), presumably dating from shortly after Bernini’s death, incorporates the same three elements and allusions to all three projects.96 An isolated ‘tempietto’ containing the equestrian group on its rocky base stands on a scogliera platform; the entrance is flanked by statues of Hercules with his club, while above the portal a figure of Atlas, surrounded by military trophies, supports a globe displaying fleurs-de-lys.

I trust it is also clear that all three works convey essentially the same message: noble ideals are embodied in a man whose merit derives not from his noble birth but from his virtue and labors. Bernini himself expressed as much shortly before he left Paris, when he said to Louis that ‘he would have been happy to spend the rest of his life in his service, not because he was a king of France and a great king, but because he had realized that his spirit was even more exalted than his position.’97 It is striking and symptomatic that Bernini’s design for the palace is inordinately sparing of ornament and almost devoid of regal or dynastic references — an austerity that Colbert had already complained of in the second project.98 Moreover, the visual and conceptual hierarchy from crude mass to ideal form reflects Bernini’s under-

96 See Berger, In the Garden, 1985, 72, 108 n. 25, Fig. 102 f.
97 . . . il s’estimerait heureux de finir sa vie à son service, non pas pour ce qu’il était un roi de France et un grand roi, mais parce qu’il avait connu que son esprit était encore plus relevé que sa condition’ (Chantelou, 1885, 201, October 5; translation from Chantelou, 1985, 254, with modifications).
98 See n. 10 above. Fleurs-de-lys crown the cornice of the central oval in the first project (Fig. 15; for a discussion of the crown motif see Berger, 1966, 173 ff., and idem, 1969,
standing of the creative process itself ‘He cited the example of the orator, who first invents, then orders, dresses, and adorns.’ The processes of achieving moral and expressive perfection are essentially the same. In its context each portrayal of the king embodied on a monumental scale a single existential hierarchy in which form and meaning were permeated with ethical content. It seems only logical that Bernini should have regarded the medium through which the hierarchy is unified, stone, not as a rigid but as a protean material subject to his will. It seems appropriate that he formulated this unorthodox notion precisely in response to a criticism of the crinkled and perforated drapery and mane of the equestrian Louis XIV ‘the imputed defect, he replied, was the greatest praise of his chisel, with which he had conquered the difficulty of rendering marble malleable as wax; not even the ancients were ‘given the heart to render stones obedient to the hand as if they were of dough.’

The simplicity, grandeur, and unity of Bernini’s thought can be fully grasped, however, only if one reconstructs in the mind’s eye how he imagined the works would be seen. Following the path of the sun, as it were, the vis-

29 f.); a coat of arms appears above the portal in the third project (Figs. 1, 4); and fleurs-de-lis, monograms, and sunbursts appear in the frieze of the Stockholm version of the third project (Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, Fig. 40).

79 ‘Nel prepararsi del opere usava di pensare . . . prima all’invenzione e poi rifletteva all’ordinazione delle parti, finalmente a dar loro perfezione di grazia, e tenerezza. Portava in ciò l’esempio dell’oratore, il quale prima inventa, poi ordina, veste e adorna’ (Baldinucci, 1948, 145). Bernini’s is a simplified and more sharply focused version of the orator-painter analogy drawn by Federico Zuccari: ‘E Si come l’Oratore . . . prima inventa, poi dispone, orna, manda à memoria, e finalmente pronuncia . . . Così il buon Pastore deve considerare tutte le patti della sua Pittura, l’inventione, la disposizione, e la composizione’ (see Zuccari, 1607, part II, p. 9; Heikamp, ed, 1961, 229).

100 The rigor and astrigency of the project designed in Paris seem to have been mitigated by the modifications Bernini introduced after his return to Rome, as recorded in drawings preserved at Stockholm. Changes evident in the east facade (see also n. 98 above) include the following: the natural rustication is confined to the main central block, and the horizontal joins in the stone courses seem more emphatic; the Hercules figures are asymmetrical, they are placed on regular low plinths, and their poses are more open and ‘welcoming’ (cf. Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, 44 f. n. 7, Figs. 40–42).

101 ‘. . . Esser i panneggiamenti del Rè, & i crini del Cavallo come troppo ripiegati, e trafitti, fuor di quella regola, che hanno a Noi lasciata gli antichi Scultori, liberamente rispose, Questo che . . . gli veniva imputato per difetto, esser il pregio maggiore del sue Scalpello con cui vinto havesa la difficoltà di render’ il Marmo pieghevole come la cera . . . E’l non haver ciò fatte gli antichi Artefici esser fore provenute dal non haver lore dato il cuere di rendere i sassi così ubbidienti alla mano, come se stessi fossero di pasta’ (Bernini, 1713, 149; cf. Baldinucci, 1948, 141).
tor entered the mountain-top palace through the Hercules portals of the east facade to have his audience with the king. While waiting in the antechamber to be admitted to the august presence, he would gaze upon the king’s portrait bust hovering above its mundane pedestal. Bernini envisaged the equestrian monument in front of the opposite, western, facade, between the Louvre and the Palace of the Tuileries. There, the image of Louis, smiling as his mount leaps to the summit of the Mountain of Glory and flanked by the imperial triumphal columns as the Pillars of Hercules, would have been the focus of the vista at the western limit of the sun’s trajectory.

The thinking displayed here had its only real precedent in Rome. To be sure, despite Bernini’s notorious distaste for much of what he saw in France, his projects for Louis were deeply and deliberately imbued with allusions to French tradition; the visualization of the royal emblem, the retention of the palace-in-a-moat the portrait mounted on a globe, the palace equestrian, all bear witness to this acknowledgment. Yet, Bernini’s whole conception of the Louvre seems intended to meld into one surpassing synthesis at Paris the two quintessential monuments of Roman world dominion, secular and religious. This dual significance was defined explicitly in the medals issued to commemorate the enterprise, of which those recording the equestrian portrait have already been discussed (p. 594 f. above). The same idea was inscribed on the foundation medal of the Louvre itself, by Jean Warin, showing Bernini’s facade with the legend Maestati ac Aeternit(ati) Gall(orum) Imperii Sacrum, ‘sacred to the majesty and eternity of the Gallic empire’ (Fig. 64).

Seen in this light the complementary monumental allusions — secular and sacral — of Bernini’s conception become all but inevitable. The colossal order crowned by a continuous balustrade with statues emulates Michelangelo’s palaces on the Campidoglio (Fig. 70); these, too, like the

102 Bernini himself chose the position in the ante-chamber of the king’s new audience hall on October 13, a week before his departure (Chantelou, 1885, 231 f.).
103 The idea of Paris surpassing Rome was expressed by Bernini himself at his first meeting with the king (cf. p. 533 f. and n. 12 above) and was bruited in a French sonnet extolling Bernini and the king (Chantelou, 1885, 149, September 9).
104 Robert Berger (1966) has persuasively argued that Bernini’s first Louvre project, including its characteristic drum-without-dome motif, doffed its hat, as it were, to an ideal château design of 1652 by Antoine Lepautre.
105 The medal (for which see La Médaille, 1970, 81, no. 116; Jones, 1982–88, II, 224 ff., no. 239) was inserted in the foundation stone along with the inscriptions mentioned above, n. 92; it is discussed several times in Chantelou’s diary (Chantelou, 1885, 164, 168 f., 215, 228 f., 240, entries for September 16, 19; October 8, 12, 17).
residence on the Palatine, rise from a summit redolent of imperial glory, that of the Capitoline hill, and include the equestrian statue portraying the most benign of emperors, Marcus Aurelius. The analogy actually gave rise to a dialogue between the Capitol and Bernini, in which the artist was reported to have said, ‘Dove è il gran Luigi, è il Campidoglio!’ (where the great Louis is, there is the Capitol — a Roman version of Louis’s notorious dictum ‘L’état c’est moi!’). No less meaningful and deliberate were the many transferrals to Paris we have noted of ideas and projects Bernini had devised in the service of the popes. The imperial palace tradition had long since been assimilated to papal ideology, and important aspects of Bernini’s concept for the Louvre had been suggested in a volume of emblems devoted to Gregory XIII in which that pope’s actions and his armorial device, the dragon, had been graphically intertwined. The image illustrating the summer palace built by Gregory (Fig. 71) shows the building perched conspicuously atop the Quirinal hill (Monte Cavallo, from the ancient sculptures of the horse tamers that adorn the square); the accompanying epigram identifies the pope as the sun and Rome and the pontiff as head of the microcosm, radiating beneficence on Italy and the world; Italy is described as a piccol Mondo, anticipating the inscription Bernini intended for the globular base of his bust of Louis XIV. I believe that Bernini, in turn, was consciously seeking to create at the Louvre for the world’s greatest terrestrial monarch the equivalent of what he had created at St. Peter’s for the world’s greatest spiritual monarch. The invention of the scogliera even made it possible to link the allusions to the imperial mountain-top palaces with the Mons Vaticanus of St. Peter and the popes and with the biblical metaphor of the rock on which Christ had built his church: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam (Matthew 16:18). These associations had been given a French cast in a medal that showed the basilica of St. Peter’s perched on a rocky base (Fig. 72). The medal celebrated the constant support given to the Holy See by one of the great French cardinals of the period, François de la Rochefoucauld (1558–1645), the image and the inscription Rupe Firmatur in Ista, ‘secure on that rock,’ punning on his name.

106 Cureau de la Chambre, 1685, 23 (cf. n. 65 above); Wittkower, 1961, 511 n. 61, 529.
107 Fabricii, 1588; the emblem to be discussed appears on p. 308. On this emblem and its significance for the Quirinal palace, see Courtright, 1990, 128 ff.
108 De la Rochefoucauld is portrayed on the obverse; his devotion to the papacy was exemplary (see Pastor, 1923–53, 28:441; Bergin, 1987). The elevation of St. Peter’s, which includes Maderno’s bell towers, reproduces Matthaeus Greuter’s 1613 engraving (Hibbard, 1971, Pl. 54). The reverse is illustrated without comment in Küthmann et al., 1973, 219 ff.,
The visitor to the Louvre would have been ravished by a secular version of the awesome spectacle he experienced in Rome proceeding through the embracing portico into the basilica to the high altar, surmounted by the baldachin, and beyond to the throne of the Prince of the Apostles in the apse. When Bernini’s unitarian vision of the Sun King is viewed in this way, one can readily understand Bernini’s view of his own contribution as an artist: he was, he said, the first to make of the arts a marvelous whole, occasionally breaching without violence the boundaries that separate them.109

After-images at Versailles

The failure of Bernini’s visit to Paris is normally taken as a turning point in French attitudes toward Italian culture since the Renaissance; the demise of his various projects for the Louvre signaled the triumph of a new national self-consciousness and self-confidence north of the Alps. Stylistically these new attitudes are linked to the rejection of the fulsome rhetoric of the Italian baroque and the development of the tempered logic of French classicism. Although correct in general terms, this analysis needs to be qualified, especially on the evidence of what took place in the immediately succeeding years when the king determined to move both his residence and the seat of government from the Louvre to Versailles. Le Brun adapted Bernini’s equestrian project in designing a monument of Louis, intended initially for

no. 51. The reverse of the example in the Bibliothèque Nationale reproduced in Fig. 248 is inscribed T. BERLI/sic/ARD. F., presumably the first medallist of that name, who was active ca. 1622–65 (Forrer, 1904–30, I, 172 f., VII, 74). It should be noted that the Rochefoucauld medal repeats the image of St. Peter’s on a rock on the medal by Caradosso of 1506 illustrating Bramante’s project for the new basilica.

Bernini explicitly recalled the piazza of St. Peter’s in his planning for the area between the Louvre and the Tuileries as well as for that in front of the Louvre (Chantelou, 1885, 42, July 1; 52, July 15). Boucher (1981) has recently suggested that Bernini’s first design for the Louvre reflected early projects by Peruzzi for St. Peter’s.

Another mountain-top theme with which Bernini must have been familiar appeared in the 1644 medal commemorating the accession to the throne of Queen Christina of Sweden, who later became the artist’s good friend. The medal shows a phoenix rising from a mountain top beneath a radiant sun, her favorite emblem (Eimer, 1992, 84–87).

109 ‘... egli sia stato fra’ Primì... che habbia saputo in modo unire assieme le belle Arti della Scultura, Pittura, & Architettura, che di tutte habbia fatte in se un maraviglioso composto... con uscir tal volta dalle Regole, senza però giannai violarle’ (Bernini, 1713, 32 f.; cf. Baldinucci, 1948, 140).

For a discussion of Bernini’s ‘wholistic’ views on art generally, see Lavin, Bernini, 1980, 6 ff.
the Louvre but then evidently to be placed before the façade of Versailles (Fig. 73). Le Brun also presumably designed the stucco relief executed by Coysevox in the Salle de la Guerre that serves as the antechamber to the ceremonial reception hall known as the Galerie des Glaces (Fig. 74). Depicting Louis crowned by a personification of princely glory, the composition translates Bernini’s moral conceit into the grandiloquent language of high allegory.

Both of Bernini’s own sculptures were also brought to Versailles, after all. The equestrian group was placed in the garden and moved several times, but the common notion that it was sent into exile must be reconsidered. In fact, it was given conspicuous locations as the focal point of the view along the major transverse axis in front of and parallel to the façade of the palace, first toward the north at the end of the Bassin de Neptune, reaching its final destination in the early eighteenth century at the other extremity at the end of the Pièce d’Eau des Suisses. It was replaced at the Bassin de Neptune by Domenico Guidi’s highly esteemed group of Time and History holding a portrait medallion of the king, so that the two works faced each other at opposite sides of the horizon. Bernini’s sculpture was thus displayed far more prominently than many other works dispersed among the minor recesses of the garden. Furthermore, the transformation of the group was, in a way, singularly appropriate. Marcus Curtius was one of the great legendary heroes of antiquity who sacrificed himself to save his country. In this sense the revision showed a remarkably subtle understanding of the meaning Bernini emphasized in explaining his conception. I suspect, indeed, that Girardon’s alterations were not intended to obliterate the reference to the king but to transform the work into a moralized depiction of Louis XIV in the guise of Marcus Curtius. The modification accommodated the sculpt-


112 See on this important point Berger, In the Garden, 1985, 63. The traditional, architectural pedestal the work ultimately received was supplied by Mattia de’Rossi (Menichella, 1985, 23 f.).

113 There was a striking and well-known precedent for such an interpretation of the theme in Rome early in the century: Cardinal Scipione Borghese had been compared to Marcus Curtius, and Bernini’s father, Pietro, had portrayed the subject by restoring an
ture to the principle, followed consistently in the garden decorations, of avoiding any direct portrayal of the king. Louis was present everywhere, of course, but in the sublimated domain of the garden his spirit was invoked only through allegory.\footnote{Strictly speaking this observation applies to Guidi’s group as well; incidentally, Guidi himself might be said to have metaphorized his portrait of the king by transforming the contemporary armor shown in the model into classical costume (cf. Seelig, 1972, 90).}

We know that Bernini’s bust of Louis also had a rather active life before it finally alighted in the Salon de Diane in 1684. At each stage along the way, it was accompanied by the bust made by Jean Warin in 1666 to rival Bernini’s (Fig. 75). First at the Louvre and then at the Tuileries and finally again at Versailles, Warin’s sculpture accompanied Bernini’s as a demonstration of French ability to compete with the acknowledged master, whose work was thus regarded and prominently displayed as the touchstone of supreme achievement in the art.\footnote{Again, I am indebted to Berger for this perception, (Versailles, 1985, 39, 50, 87 nn. 104–5).}

As to the château of Versailles (Fig. 76), the very clarion of French architectural identity, the analogy was long ago noted between the upper silhouette of Bernini’s Louvre project — the continuous horizontal cornice and balustrade crowned with sculptures — and that of Louis Le Vau’s building.\footnote{Cf. Blunt, 1953, 192, 279 n. 35.} This relationship, indeed, is symptomatic of the synthetic creative procedure that is perhaps the chief legacy at Versailles of Bernini’s work for the Louvre. In certain respects the garden façade, as originally planned by Le Vau, belongs in a series of works that link elements of the two traditional types of noble residential architecture, the urban palace (Fig. 77) and the informal extramural villa (Fig. 78). The earmark of the former was the flat street façade with a monumental order or orders placed on a high rusticated base; the earmark of the latter was a U-shaped plan embracing a garden or courtyard between projecting wings. Various steps had been taken earlier in the century to relate the two types. In the Villa Borghese at Rome a coherent façade was achieved by

including a terrace between the two wings (Fig. 23). In the Palazzo Barberini, where Bernini himself had worked, the orders and rusticated base of the palace type were introduced in a U-shaped façade (Fig. 79). It can hardly be coincidence that both these buildings are near, but not in, the city center; hence they are topographically as well as typologically intermediate between the two alternatives. Le Vau in effect combined these intermediate suburban arrangements, partly by applying the unifying lesson of Bernini’s Louvre: a rusticated base surmounted by a single order and crowned by a horizontal roofline with sculptured balustrade. Le Vau thus for the first time fused the palace and villa types into a unified and consistent architectural system that incorporates the entire façade. The fusion perfectly expresses the unique status of Versailles as a royal château in the venerable tradition stemming from Charlemagne — Constantine’s ‘great’ successor and Louis’s model in other respects as well — a permanent extra-urban seat of the monarchy.

In another context a bold observation has recently been made concerning a painting of Versailles by Jean-Baptiste Martin (Fig. 80). The view toward the west of the Bassin d’Apollon and the Grand Canal is framed by poplar trees, sacred to Hercules. The arrangement seems to reflect Bernini’s project for the Louvre, where the Pillars of Hercules would have framed the view from the palace to the west, in reference to the Non Plus Ultra device used by the Hapsburgs.

Most intriguing of all is the evidence recently discovered that Bernini actually made a design for Versailles and that, for a time at least, his design

---

117 Cf. Berger, Versailles, 1985, 23, 25. My analysis is merely an extension and refinement of Berger’s observation that the primary sources of Le Vau’s Enveloppe at Versailles were the Italian villa type with terrace and Roman High Renaissance palaces. French indebtedness to Bernini later at the Louvre and at Versailles has also been stressed by Tadgell, 1978, 54–58, 83 n. 121 and 1980, 327, 335.

118 K. O. Johnson, 1981, 33 ff. Our attention here being focused in the legacy at Versailles of Bernini’s ideas for the Louvre, I will not pursue possible relationships between the planning of the château and other projects in which Bernini had been involved — notably those between the tridentine avenues of approach with twin buildings at the angles and the Piazza del Popolo at Rome (most recently, Castex et al., 1980, 7 ff., a reference for which I am indebted to Guy Walton). A similar arrangement was proposed in 1669 by François d’Orbais for the approach to the main façade of the Louvre (cf. Chastel and Pérouse de Montclos, 1966, 181, Fig. 5 and Pl. V).
may have been adopted for execution. This information is supplied by a source that cannot be dismissed out of hand — a detailed diary of a visit to Versailles by the future Grand Duke Cosimo III of Tuscany in 1669. Under the date August 11 of that year, it is reported that work at Versailles was proceeding on a majestic façade designed by Bernini. Except for Bernini’s own expressed admiration for Versailles during his stay in Paris in 1665, this statement provides the first direct link between Bernini and the château. No trace of Bernini’s project has come down to us, and the claim may well be exaggerated. It is certainly fortuitous, however, that the notice comes at just the right moment to help explain a heretofore puzzling episode in the history of the planning of Versailles. Early in the summer of 1669 work was proceeding according to a plan by Le Vau that, following the king’s wish, retained the old Petit Château built by his father. Yet in June Louis suddenly changed his mind and issued a public declaration that he intended to demolish the earlier structure. Colbert, who opposed the idea, held an emergency competition among half-a-dozen French architects, including Le Vau, for new proposals for a new Versailles. The suggestion is inescapable that the competition was held in reaction to the receipt — perhaps unsolicited — of a project of this kind from Bernini. His submission may even have been adopted until the final decision was taken later that year to retain the old building after all and return to Le Vau’s first plan.

* * *

Absolutely nothing of Bernini’s projects for France remains as he intended, either at the Louvre or at Versailles. There can be no doubt, however, that his conception of the nobility and grandeur suitable for a great monarch left an indelible trace on the French imagination. A tragi-comical testimony to this fact was the defacement and mutilation of the equestrian portrait with paint and hammer, perpetrated in 1980, the tricentennial of Bernini’s death (Fig. 81). Evidently, the vandals considered the monument

---

119 For what follows, see Pühringer-Zwanowetz, 1976. The author of the report to be discussed was probably Lorenzo Magalotti, whose interest in the Louvre is known from letters written to him by the painter Ciro Ferri on September 30, 1665, and February 17, 1666 (Bottari and Ticozzi, 1822–25, II, 47–52).
120 Chantelou, 1885, 154 ff., September 13.
a symbol of _French_ culture, and instead of the inscription Bernini intended, they left an eloquent graffito of their own:

YARK YARK!!!
PATRIMOINE
KAPUTT
ANTIFRANCE

_The Idea of the Prince Hero_

There was a certain ironic justice in the vandals’ gesture of desecration, for Bernini’s conception itself was profoundly subversive, both in its form — the suppression of royal and dynastic imagery, the portrayal of the king in a momentary action, the smile that seemed inappropriate, the treatment of marble as if it were dough, the elevation of raw nature to the domain of high art — and in its content. Bernini’s image of Louis XIV must be seen against a major current of thought concerning political hegemony and the qualities required of the ideal ruler, that had been developing for the better part of a century. The main proponents were the Jesuits, who were intent upon responding and providing an alternative to Machiavelli’s model of cynical unscrupulousness in the worldly practice of statecraft. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a veritable stream of anti-Machiavellian literature defended the relevance of Christian moral principles not only to utopistic ideals of domestic rule and foreign diplomacy but also to realistic and successful statesmanship. The key argument in this ‘reason of state’ was

121 I am greatly indebted to Simone Hoog of the Musée Nationale du Château de Versailles for photographs and the following information, _in litteris_:  
1) l’acte de vandalisme sur le Marcus Curtius s’est passé dans la nuit du 5 au 6 juin 1980.  
2) les morceaux du cheval qui avaient été arrachés concernaient: la queue, la crinière, la patte avant droite, l’oreille droite et, pour le cavalier un morceau du cimier et le menton; avec bien sûr quelques épauffures supplémentaires de moindre importance . . . tout a été ‘recollé,’ mais il nous manque malheureusement quelques petits éclats de marbre (pour la queue et l’oreille du cheval en particulier).  

The restored sculpture is now permanently on display in the Grandes Ecuries.
that the best form of government, monarchy, while responsible ultimately to God, was based on the consent of the people, that the power of the ruler derived practically from his reputation, and that his reputation in turn depended on his exercise of virtue. Bernini was profoundly indebted to this vital tradition of moral statesmanship, which culminated in the idea of the prince-hero, but he carried the argument a decisive step further. The change is evident in his explanation of his own work and the philosophy of kingship it embodied, as well as in his appropriation of the Jesuit Claude Menestrier’s emblem and interpretation of the Peace of the Pyrenees. The restrained intensity of the equestrian portrait and the bust of Louis expressed the radical political idea that the true basis of just rule lay in individual virtue and self-control rather than in inherited rank and unbridled power. His view challenged the very foundations of traditional monarchist ideology.\(^{122}\)

This fundamental conflict of interest is dramatically illustrated by what was perhaps the major bone of contention in the debates between the artist and Colbert and the other French critics of his design for the Louvre: the location of the royal apartment. Bernini insisted, to what proved to be the bitter end, that the king must be quartered in the east wing, the most prominent part of the palace; he rejected the argument that the rooms would be relatively cramped and exposed to the turmoil and dangers of the public square in front (the Fronde and the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 against

---

\(^{122}\) On Bernini, the anti-Machiavellian tradition and the prince-hero (p. 572 f. above), see Lavin, 1991. The anti-Machiavellian tradition, first defined by Meinecke, 1957, has been studied by De Mattei, 1969 and 1979, and the theories of the chief exponents in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have been summarized by Bireley, 1990. This development in the secular sphere had a close and surely related corollary in the theological principle of heroic virtue, essential in the process of canonizing saints, first introduced in 1602 and elaborately formulated later in the century (for which see Hofmann, 1933; Enciclopedia cattolica, 1948–54, III, s. v. ‘Canonizzazione,’ cols. 595 f., 605 f.).

An important and pioneering study by Keller (1971) discusses the major European equestrian monuments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in relation to contemporary political theory, including some of the writers who belong in the anti-Machiavellian camp. In the present context, however, Keller’s work has a critical shortcoming: although his perception of Bernini’s intention is sound, Keller excludes Bernini’s equestrian Louis XIV as expressing an allegorical conceit rather than a political theory (see pp. 17 and 68 ff.). In fact, Bernini’s innovation lay precisely in merging these two levels of meaning.
James I of England had not been forgotten). Ceremony and symbolism, as such, were not the primary point; it was rather that the concerns of safety and convenience were secondary to the duties and obligations imposed by the office of ruler. Bernini measured the stature of a ruler by the moral restraints and obligations of personal leadership he undertook, despite the discomforts and risks they entailed.

This was precisely the point Bernini explained to the obtuse Frenchman who could not understand a happy, benevolent expression on the face of an armed warrior on a martial horse — that he had portrayed Louis enjoying the glory of victory attained through virtue and self-sacrifice. The passage (quoted in n. 63 above) is of further interest because it reveals the full import of Bernini’s formal subversion of hallowed ideology, his nonviolent break with artistic convention and decorum. Having given his explanation, Bernini added that his meaning was evident throughout the work, but would become much clearer still when the sculpture was seen on its intended rocky promontory. By raising to lofty moral and aesthetic standards a lowly and deprecated form, he created a new means of visual expression to convey a new social ideal.

POSTSCRIPT

Louis XIV: Bernini = Mitterand: Pei

The power of Bernini’s image of the Sun King has been reflected anew in the no less revolutionary developments that have taken place at the Louvre under President Mitterand and the architect I. M. Pei. This rapprochement across the centuries is evident in an anecdote recounted to me by Pei, who recalled that on one occasion Mitterand said to him, ‘You can be sure of one thing, Mr. Pei: I will not abandon you as Louis XIV abandoned Bernini!’ — a promise the president has maintained, despite a storm of protest against the project for a new entrance to the new, Grand Louvre.

123 The sharpest critique is that of Colbert, reported by Chantelou as the last entry in his diary, November 30, 1665, a few days after Bernini left for Rome (Chantelou, 1885, 264 f.). Bauer rightly recalls the Gunpowder Plot in this connection (in Chantelou, 1985, 37, 303).

124 The inversion and moralization of conventional social values implicit in Bernini’s attitude in the official, public domain has its counterpart in his creation of the private caricature portrait of exalted and high-born personages (see Lavin, 1990).
Owing in part, perhaps, to the sheer logic of the situation but also in part, surely, by design, Pei has brought into being several important elements of Bernini’s dream of giving form to the glory of France.

From the time of Louis XIV and Bernini onward, the space between the west façade of the Louvre and the Tuileries was not meant to stand empty. Many projects were proposed (Fig. 82 includes those dating 1624-1829), until the series finally came to an end in the glass pyramid designed by another architect imported from abroad, who succeeded in illustrating the breadth of French vision and the grandeur of French culture. Bernini himself proposed for the area now occupied by Pei’s pyramid two theaters, modeled on the Colosseum and the Theater of Marcellus in Rome, one facing the Louvre, the other the Tuileries. Placed back to back, with room for ten thousand spectators on either side, the theaters would have realized on a monumental scale the effect of one of Bernini’s fabled comedies, in which he created the illusion of two theaters and two audiences in plain view of one another. The two theaters at the Louvre would have reflected the spectacle of French civic and ceremonial life at its very heart.

This is exactly what Pei has created — a great spectacle at the veritable center of French cultural life. And he has achieved this result, which might be described as maximum, with means that can be described as minimum (Figs. 83, 84). Apart from its symbolic associations (Pei denies that he intended any — cf. Fig. 85), the pyramid is the simplest and least obtrusive of structural forms, and glass, whether opaque or transparent, is the most self-effacing structural material. When the glass is opaque, it mirrors the scene of people from all over the world who have come to enjoy, participate in, and pay homage to French culture, with the sacrosanct façades of the Louvre as their backdrop. When the glass is transparent, what does one see? People from all over the world who have come to enjoy, participate in and pay homage to French culture, with the sacrosanct façades of the Louvre as their backdrop. Either way, the pyramid itself disappears, becom-

125 For a complete and thorough survey of these projects, see Daufresne, 1987.
126 The sources concerning this proposal are conveniently gathered in Del Pesco, Il Louvre, 1984, 41 f., 48 n. 22, who also reproduces several projects, including two by Claude Perrault, that reflect Bernini’s scheme; further, Daufresne, 1987, 76 ff.
127 Bernini’s comedy of two theaters is described by Baldinucci, 1948, 151, and Bernini, 1713, 56.
128 In an interview Pei demonstrated to me (see Fig. 85) how he derived the pyramid from the geometric configuration of Le Nôtre’s garden parterre of the Tuileries.
ing a clear and limpid representation of its environment. Pei solved the terrifying problem of making a monumental entrance to the Louvre by creating an almost invisible theater where the people of the world are the actors and the Louvre is the stage set.

Almost exactly ten years after its desecration at Versailles, Bernini’s equestrian image of the Sun King was ‘restored’ (cast in lead) to the space between the Louvre and the Tuileries for which it had originally been destined (Fig. 86). The restitution of the image to its proper position of leadership provoked almost the same furor as its original appearance in Paris three centuries before — appropriately enough, since Bernini’s sculpture, far from adhering comfortably to the conventions of its genre, was meant to convey the artist’s new, provocative, even subversive, conception of the ideal head of state. In replacing the work, Pei used neither the same material nor the same location Bernini had envisaged. Instead, Pei used the image of the Sun King to resolve one of the historic problems of ceremonial urbanism in Paris — the nonalignment of the Louvre with the axis formed by the Tuileries, the Napoleonic arches of triumph and the Champs-Elysées. Pei oriented the horseman and his pedestal on that axis, but aligned the platform beneath the monument with the Louvre (Fig. 87). In this way, the Pei-Bernini image of the Sun King came to serve precisely the function for which it was intended, as the visual and symbolic link between the old France and the new.

The whole conception, which is truly in the spirit of Bernini, also fulfills Bernini’s definition of the architect’s task: which ‘consists not in making beautiful and comfortable buildings, but in knowing how to invent ways of using the insufficient, the bad, and the ill-suited to make beautiful things in which what had been a defect becomes useful, so that if it did not exist one would have to create it.’

129 The importance of simplicity-opacity-transparency as Pei’s way of relating his pyramid to the historic buildings of the Louvre, has been observed by S. Lavin, 1988. The transparency of the pyramid was ably discussed in a paper by Stephen L. Rustow, ‘Transparent Contradictions: Pei’s Pyramid at the Louvre,’ delivered at the 1990 meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians.


131 The displacement of the statue on the grand axe of Paris is also noted by Fleckner, 1992.

132 ‘. . . il sommo pregio dell’artefice [is] il sapere inventar maniere per servirsi del poco, del cattivo e male adattato al bisogno per far cose belle e far sì che sia utile quel che fu difetto e che, se non fusse, bisognerebbe farlo’ (Baldinucci, 1948, 146; cf. Bernini 1713, 32).
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