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The chief purpose of this essay is to present three portrait busts, one by François Duquesnoy (1597–1643) and two by Francesco Mochi (1580–1654). One of those by Mochi is here published for the first time; the other two have been published before, with attributions to Bernini. The busts are historically valuable in part because very few documented portraits by these artists are known: five in the case of Duquesnoy, four in that of Mochi, including those we are adding now. Moreover, purely as a matter of chance, the three works, all of which are accurately datable, fall within a limited and historically critical span of time, the fourth decade of the seventeenth century. It was then that the notion of the portrait as a depiction of a significant physical and psychological “moment” emerged, and Bernini developed his famous “speaking” likenesses. These are often regarded as the crowning achievement of the period in portraiture. We shall see that the busts presented here deal with essentially the same notion of portraiture, and offer different yet no less valid interpretations. Hence they not only shed much needed new light on the contributions of Duquesnoy and Mochi in this domain, but they may also help to create a more balanced understanding of the period as a whole.

The reader should be forewarned of a certain imbalance in the discussion of the sculptures. In the case of Duquesnoy I shall confine my remarks almost exclusively to the one new piece, whereas I shall review Mochi’s other known portrait busts in an effort to situate the two new works within his development. The difference in treatment was determined partly by the fact that Duquesnoy’s portraiture, unlike Mochi’s, has received a good deal of attention in recent literature, and partly by the fact that in some respects Mochi’s style is more problematic.1

The Nano di Créqui

A small-scale bust by Duquesnoy in the collection of Prince Urbano Barberini was first published by Sestieri with an attribution to Bernini, and regarded by him as an early work of about 1625 (Figs. 1–3).2 The fanciful classical costume and unusual physiognomy suggested that it was a caricature. Subsequently, Wittkower rejected the attribution to Bernini and dated the work much later, about 1680.3

The Barberini family inventories identify both the sitter and the author of the portrait, and help to reveal the circumstances of its creation. It is first mentioned in Cardinal Antonio’s inventory of 1644: “A portrait of the dwarf of the Duke of Créqui, with its bust, and pedestal of white and black, made by Francesco Fiamengo.”4 It was listed again as the work of Duquesnoy in 1671, and valued at one hundred scudi.5 In Cardinal Carlo’s inventory of 1692, its small size is noted and the fact that it bore the number 59.6 The Barberini bust is only forty-eight centimeters high (nineteen inches) with the base, which is of black and white veined marble, and the number 59 is written heavily in black on the back support in a seventeenth-century hand.

Charles Sieur de Créqui, Duc de Lesdiguières, premier gentilhomme de la chambre du roi and Marshal of France, was the ambassador extraordinary of Louis XIII to Pope Urban VIII.7

NB A bibliography of frequently cited sources, given short titles in the footnotes, and a list of abbreviations will be found at the end of this article.

The documents from the Barberini archive cited here, which were the point of departure for the study, are the fruits of Mrs. Lavin’s research. The article was written during my tenure of a Guggenheim Fellowship, for which I am most grateful.


3 Bernini, 271.

4 “Un ritratto del Nano del Duca di Crequij, con suo petto, e peduccio di bianco e nero, fatto da francesco fiamengo, sopra uno scabellone simile alli sopradetti” BVAB-Inv. Ant. 1644, 65.

5 “Un Ritratto del Nano di Chrichi fatto da Fran.” fiammingo con peduccio moderno di bianco e nero—100” BVAB-Inv. Ant. 1671, 625.


8 Créqui’s visit to Rome, beginning in the fall of 1632 with the preparations for his arrival, can be followed in some detail in the various series of avvisi, or news dispatches: BV, mss Capponi 18, Capponi 19, Barb. lat. 6353, Ottoboni 3339. For reports of his departure, cf. E. Rossi, “Varie,” Roma, 15, 1937, 96, and “Roma ignorata,” ibid., 226.

9 “Poco distante veniavanu i Paggi di S. E. al numero di 16 vestiti tutti con Calze, e Cappotti di scarlatto ricamati medesimamente di seta verde, e bianca, foderati tutti di tabi verde, Glisboni di raso cremesino ricamati, con piume alli Cappelli bellissime, spade dorate con foder di velluto negro, e pendoni ricamati d’oro, e d’argent, auanti à quali era il Nano di S. E. vestito & ornato come li Paggi . . . .” 8f. of the published description of this cavalcade and that of
He was sent to Rome to persuade the Pope to join France in an alliance against Spain, and to obtain an annulment of the marriage secretly contracted by the Duke of Orléans to Marguerite of Lorraine. The Pope steadfastly refused both requests, although Créqui’s visit was protracted for a total of thirteen months, from June, 1633, to July, 1634. He arrived with a great retinue, having travelled by land to Civitavecchia and from there by boat to the Tiber docks. He established himself in the Palazzo Orsini at the Pasquino and received private welcoming visits from various personages, including the Barberini cardinals Francesco, Antonio and the older Sant’ Onofrio. After a few days, on June 19, his solemn entry into the Holy City was held. It is in the various accounts of this dazzling cavalcata that we first hear of the most remarkable member of Créqui’s entourage, his dwarf: “A short distance after came His Excellency’s pages, sixteen in number, all dressed in hose and coats of scarlet embroidered with green and white silk and lined with green taffeta, jackets of embroidered crimson satin, with beautiful plumes in their hats, gilded swords with scabbards of black velvet and pendants embroidered with gold and silver; at their head [on horseback] His Excellency’s dwarf, dressed and adorned as the pages.”

A week later, on June 25, a second cavalcata much more splendid than the first was occasioned by Créqui’s formal appearance before the Pope in a public consistory. Again the dwarf took an important part. Créqui’s coach, completely gilded and richly ornamented with lilies and cherubs and fringes of gold, lined inside and out with gold brocade and black velvet, was drawn by dapple-grey horses led by two coachmen. Seated in the coachman’s place was His Excellency’s dwarf “who was the marvel of all Rome as much for the smallness of his stature, as for the perfect proportions of his limbs.” He was thus properly a midget, and the perfection of his proportions, emphasized repeatedly by the chroniclers, must indeed have made his appearance strikingly different from the mis-shapen awkwardness that usually characterizes victims of nanism: “The nano was remarkable because his members were gracefully proportioned”,11 “he was the smallest and his features were the best proportioned that had ever been seen.”12

The dwarf served his master not simply as an unusual ornament, but as a kind of ceremonial messenger. Throughout his stay, but particularly during the first part, the Duke’s official life, apart from the negotiations themselves, was a continual exchange of official visits with the nobles and high prelates in Rome. He complimented them with sumptuous gifts, borne on occasion by the nano acting as his emissary and receiving rich rewards from the recipients in return. On the Duke’s behalf on July 2, for example, the dwarf and two pages presented the Spanish ambassador with a portrait of the Queen of France, a jeweled crown and mirror, three jeweled watches, more than two hundred meters of English ribbon, valued altogether at over one thousand scudi; the nano was rewarded by the Spanish representative with a golden necklace worth three hundred scudi and each of the footmen who carried the gifts received tips of twenty scudi.13

We have only a partial record of the exchange of gifts with the Barberini. In one of Cardinal Francesco’s household record books on September 29, 1633, it is noted that Créqui—who had a cultivated taste for literature and art—had been given a table of semi-precious stone and three paintings, a St. Catherine, a Conversion of St. Paul, and a Lot and His daughters attributed to Sisto Badalocchio.14 Cardinal Antonio presented him with a painting of Angelica and Medoro by Lanfranco. On November 26, 1633, a painting entered Cardinal Francesco’s collection, presumably a gift from the Duke, of Créqui’s dwarf shown standing, life-size.16 The equivalent household ledger of Cardinal Antonio for these years has not come to light. But no doubt he acquired Duquesnoy’s little bust of the dwarf—which must also have been life-size—at the same time and presumably as a gift commissioned by Créqui.


10 “... sedendo nel luogo del cochiero il Nano di S. E. che rendeva non man maraviglia a tutta Roma per la piccolezza della statura, che per la proportione così perfetta de’ membrij” ibid., 12.
12 "Comparve poi a cavallo un Nano, che è il più piccolo, e di fattezze più proporzionate, che si sia veduto" BV, ms Barb. lat. 6333, fol. 87v.
13 BV, ms Capponi 19, fol. 248v; Barb. lat. 6333, fol. 166.
14 [[Usciti]] A di 29 detto [September], 1633 Donato da S.E. a Monzu Chichiambi strarorinario del Re di Francia cioè Un tavolino senza Cornice figura in tela il Nano di Monsu di Chirichi alto palmi cinque e largo tre palmi [112cm x 67cm] in circa” BVAB, Arm. 155, “Inventario... della Guardarobba... nel Palazzo della Cancelleria... del Card. Fan... Ottobre 1649...,” fol. 204.
16 Toward the end of his stay Cardinal Antonio also gave him two paintings attributed to Titian (cf. Rossi in Roma, 1937, 226). In another avviso Antonio is said to have given Créqui two paintings by Lanfranco and Caravaggio, acquired from the Vigna Ludovisi (Ademollo, “Ambasciatori,” 202).
17 “En[trati] un quattro alto p,” sei con il Retratto di un Nano del Duca Chiriqui” BVAB-Ricordi Franc. c, fol. 76f.
When he left Rome in 1634, Créqui's assignments took him to northern Italy, where he died in battle in 1638. Throughout this period he remained in correspondence with the Barberini, but nothing further is heard of his dwarf.  

Once the name of Duquesnoy has been sounded in connection with the bust, it immediately rings true. As the leading French-speaking sculptor in Rome, then at work on his colossal ancient type the torso is relatively short and the straight sides of the lower part, with the shorter horizontal edge corresponding where it presumably developed from the Greek herm. In the ancient type the torso is relatively short and the straight sides rise nearly vertically, excluding the shoulders, so that the bust appears as a sort of cut-out; the base is low and wider than the bottom edge of the torso. This formula was revived in the Renaissance and applied to bust forms with larger torsos that include the shoulders and part of the upper arms. Three main variants emerged, in Florence, Rome and Venice. In the Florentine version—of which the outstanding example, Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti*, was visible in Rome—the torso is considerably elongated, and is placed on a high base that conforms in width to its lower edge. In Rome the torso is more compact and the base is low, but somewhat narrower than the bottom edge of the torso. In the Venetian solution—of which a notable example, Alessandro Vittoria's bust of Marino Grimani, was probably also in Rome—the body acquires a huge bulk; the base is low and wide, but the bottom horizontal edge of the torso is often much wider still. It is significant that Duquesnoy, virtually alone among early seventeenth-century sculptors in Rome, should have adopted this patently classicistic formula; it contrasts markedly with the continuous curves for the torso's lower silhouette preferred, as we shall see, by Bernini and Mochi. But equally significant is the compromise Duquesnoy worked out among the earlier solutions. The torso is shorter than in Florence, broader than in Rome, not so inflated as in Venice: the base is high and the torso's lower edge conforms to it in width. Duquesnoy's design has in common with those of Bernini and Mochi an expansive, wide-flaring silhouette that gives the torso a rhythmic lilt in relation to the base. The *Nano* bust is a variant of this type, but with a distinct source of its own, which we shall consider presently.

No less characteristic of Duquesnoy than the form of the bust are the other features of its style. Particularly close to the early portraits are the soft, extremely refined technique, the translucent yet not highly polished surface and the rippling drapery folds. The treatment of the hair with locks emerging from beneath and swept round to the outside as if caught by a sudden gust of wind, is also a recurrent feature in his portraits.

While the *Nano* is thus in many respects typical of Duquesnoy, it has a number of qualities that distinguish it from his other portraits. There are, to begin with, no smooth, clear shapes; the hair, the skin of the face and body, and the drapery sides were increasingly indented to show the stumps, and the angles tended to disappear.


The *Altoviti* bust, ca. 1550, was in the Palazzo Altoviti in Rome until 1899 (cf. E. Camesasca, *Tutta l’opera dei Cellini*, Milan, 1955, 46; for a view with the base, see Pope-Hennessy, *Italian Sculpture*, 1, fig. 122).

See the bust of Blosio Palladio (d. 1550) in Santa Maria in Aquiro, Rome (Grisebach, *Römische Porträtbüsten*, pl. 15), attributed to Guglielmo della Porta by Gramberg, in an article in *Zeitschrift für bildenden Kunst*, 6, 1937, 48.

A. Santangelo, *Museo di Palazzo Venezia. Catalogo delle sculture*, Rome, 1954, 18, fig. 23, with bibliography; from the Strogannoff collection, Rome. The bust, which is signed, is generally dated 1586-90. Grimani is dressed in the robes of a Venetian procurator, an office to which he was appointed in 1588; he became Doge in 1595. He was in Rome as ambassador to the Holy See from 1585 until 1592, and lived in the Palazzo Venezia. (Cf. F. Hermann, *Il palazzo di Venezia*, Rome, 1948, 262.)

As noted also by Nava Cellini, "Duquesnoy e Poussin," 51ff. The only other example I know is the undated (ca. 1633-34) bust of Francesco Bracciolini by Giuliano Finelli in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Pope-Hennessy, *Catalogue*, 609ff). Later, in the bust of Cardinal Maurice of Savoy in Turin, dated 1635, Duquesnoy modified the silhouette to a more Algirdiesque form (cf. A. Mezzetti, in

---


18 The busts, originally paired, of John Barclay (now in the museum of the monastery of Sant' Onofrio in Rome) and Bernardo Guglielm (in San Lorenzo fuori le Mura; photo: GFN E42806), were commissioned by Cardinal Francesco Barberini; cf. Noehles, "Francesco Duquesnoy," 55, fig. 52, in connection with Poussin's marriage in 1630.

19 The busts, a small (28.5cm) terra cotta, is first recorded in a sales catalogue of Marriette's collection, July, 1775; a sketch by Saint-Aubin in his copy of the catalogue, is reproduced by Blunt, *Nicolaus Poussin*, 55, fig. 52, in connection with Poussin's marriage in 1630. It was bought by Horace Walpole and remained at Strawberry Hill until 1842, when it was sold to one J. P. Beavan, Esq. I reproduce here a more detailed drawing in a copy of Walpole's *Description of the Villa... at Strawberry Hill...*, 1784, now in the collection of W. S. Lewis at Farmington, Conn. (cf. W. S. Lewis, ed., *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, New Haven, xxxii, 1965, 282, where the purchaser's name is misspelled as Bevan).

all consist of small, interlocking forms that create an effect of unusual vividness. Exceptional, too, is the dynamic, asymmetrical composition, in which powerful diagonal forces are interwoven in an eccentric counterpoint about the central axis. The greater visual weight of the drapery at the lower right is restrained, as it were, at the upper left by the tilt of the head and the downward pull of the nude right shoulder; a final discharge of energy occurs to the right with the sideward turn of the head and the long wavy lock that snakes down along the shoulder. The succession of interpenetrating diagonals continues at the downward pull of the nude right shoulder; a strained, as it were, at the upper left by the tilt of the head and to be viewed.

A clue to the meaning of these qualities is provided by another aspect in which the bust is unique among Duquesnoy's portraits, namely its relation to the antique, for in this case Duquesnoy clearly followed one specific model. The pose and composition are so close to the familiar bust type of the Emperor Caracalla that we must assume Duquesnoy had in mind a work of this class (Fig. 6). With its powerful sense of movement and lively facial grimace the Caracalla type is one of the cornerstones of the Severan “Baroque,” so that Duquesnoy here selected from antiquity one of its least classical creations.

But Duquesnoy has altered the prototype in important ways. Caracalla's shoulders are on the same level, and adhere to a flat plane facing the spectator; the Nano's left shoulder is higher and cast forward in relation to his right. Caracalla's head is erect and maintains the vertical axis of the torso, whereas the Nano's head is tilted sideways. In a word, Duquesnoy introduced a deeper, more pervasive animation. Moreover, the surfaces of the classical work are smooth and generalized, while Duquesnoy's forms convey a sense of warmth and intimacy. The ancient work, for all its outward expressiveness, has an essential reserve and self-containment, while Duquesnoy makes us feel the presence of the inner man.

All this concerns only what might be the “unconscious” relation to the classical model. One suspects, however, that a relationship exists on the conscious level as well—that Duquesnoy actually wished the spectator to call to mind the Caracalla portrait type, though not Caracalla himself. This seems evident from the costume, from the use of the “blank” eye, and from the very closeness to the model, in all of which respects the Nano bust is also unique among Duquesnoy's portraits. His purpose becomes clear if one considers that the midget indeed presented a unique problem, combining the grotesque and the ideal, the abnormal and the perfect, in a way which by its nature could be illustrated only through metaphor. Duquesnoy conceived of him as a kind of mythic creature, the pointed classical reference alluding to the beauty of the nano's...
body, while the small scale literally recorded his miniscule proportions. But surely a deliberate irony was also intended by the reference to the fearsome grimacing Imperial portrait-type in the diminutive image of this charmed spirit, full of humor and lyrical grace. The relationship verges on caricature, not of the person represented, but of the classical formula to which he is assimilated.30

It has been said in regard to Duquesnoy that antiquity was viewed in the seventeenth century with a growing sense of historical distance, almost with nostalgia, at the same time that the sense of an immediately present reality became more acute.31 It may be added that Duquesnoy was here, too, following in the footsteps of Giambologna who, coming from the North, had by a sort of innocent subversion transformed the outward forms of classical antiquity to express a mystical conception of reality that was at once concrete and universal.32 In so doing Giambologna created a whole new range of visual imagery which combined an earthy realism and the purest idealism. With Duquesnoy the subversion became more overt and, one may say, regretful, and this led him to the kind of melancholic “demonumentalization” that is evident in his small-scale works and is implicit also in his large ones.33 The reality became more personal and immediate, moreover, and hence his preoccupation with effects of intimacy, sentiment and ephemerality.

Duquesnoy, too, created a new class of imagery, of which the bust of Créqui’s dwarf is a prime example. Since its revival in the Renaissance, the sculptured portrait had performed a largely “extrinsic” function, in that the person represented was noteworthy by virtue of his position or his achievement (be it only that of commissioning the work). In the sixteenth century, and in the Florentine ambient into which Giambologna moved, there developed a vogue for what might be called genre portrait statuery, in which an individual is recorded because he exemplified a particular social stratum or because of a physical abnormality.34 Here we find, in small bronzes or as fountain decorations, the first identifiable portrait sculptures of dwarves.35 These may, moreover, involve ironic allusions to ancient gods, as when Morgante is represented as Bacchus or Barbino as Neptune, and the sources make it clear that the dwarves were appreciated not merely for their outlandish shapes but also for other personal characteristics such as grace of movement and qualities of mind.36 But though Duquesnoy must have known of such works, they provide only a limited precedent for his achievement. The motivation behind them was still extrinsic, and the resulting portrait was in the nature of a curiosity; the figure is shown full-length, and a status apart is inherent in the small-bronze format or the sculpture’s use in a garden.37 To be sure, Créqui’s nano was also a freak, but of a unique and paradoxical kind in which the grotesque and the normal cancelled each other out, so to speak. Apart from the man’s great curved beak, which is prodigious indeed, only the classical garb and reference to the ancient portrait type suggest an exotic context; in combination with the “life-like” scale, as we have seen, they enabled Duquesnoy to create a visual equivalent for the paradox of the midget’s anatomy. What gives the portrait its special character, however, are not these external appurtenances, but precisely its quality of personal informality, by which we are made to feel a privileged intimacy with this extraordinary individual.

Viewed in this light, the bust of Créqui’s dwarf may be seen to mark a critical stage in the development of a new form of

30 There is a certain feminine quality about the bust, which may also be a deliberate contrast to the Caracalla type; the costume is not specifically that of an emperor but was used primarily for hunters, and often for Diana and Amazons; the tress flowing down the shoulder has a close antecedent in a female portrait in Berlin, acquired in Rome in the 18th century (Blümel, Römische Bildnisse, 48f., pl. 75).
31 The formulation is that of Nava Cellini, Duquesnoy, cited n. 1 above.
32 Giambologna’s approach to the classical tradition has been beautifully characterized, though in somewhat different terms, by F. Kriegbaum in “Der Meister des ‘Centauro’ am Ponte Vecchio,” Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstskammlungen, 49, 1928, 135ff., and in “Giovanni Bologna,” 37ff., esp. 57ff., 66.
33 It seems worth noting here Duquesnoy’s interest in the child’s portrait (cf. the bust of Dirk Six, known in an engraving; Fransolet, François Du Quesnoy, 126), one of the many ways in which he recalls, and may well have been inspired by the masters of the Early Renaissance, notably Desiderio.
34 See the chapter on Florentine fountains with genre themes in B. H. Wiles, The Fountains of Florentine Sculptors and their Followers from Donatello to Bernini, Cambridge, Mass., 1933, 96ff. Wiles rightly emphasizes that for the most part these are not real portraits.
36 Vasari speaks of Barbino as “ingegnoso, letterato e molto gentile” (Vasari-Milanesi, viti, 639); on Morgante see the material assembled by Keutner, “Giardino Pensile,” 245, n. 23. The underlying sense of tragedy and compassion one feels in certain of these works is noted by Kriegbaum, “Giovanni Bologna,” 63f., and Pope-Hennessy, “A Small Bronze,” 89.
37 A notable genre portrait in a stricter sense is the head of a negress in the style of Giambologna in the Victoria and Albert Museum, where serpentine marble is used to suggest the color of the skin (Pope-Hennessy, Catalogue, 479ff.); even here, however, a distinction from “normal” portraiture is made by the small scale (28.6cm).
38 The two Scipione busts were made in 1632, and are mentioned after that of Urban VIII in Guidicciioni’s letter (see n. 65 below).
39 The Bonarelli bust is undated but there is good evidence for placing it about 1635 (Wittkower, Bernini, 203). The Bonarelli bust, in fact,
“pure” portraiture in sculpture. Duquesnoy must certainly have owed a considerable debt to Bernini; his busts of Urban VIII and Cardinal Scipione Borghese, made the year before, had broken radically with the traditions of official portraiture by introducing elements suggestive of a direct, casual relation to the sitter. But a few years later Bernini himself in turn seems to have profited from Duquesnoy’s experiment—in the bust of his mistress Costanza Bonarelli, which is probably the first pure portrait bust in the sense that it is private, informal, and made exclusively to record the features of another human being as the artist saw them.

Francesco Mochi’s Portrait Busts

Probably the earliest bust we have by Mochi is that on the tomb of Cardinal Ladislao D’Aquino in Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome (Fig. 7). D’Aquino died on February 12, 1621, and the inscription on the memorial records that it was erected by his protégé, one Giovanni Riccio of Pescia. It has been assumed that Mochi did not carry out the work until after his final return to Rome from Piacenza in May, 1629. But we know that Mochi was in Rome on leave of absence for the first six months of 1621 and the bust may well have been executed then, in the period immediately following the Cardinal’s death.

The portrait displays the fundamental elements of Mochi’s style, which might be considered first under its representational, then under its formal aspects. The pose involves a vigorous tension, with the head thrust forward and to the right; it crushes the collar on the right and pulls the drapery into a series of folds running diagonally across the chest, which are punctuated by the irregular cascade of buttons. The drapery at either shoulder bends forward suggesting an action of the arms enframing the torso. The head is large in proportion to the rest of the body, lending emphasis to its great domical mass. As in the portrait of Alessandro Farnese on his equestrian monument in Piacenza, which Mochi executed following his visit to Rome, the wrinkles on the forehead and between the brows give the face an expression of fierce concentration that seems to project from the sharply focused eyes.

These “representational” devices owe much of their penetrating force to the way in which the forms are rendered. The cranium is almost spherical and the features of the face seem to have been laminated together from a multitude of separate sections. The hair of the head and beard consists of clearly defined strands and short clumps, which do not fuse into a soft texture but form independent units in a carefully arranged system. The drapery is a structure of plain surfaces intersecting along sharp edges that represent the folds. Even the large buttons are pure, smooth shapes.

Thus, the strained animation of pose and expression is underscored by the geometric severity of design and precision of technique. As a result, while Mochi creates an effect of great feeling, the emotional content is impersonal and austere, raised to an ideal plane. It is this combination of psychological intensity and otherworldly abstraction that gives Mochi’s work its extraordinary affective power.

The inscription below the bust helps to elucidate its specific meaning. D’Aquino, who was one of the strongest candidates for the papal throne at the moment of his death, during the conclave that elected Gregory XV, is described as “famed for his great virtues” and as having been “called during the conclave by divine will and favor not to the highest earthly office
but to heaven." The bust actually seems to show the Cardinal as one who turns from the affairs of this world to concentrate on the awful aspect of the next. This kind of spirituality has its nearest precedent in Roman funerary portraiture of the late sixteenth century. Intense facial grimaces and a bleak austerity of form often characterize the icon-like images that peer threateningly from the tombs of the period of the Counter-Reformation. Mochi retains the spiritual content of this style, but for its deliberate rigidity and dessication he substitutes a new feeling of vitality and mobility. In 1621, the bust of D'Aquino must have pointed the way to a freer and more expressive conception of the sculptured portrait.

A measure of the work's significance is provided by comparing it with one by Bernini that must have been made at almost the same time, the bust of Cardinal Dolfín in San Michele all'Isola in Venice (Fig. 8). Both portraits are equidistant from the hieratic schemata of the earlier phase. But in the Dolfín bust all the qualities we have mentioned seem to find their diametric opposites: emotional warmth, physical ease, subtle modulations in the treatment of form. Bernini, too, suggests an inner life. He does so indirectly, however, by creating an optical illusion. Paradoxically, though drama and movement are qualities in portrait sculpture for which Bernini is often given credit, the Dolfín bust seems muted and restrained by comparison with Mochi's work.

The first of the newly identified portraits by Mochi, now in the Museum of Art at Toledo, Ohio, represents Cardinal Antonio Barberini, a nephew of Pope Urban VIII (Figs. 9–10, 12–13). The importance of the bust was first appreciated by Antonio Nava Cellini, who also established the identity of the sitter. Nava Cellini attributed the bust to Bernini, though with a remarkably penetrating analysis in which she recognized the anomalies it presented in relation to his other works. In fact, it is listed in 1644 and 1671 in the inventories of Cardinal Antonio's own art collections, and Mochi is named as the artist. The Pope raised his nephew to the purple in 1627, though the appointment was not made public until February of the following year, at which time Antonio was only twenty years old. The Cardinal is shown as an extremely young man and Nava Cellini was doubtless correct in suggesting that the bust was executed to celebrate his elevation; Mochi returned from Piacenza in May, 1629, whereas the Cardinal left Rome for a long series of diplomatic missions in November of the same year; we may safely assume that the portrait was made in the intervening months.

Many analogies with the D'Aquino bust are immediately evident: the simplified rendering of the facial topography, the emphasis in the drapery on plain surfaces broken abruptly by angular folds, the collar projecting outward in a perfect tubular shape, even the large, smooth, flat buttons.

The mood here is very different, quiet and introspective. The head is generally inclined and the sharply projecting brows cast a shadow over the eyes. Within these shadows the pupils are incised to suggest that the glance is slightly upward. The figure seems lost in a spiritual reverie and the soft, uniform luster of the surface contributes to the sense of ethereality.

The stylistic differences from the D'Aquino bust are of special interest, for while the outward emotion is subdued, the formal qualities of the earlier work have been intensified. A series of dramatic contrasts is introduced: the dark marble base enhances the whiteness of the bust itself; the broad expanse of the torso and the loose-fitting garment make the head seem very small and the neck very slender; the pellucid refinement of the face is enhanced by the heavy masses of wavy hair that engulf it. Also, the drapery now has an outright metallic effect, bent irregularly at the center and rolling into trumpet-shaped folds at the sides. The collar appears as a section of a horizontal circular tube, through which the vertical cylinder of the neck

46 On the dating of the Dolfín bust, early 1621, ibid., 238.
47 We may add here, by the way, some notes concerning a lost portrait bust by Mochi described by Pascoli, Vite, ii, 414, as very similar to that of Aquino. It represented one Marcantonio Eugeni, and decorated his tomb near the Eugeni family altar in Sant' Agostino, Perugia. Eugeni, who died in 1657, was a consistorial advocate and was listed as a consul of Rome in 1641 (Forcella, Iscrizioni, i, col. 1). The bust is mentioned as the work of Mochi and the inscription on the tomb is transcribed in a manuscript description of the church preserved in the archive of Sant' Agostino at Perugia: J. Giappesi (d. 1720), Diversarum, 272f. (cf. D. A. Perini, Bibliographia augustiniana, Florence, 1931, i, 112). For the inscription see also Le Trombe funebri nelle solenne e sacre celebrate in S. Agostino di Perugia all' Illustr. Signor Il Signor Marcantonio Eugeni Avvocato Concistoriale. Perugia, 1659, last page (Bibl. Comunale, Perugia). On Eugeni, see G. Moroni, Dizionario d'erudizione storico-ecclesiastica, Venice, 1840ff., i, 158f. The work is recorded in guide books of Perugia (e.g., C. Costantini, Guida al forestiere per l'augusta città di Perugia, Perugia, 1784, 137) until Sant' Agostino was rebuilt around 1800 (O. Gurrieri, "La chiesa di Sant' Agostino in Perugia e le sue vicende architettoniche," Atti del V convegno nazionale di storia dell'architettura [Perugia, 1948], Florence, 1957, 562).
49 The attribution to Bernini was followed, also with reservations, by Wittkower, Bernini, 194. The bust was reproduced with an attribution to Giuliano Finelli, and falsely identified as Cardinal Francesco Barberini (presumably following a lapse in Wittkower) by R. W. Lightbown, "The Journey of the Bernini Bust of Charles I to England," Connoisseur, 164, Dec., 1968, 220, fig. 6.
50 "Un ritratto con suo petto di marmo di S. Em" fatta dal Mochi con pedestallo di giallo, e nero" (BVAB-Inv. Ant. 1644, 75; cited by Martellini, "Il Battesimo di Cristo di Francesco Mochi," Bollettino dei Musei comunali di Roma, 3, 1956, 59, n. 18, before the work came to light); it is evaluated at one hundred and fifty scudi in the inventory of Cardinal Antonio's possessions taken following his death in 1671: "Un ritratto della F. M. del s. Card. Antonio di altezza p. 3½ con suo peduccio di giallo, e nero venato—150" BVAB-Inv. Ant. 1671, 672; also in a 1692 inventory of Cardinal Carlo, Antonio's nephew: "Un ritratto in marmo del S. Card. Anto
protrudes. Finally, a suggestion of mathematical rigor is introduced by the vertical and horizontal creases incised in the mozzetta like an algebraic grid.

In sum, the observer is affected in a subtler but perhaps more incisive way than by the D'Aquino bust; the impression of psychological depth is greater, while the image is more ideal.

Two matters concerning the shape of the portrait require comment because they provide additional insights into Mochi’s attitude toward preceding traditions, especially considered in relation to Bernini. One of the remarkable features of the Antonij bust is the great width and relatively low cut-off line of the torso. Through the 1620’s and after, Bernini tended to increase the width of his torsos, thus moving away from the vertically oriented shapes preferred in the late sixteenth century, especially in Rome. Although Mochi, too, added width, he counteracted it by increasing the length as well, and in this sense he may be said to have adhered more closely to the past. Moreover, the change in relative dimensions is used to very different purposes by the two artists. Bernini creates a balanced proportion between head and body, while Mochi, as we have mentioned, used the vast torso to emphasize the refinement of the head and the delicacy of the physique one senses beneath the drapery. The somewhat ungainly effect, a recurrent feature in Mochi’s work, adds a subtly disturbing note, whereas with Bernini it is the melodious harmony by which we are moved. The important point, however, is that in both cases a new relationship between head and torso is established, the result of which is to make the image seem more imposing.

Equally significant is the contour of the bust’s lower edge, which might be described as a segment of a circle flanked by two tangents. During the twenties Bernini had developed a characteristic bow-shaped lower silhouette for his portraits, in which the lateral portions of the line move outward and upward in two flaring arcs. The curves are swelling and buoyant, and where they meet the lines of the shoulders they form spearheads that pierce the surrounding space. Again, Mochi’s expansive outline also differs from the cramped tightness of the earlier style; but his design remains closed and self-contained, and below, instead of sinuous curves, the shape is geometrically simple. Whereas Bernini’s busts seem to float effortlessly on wings, Mochi’s seems to ride stiffly on rockers. But in either case the effect involves a more dynamic relationship between the bust and its support.

For the shape and proportions of the bust Mochi seems to have taken as his model the opulent, polychrome portrait of Paul III Farnese by Guglielmo della Porta (1546–47; Fig. 11), Mochi must have known the work well, since it was kept in the Roman palace of the Farnese family, by which he was patronized and protected all his life. The Farnese bust may have inspired not only Mochi’s design but also his use of a darkly colored base. At the same time, he introduces significant changes: by lowering and altering the form of the base and by straightening the sides of the lower edge, he creates a simpler, broader outline and a less precarious support; for the complex, interweaving color scheme he substitutes a single, bold contrast. In general, it is as though della Porta’s image of ancient, worldly wisdom had been rejuvenated, traced to its origin in youthful purity and idealism. Although there is no direct evidence to suggest an interpretation of Mochi’s portrait, it is possible that both the similarities to and differences from the Farnese bust had more than formal significance. When Antonio Barberini was made Cardinal, Urban VIII was widely criticized for appointing such a callow youth; and the accusation of gross nepotism had particular force in view of the fact that he had already elevated his own brother and another of his nephews. The specific effect that Mochi’s bust conveys of high seriousness and spirituality vested in one so young and frail may have been intended to counter these objections.
The third bust we have by Mochi, now in the Museo di Roma, represents Carlo Barberini, a second brother of Urban VIII and Cardinal Antonio's father (Figs. 14, 15, 17). 58 Carlo, who had been made General of the Holy Church by the Pope in 1623, died in Bologna in 1630. The bust was probably commissioned then as a private memento paralleling the public monument—an ancient standing cuirass statue restored by Bernini and Algardi, installed in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in the same year. 59 Carlo's bust must have been conceived as a pendant to that of Cardinal Antonio, to which it corresponds in dimensions, general outline and in the form and material of the base. Moreover, the mature, erect, imperious military figure forms an ideal antitype to the contemplative introversion of the young Cardinal.

The stylistic tendencies discernible in the bust of Antonio are still more pronounced here. The undecorated armor plate is a pure, stereometric construction. Its stark perfection is reinforced by the diagonal sweep of the sash, which is tightly drawn so that it encircles the body with an aureole of strident lines of tension. Again the form of the torso is unusual. The arms are not severed along one of the horizontal divisions of the plate, as might be expected in an armored portrait of this kind. 60 Rather, the cut-off lines are diagonal and form tangents to the curve of the waistline. Thus, no voids are left under the arms, the silhouette remains closed and the torso appears as one great, coherent volume from which the head protrudes. At the same time, the seemingly arbitrary diagonal amputation also creates a sense of fragmentation, and this effect is deliberately evoked at the left by the angle of the section through the stump, which makes its surface visible from the front. As a result, the right arm seems to penetrate the spectator's space. This, in turn, enhances another remarkable feature, namely the asymmetrical movement of the arms. The right arm is actually extended forward, the left back, as if they were performing counteractions. This action of the arms, in concert with the turn of the head, gives the figure a subtle but insistent diagonal thrust through space. Confirmation of Mochi's intention is provided by an engraving of the work, based on Mochi's own drawing, in which the bust is shown at an angle that emphasizes its diagonal orientation and the severed surface of the arm (Fig. 16).

The effect of these devices is to suggest that the bust is part of a complete, moving figure. Instead of restoring an ancient fragment Mochi created a modern one of his own. The idea, as for bibliography see Martinelli, Seicento europeo, 1957, 271. Martinelli dated the work 1635–40; the bust came to the Museo di Roma from the Palazzo Barberini.

Martinelli, "Alcune opere," 73, pl. xxx, published as an original by Mochi a second, closely related bust of Carlo Barberini, also from the Palazzo Barberini in Rome and now in the apartment of Augusto Barberini in the Palazzo Barberini at Palestrina. Though of good quality, it is actually a simplified copy of the work in the Museo di Roma, reducing the bold carving and subtle variations of the latter work to a rigid scheme. For example, the scalloped edges of the armor plate, which in the Museo di Roma bust are variously bent and undercut, are flattened and regularized in the Palestrina version. A row of scallops emerging from beneath the sash above the right breast has been omitted. The asymmetrical displacement of the arms (discussed in the text immediately below) is eliminated, and instead of being detached, the arms are joined closely to the body. Nor are the stumps of the arms cut diagonally, but follow the sections of the armor. In all these respects the Museo di Roma bust, not that at Palestrina, corresponds to the engraving after a drawing supplied by Mochi himself (Fig. 16) in H. Tetius, Aedes Barberinae, Rome, 1642, 221. The only detail in which the Museo di Roma bust does not correspond to the engraving is that it has no collar (present in the Palestrina version). The explanation of this difference is suggested by a tell-tale gash visible at the center of the upper lip of the neck-piece; it indicates that a collar once existed, but was removed probably because it had been broken.

That the Palestrina version is a later copy is evident, finally, from the Barberini inventories. Only one bust of Carlo is mentioned in Tetius's description of the Palazzo Barberini (1885, f.), whereas two appear in Cardinal Antonio's 1671 inventory. One of these is again described as having a black and yellow veined marble base, and is ascribed to Mochi and valued at two hundred scudi: "Un ritratto della F.M.* del s.D. Carlo Barberini di p.m. 4 di altezza di mano del Mochi con suo peduccio giallo, e nero venato—200;" the second is without an attribution and valued at only sixty scudi: "Un ritratto della F.M.* del S. D. Carlo Barberini di marmo alto p.m. 3½—60" BVAB-Inv. Ant. 1671, 672. In the 1692 inventory of Cardinal Carlo the first bust is described as "Un busto grande del S. R. D. Carlo Barberini armato di corazza con banda, con suo peduccio quadro di nero venato di giallo," the second as "Un altro di S. D. Carlo Barberino armato di Corazza, e banda con pieduccio di porta santa" BVAB-Inv. Carlo 1692, fols. 248v, 265. In fact, the Palestrina bust has a rose-colored base of Porta Santa marble, while the base of that in the Museo di Roma is of veined black and yellow marble. (Both busts are of essentially the same height: that in the Museo di Roma one hundred centimeters with, 85.3cm without base; that in the Palestrina 99cm with, 82cm without base, though they are given slightly different dimensions in the 1671 inventory.)

58 See Wittkower, Bernini, 196.
59 See Giusebch, Römische Porträtbüsten, pls. 30, 63, 66.
60 In general, see the comments on the portraits of Cellini and Bandinelli in Pope-Hennissy, Italian Sculpture, 1, 94f., and Lavin, "Five New Sculptures," 227, n. 29, 241f.
61 These motives seem first to appear in Francesco da Sangallo's bust of Giovanni delle Bande Nere, in the Bargello, where the left arm moves forward (ca. 1526; cf. U. Middeldorf, "Portraits by Francesco da Sangallo," Art Quarterly, 1, 1938, 113f.). The "visibly severed arm" occurs also in the bust of the artist's father by Ridolfo Sirigatti, the first teacher of Pietro Bernini, in the Victoria and Albert Museum; here the left arm moves forward, the right back (inscribed 1576; cf. J. Pope-Hennissy, Essays on Italian Sculpture, London and New York, 1968, 162f.).
62 This is most strikingly the case in Bandinelli's large bronze bust of Cosimo 1. In a draft of a letter of ca. 1556–58 concerning the bust, Bandinelli makes the fragmentary effect quite explicit (cf. D. Heikamp, "In margine alla 'Vita di Baccio Bandinelli' del Vasari," Paragon, 1966, No. 191, 58).
63 In antiquity various bust types were derived from statues, but this is evident primarily from the physical attributes, such as physiognomy, costume, etc. (Lippold, Kopien, 162f.). The one notable case in which the bust looks as though it were part of a statue is that of certain portraits of Antinous, where the downward and sideward turn of the head and the raised position of one arm stump suggest the pose of the original figure (ibid., 190; C. W. Clairmont, Die Bildnisse des Antinous, Neuchâtel, 1966, 22). The main purpose, clearly, is to assimilate Antinous to the deity represented by the statue type; but it is also possible that in these classicistic works a reference to fragmentary Greek statuary is intended. It seems probable to me that Bandinelli's marble Cosimo I in the Bargello,
Bernini had introduced an asymmetrical dislocation of the pun. His innovation may best be understood in relation to increasing irregular in outline and take on an existence of the forward stump visible. They their own, independent of the costume. By their arrangement The sixteenth-century sculptors were doubtless inspired by the draperies intimate the body, yet form a proscenium-like screen that conceals its severed edges. The illusion Bernini creates thereby is not that the bust is part of a statue, but that the trunk and arms of the sitter himself continue in an imaginary space below.

We have here, then, a striking instance of Mochi’s innovative return to earlier traditions. He played a crucial role in the transmission of these devices, which serve at once to make the bust more vital and allude to a reality that actually represented. What distinguishes Mochi from the others, however, is that he employs these motives within a convex and strictly symmetrical lower silhouette. The arms and trunk together form a “perfect” outline, and any hint of accidental irregularity is avoided. His bust, therefore, appears neither as a fragment of a statue nor as a fragment of a real human being; it is a fragment, pure and simple. Mochi’s purpose, clearly, was to suggest to the observer the bust’s commemorative function. He did so by creating an object that combines, in a very specific sense, the movement of life and the ideal existence of a monument.

Mochi’s and Bernini’s heads of Carlo Barberini provide a unique opportunity to compare their styles (Figs. 17–18). Bernini’s surfaces are soft, vague, complex; he conveys the acci-

cata.

I have found no ancient example, however, with a real contraposto, one arm stump moving forward, the other back. Moreover, the outline of the Antinous portraits, though asymmetrical, remains smooth and regular, so that the bust appears as a portion, but not as a fragment of a statue. Finally, the cut is of the usual sort, in which the edge, not the surface of the arm stump, is visible from the front.

The sixteenth-century sculptors were doubtless inspired by actual ancient statue fragments, and some reworked fragments have been taken as true busts (Lippold, Kopien, 163).

In his busts of Francesco Barberini in Washington, ca. 1623, and Antonio Cepparelli in San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, dated 1622–23 (Lavin, “Five New Sculptures,” 240ff.). The earliest “displaced shoulder” I know of is in Michelangelo’s bust of Brutus, where the left shoulder is thrust forward.

This emerges from the important laudatory letter dated June 4, 1633, written to Bernini by Lelio Guidicci, recently published by D’Onofrio, Roma vida da Roma, 380ff. In the letter specific mention is made of the motion of the right shoulder and lifting of the mozzetta, showing the Pope as if in “l’attione di accenar col braccio ad alcuno che si levi in piedi.” There can be little doubt that, as D’Onofrio maintains, the passage refers to the bust now in the collection of Giulio Barberini. The letter fixes the execution to the summer of 1632, virtually at the same time as the busts of Scipione Borghese, thus justifying Wittkower’s original early dating (and dispelling my own reservations thereto; cf. Wittkower, Bernini, 185, and Art Bulletin, 38, 1956, 259).

Wittkower has now published another splendid and very similar bust of Urban in a private collection, which he regards, doubtless correctly, as Bernini’s first redaction of the bust in the Giulio Barberini collection (“A New Bust of Pope Urban VIII by Bernini,” Burlington Magazine, 111, 1969, 60–64). There are flaws in the marble of the new work, and these presumably made the second bust necessary. Though with considerable hesitation, Wittkower reaffirms his more recent late dating (1637–38), despite the evidence provided by Guidicci’s letter.

Apart from stylistic and physiognomical considerations (and these now seem to me in any case to speak for an early date), a significant difference between the two works should be added to those discussed by Wittkower. In the second (Barberini) portrait, a horizontal crease runs along the lower part of the mozzetta which does not appear in the first version. (The same difference may be observed in the two bronzes based on this bust type, in Camerino—without crease—and in the Biblioteca Vaticana—with crease.) The case exactly parallels that of the two busts of Scipione Borghese, where Bernini also introduced a horizontal crease across the bottom of the mozzetta in the second version. The following two documents provide a terminus ante quem of November, 1632, for a bronze bust of Urban, almost certainly by Bernini: November 28, 1632—“E più a n. 6 facchin che portano il piedestalo dove sta sopra il busto di bronzio ritratto di N. S. Papa Urbano VIII” (BVAB, Arm. 34; Contromandati, Taddeo, by date); January 19, 1633—“Al Cav. Lorenzo Bernino spesi da lui in un’piedistallo di granito—√ 25’ BVAB, Ind. 11, Cred. v, Cas. 67, Mazz. lxxii, Lett. i, No. 11, “Statue comperate,” fol. 2.

We may note, finally, that the specific motive of a lifting of the drapery at one side that Bernini used here to suggest the movement of the arm, had close Florentine precedent; see the bust of an ecclesiastic in the Victoria and Albert Museum, attributed to Felice Falma (1583–1625); Pope-Hennessy, Catalogue, 569f.

It should be observed that in the d’Este and Louis XIV portraits Bernini also emphasized the integrity of the bust as such, notably by wrapping the drapery under its lower edge. The illusion hereby is not that the bust is part of a statue, but that the trunk and arms of the sitter himself continue in an imaginary space below.

Concerning the date of Finelli’s bust of Buonarroti, cf. Lavin, “Five New Sculptures,” 227, n. 27. I am able now to add Buonarroti’s payments to Finelli for the work: “Et addi 15 di febb.” [1630] a Giuliano scultore la testa che me fa di marmo mio ritratto di moneta fiorentine—10. 3. 34’; “Addì 12 detto [June, 1630] a Giuliano scultore scudi trenta p resto della testa da mio ritratto di X dieci lo scudo—330” (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, ms Buo-

ca. 1544, emulates this Antinous bust type (Pope-Hennessy, Italian Sculpture, 111, pl. 68).

Apart from stylistic and physiognomical considerations (and these now seem to me in any case to speak for an early date), a
ponents of color, light and form. Mochi simplifies, abstracts, reduces each element to its basic constituent. Bernini achieves his goal by creating a kind of optical hallucination, whereas Mochi achieves his by an equally "super-realistic" clarity of shape and line. What their goals were in this case is suggested by a comparison of the psychological qualities of the two portraits. Bernini's head seems particularly reserved because the eyes are left blank, no doubt to maintain the allusion to classical austerity inherent in the conception of the monument. But a resonant effect of psychological poise and fluidity is characteristic of his portraits, even when they are most dramatic. Mochi sounds a more strident tone; the sharply incised lines of the forehead and the raised eyebrows give the face a tense, high-pitched expression.

Here it becomes essential to consider the expressive problem that Mochi and Bernini probably confronted. The commemorative inscription erected by the Roman Senate on the inner façade of Santa Maria in Araceli, as well as the inscription on the base of the Conservatori statue, lays particular emphasis on the dual aspect of Carlo Barberini's personality. He is described not simply as a military leader but as one who guarded the peace and sought to prevent war by wise counsel and prudence (he was in fact accompanying his son to Bologna on a mission of peace when he died); similarly, he is extolled for his civic as well as his military virtue. In both portraits Carlo Barberini's features are indeed transformed into the image of an ideal man who seems to embody this contradictory notion of martial pacificity. The aggressiveness of the General appears mitigated, in the one case by a sense of humane compassion, in the other by a sense of moral righteousness.

The last of Mochi's busts that has come down to us, though pathetically broken and mutilated, is recognizable at once as one of the most extraordinary achievements of the seventeenth century in portraiture. It represents one Pomponio Zuccarini, who was a canon of Santa Maria ad Martyres in Rome (the Pantheon), and is mentioned as the work of Mochi in the first edition, 1686, of Titi's guide to Rome (Figs. 19-21, 23-24). It formed part of a funereal monument Zuccarini had made for himself near the entrance to the building; the accompanying inscription bore the date 1638, at which time Zuccarini was aged forty-four. Zuccarini was on close terms with the Barberini, particularly with Cardinal Antonio, and it was very likely in this context that he came to have himself portrayed by Mochi. Sometime in the course of subsequent alterations to the interior of the Pantheon, the monument itself and the inscription were lost, and the bust was placed in one of the oval niches in the first of the side chapels on the right.

The work presents many of the same features we found in the earlier busts, particularly those of Antonio and Carlo Barberini. Enough of the lower edge remains to show that it must have been formed by a continuous line whose sides were straight diagonals. As in the portrait of Antonio, the head emerges abruptly from the collar, which is carved as a smooth ring, and the face is surrounded by an elaborate mass of hair; similar, too, are the perfect conical folds that the hanging drapery tends to form and the striated treatment of the curls and

---

67 For the inscriptions see Forcella, Iscrizioni, i, 56, No. 137, 232, No. 1633.
68 Titi, Ammaestramento, 329. Astolfi, "Uomini illustri," 425, queried in passing whether this bust, which he recognized as different from the others in the chapel (see Appendix II below), might not represent Zuccarini. The portrait of Zuccarini was listed among Mochi's lost works by V. Martinelli, "Contributi alla scultura del seicento a Roma. I. Francesco Mochi a Roma," 1951, 235, and in Martinelli and C. Pietrangeli, La protomoteca capitolina, Rome, 1955, 28, n. 11.
69 For the inscription, see Forcella, Iscrizioni, I, 299, No. 1139, and Erol, Raccolta, 460f. (but with a false account of the tomb). The monument is described in the first volume of the manuscript inventory of inscriptions in Roman churches compiled toward the middle of the seventeenth century by Gaspare Alveri (British Museum, Add. ms 8490, fol. 15; cf. the copyist's receipt for payment from Alveri, fol. 133, dated February 3, 1658): "Et attaccato alla settima cima nella quale non vi è accanto cosa..." The measurements are given in the inventory of Zuccarini's house in Piazza Barberini: "Due quadri di tela da testa..." Annunziata et Angelo Gabriele toccate di mano di Guido Reni con cornici dorate che hò in casa"). The paintings are mentioned in the inventory of Zuccarini's house in Piazza Barberini: "Due quadri di tela da tesa..." The measurements are given in the inventory of Zuccarini's house in Piazza Barberini: "Due quadri di tela da tesa..." The measurements are given in the inventory of Zuccarini's house in Piazza Barberini: "Due quadri di tela da tesa..."
70 Zuccarini received various payments from Cardinal Antonio in the early 1630's, "Spese fatte dal s. Giacomo a Bologna..." (see Appendix II below), and several payments from the Senate of Rome, 1662, at the age of sixty-eight (AVR, Santa Maria ad Martyres, "Liber Mortuorum ab Anno 1592 ad Annum 1703," fol. 110).
71 Height without base seventy centimeters (with base eighty-five centimeters); width fifty-six centimeters. The base, which is a separate and different piece of marble, is identical with those under the other busts in the chapel, probably replaced the original when the busts were given a uniform installation. The main losses are in the hair, on the nose, at the left arm, and at the center of the lower edge
the tonsure at the back of the head (Figs. 12, 24). Like the bust of Carlo are the erect posture and proud turn of the head and the alert expression created by the raised eyebrows and furrowed forehead. Details such as the pupils of the eyes are virtually the same in all three works.

What raises the Zuccarini portrait to the level of an epic fantasy is the treatment of the cotta, the linen outer garment worn by the priest during the liturgy, and the hair. The innumerable long narrow pleats of the surplise are transformed into a pattern of rigorously parallel zigzag channels that expand as they move downward. The lace edges and seams are rendered by a regular system of large and small drill holes that are widely enough spaced so that the viewer is constantly reminded of the marble's surface. The contrast could hardly be more complete than with the tremulous, irregular furrows Bernini developed to evoke the same crinkly texture. With unparalleled boldness Mochi here not only defies his contemporaries, but challenges at its very core the whole tradition of naturalism in Italian sculpture since the Renaissance. I know of only one other example of the device used in the Zuccarini bust: the full-length portrait of Cardinal Richelieu made by Mochi himself probably a year or two later (Fig. 22). Here the treatment of the cotta is identical.

The hair of the Zuccarini bust is a wig-like agglomeration of tightly curled locks. They engulf the face without any transition or suggestion of gradual emergence from the head. There is an equally studied relation between the hair and the drapery. By virtue of their comparably small scale the curls and the pleats seem to echo one another; at the same time they set each other off—the shallow, mathematical precision of the one against the deeply undercut, wormy fluidity and confusion of the other. Both seem animated by a kind of electric charge, and together they surround the face with a corruscating network of impulses of energy. In this way Mochi effectively eliminates any sense of a real body, and the eye comes to rest only on the aloof and vaguely pathetic face.

Mochi's position may be made clearer by a final comparison with a contemporary work by Bernini: the bust of Thomas Baker in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, which must have been made about the same time as that of Zuccarini (Fig. 25). On one level the gulf between the two artists has widened. The large, deep drapery folds, the overt action of the pose, the drastically undercut lace collar, the loosely tousled hair—all show that Bernini had moved along a completely different stylistic path. But the differences do not seem so great when one explores the effects these devices produce. The drapery disguises the body to a degree unprecedented in Bernini's portraiture. The left elbow is sliced off so that the lower arm and hand seem to dangle mysteriously, as if supported by the drapery alone. The lace collar acts as a thin screen, behind which one feels the presence of a substanceless void. The hair, again wig-like and directly framing the face, immerses the head in a soft but impenetrable cloud. Soft and subtle modulations give the face the blurred effect of some ectoplasmic apparition. There is even an element of visual "mechanization" in the lace and in the rows of drill holes that reproduce no real
form but suggest the glistening shadows of the hair. Thus, both artists, although in very different ways, tend to dissolve solid physical reality and substitute for it effects based on intangibles, in the one case optical illusion, in the other abstract pattern.

Of equal importance is the analogy between the two busts on the expressive level; both sitters look faintly ridiculous in their elaborate headdresses and costumes and vain postures. It could probably be shown that this element of satire, touching upon caricature, appears here for the first time in monumental portrait sculpture. It also implies, in psychological terms, a very specific and conscious distinction between appearance and reality. In the Baker bust the effect is one of unadulterated wit, whereas in the Zuccarini there is a heroic undercurrent of pathos. But in either case it seems that the artist, by focusing on the outer surface of the personality, sought to expose the inner man.

New York University

APPENDIX I

THE PROBLEM OF MOCHI’S STYLISTIC DEVELOPMENT

To many observers Francesco Mochi’s stylistic development has seemed to run counter to the main evolution of seventeenth-century art in Rome. During the first quarter of the century, in Rome, Orvieto and Piacenza, he produced a series of works whose explosive dynamism broke radically with the past and looked ahead to a new era. Subsequently, however, through the last twenty-five years of his life, he appears to have turned his back on this auspicious start; his outlook became progressively more ascetic and introspective, until in the end he was completely isolated from the very movement he

75 It seems relevant to the appearance of this element of satire in monumental portrait sculpture, that at the same period, in the hands of Bernini, caricature drawing itself became a truly independent art form. I offer here some observations in this regard.

Bernini’s caricatures have been defined as the first in which the genre is raised to the level of an independent art, in the specific sense that he used an abbreviated, consciously “primitve” outline technique, included only one figure (without background) on a sheet, and treated it as a finished and self-contained picture (cf. H. Brauer and R. Wittkower, Die Zeichnungen des Gianlorenzo Bernini, Berlin, 1931, 182 f.). As far as I can see, this definition remains valid in essence, though important contributions to the subject have since been made. (Mahon, Studies, 259 ff.; R. Wittkower, The Drawings of the Carracci in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle, London, 1952, 18, 123 ff.; W. Boeck, “Die bolognesischen Meister des Karikaturenbandes der Münchener graphischen Sammlung,” Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, 5, 1954, 154 ff.)

A problem is posed by Boeck’s re-assignment to Annibale Carracci of certain sheets in an album of Bolognese caricatures in Munich, which Wittkower had rejected and dated after 1650. Apart from the attribution and date, however, the relevance of these drawings in the present context is limited by the nature of the distortion and the drawing style. Some of the pages are devoted to a single, isolated figure, but in these cases the distortion consists mainly in a conventional diminution of the lower extremities to give a dwarfish effect, and the technique involves normal modelling and shading. Another distinction, noteworthy from the point of view of portraiture, is that these drawings show the whole figure, whereas Bernini’s caricatures often concentrate on a bust alone.

On the other hand, a likely clue to the role of the Carracci heritage in the genesis of Bernini’s caricatures is suggested by the circumstances of the publication in Rome, in 1646, of a series of etchings after drawings by Annibale of Bolognese genre figures—artisans, merchants, etc. (cf. Mahon, Studies, 231 ff.). The etchings are accompanied by a preface by Giovanni Antonio Massani (pseudonym Mosoni), who records that he was himself the owner of the album of drawings. Massani was Maestro di Casa of Urban VIII, and Bernini must have known him well. The album had belonged to the letterato Lelio Guidicciioni until his death in 1643. Guidicciioni and Bernini were also closely associated (see n. 65 above and D’Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma, 378 ff.). Guidicciioni, in turn, had been given the album by Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi, presumably as a legacy on the latter’s death in 1632. Bernini’s first datable caricatures—of Cardinal Scipione Borghese, who died in 1633—were made at this time.

Massani’s preface also provides an insight into a significant non-stylistic aspect of Bernini’s conception of “pure” caricature, namely his terminology. Mahon (Studies, 260, n. 45) called attention to the fact that what is probably the first appearance in print of the word caricatura occurs in a passage in which Massani reports Annibale’s theoretical explanation of his satirical drawings. There, however, the word is not applied to the drawings themselves (for which “Ritratti carichi” is used), but to the process of exaggeration (“la caricatura”) by which the artist increases the comical distortion he observes in nature. As far as I know, “caricature” is first used as a true technical term for drawings of this class (e.g., “queste due caricature”) in two letters written in 1652, one by, the other about Bernini (S. Fraschetti, Il Bernini, Rome, 1900, 247, n. 1; L. Ozzola, “Tre lettere inedite riguardanti il Bernini,” L’Arte, 9, 1906, 205). It is also interesting, in the matter of theory, that Massani and other early writers (Mancini, Bellori, Passeri, Malvasia) discuss caricature primarily in terms of imitation or wit, whereas Baldinucci specifically derives Bernini’s caricatures from the artist’s “franchezza di tocco” in drawing (Vita, 140).

A second non-stylistic point that may be added to the definition of Bernini’s caricatures concerns their “sociology.” Bernini’s are the earliest caricatures so far known of specifically identifiable personalities, and he seems to have been the first habitually to caricature very important, high-ranking personages—a final liberation, as it were, from the traditional study of grotesque physiognomies and genre types. Baldinucci (ibid.) and Domenico Bernini (Vita, 29) particularly stress the social prominence of Bernini’s caricature victims. (Cf. F. Stampfle and J. Bean, Drawings from New York Collections. II. The Seventeenth Century in Italy, Greenwich, Conn., 1967, 55. A satirical drawing by Domenichino at Chatsworth showing two members of the Aldobrandini household in an interior setting, is datable 1634, after Bernini’s caricatures of Scipione Borghese; J. Pope-Hennessey, “A Caricature by Domenichino,” Burlington Magazine, 94, 1952, 167.)

That this development took place in the 1630’s is suggested not only by the fact that Bernini’s earliest datable caricatures belong to this period (Domenico Bernini, Vita, 28, says that his father made caricatures in the time of Urban VIII, 1623-44, and after; but so also do his first comedies, which were essentially personal satires, often of important people (cf. I. Lavin, review of C. D’Onofrio, Fontana di Trevi. Commedia inedita di Gianlorenzo Bernini, Rome, 1963, in Art Bulletin, 46, 1964, 570, 572).

It might be objected, regarding sculptured busts, that a satirical content would hardly have been permitted by a high-ranking patron in a formal portrait of himself. But we know, at least, that Bernini’s caricatures of great personages were avidly appreciated by them, and that they themselves joined in the fun (Baldinucci, Vita, 140; D. Bernini, Vita, 29). Paolo Giordano Orsini, Duke of Bracciano, whose busts by Bernini—a small bronze of 1623-24 and a life-size marble ascribed to about 1635 (Wittkower, Bernini, 205)—suggest an element of buffoonery, was, according to one of his own poems, an accomplice of Bernini in caricaturing their friends (published 1648: first cited by A. Muñoz, Roma barocca, Milan and Rome, 1919, 369 f.).


5. Drawing of Lost Bust by François Duquesnoy of Anne Marie Dughet, the wife of Poussin. Farmington, Conn., W. S. Lewis Collection


22. Francesco Mochi, *Portrait statue of Cardinal Richelieu* (fragment). Niort (Deux-Sèvres), Musée Lapidaire


27. Portrait of James Alban Gibbes, engraving after a drawing by Pietro da Cortona, 1666 (from *Carminum Iacobi Albani Ghibesii . . . Pars Lyrica*, Rome, 1688, facing pl. 1)

had helped to create. Although it is generally admitted that at least some of his late sculptures display Mochi’s usual expressive power, even his most sympathetic commentators have regarded those gaunt, hermetic figures as the pathetic exclamations of a solitary and defeated reformer.

Various explanations have been offered for this view of Mochi’s development, the most appealing of which is based on the circumstance that, with few interruptions, Mochi spent the better part of two decades in Piacenza, effectively removed from the crest of the new wave; by the time he returned to Rome in 1629, Bernini, who was nearly twenty years younger, had won such complete control there that Mochi felt himself foredoomed. This situation, with which he refused to come to terms, drove him to despair and introversion. A variety of information from Mochi’s early biographers and documentary sources seems to buttress this interpretation: his persistent allegiance to the ‘‘maniera fiorentina’’ (he was born at Montevarchi, near Florence, and received his first training in Florence under the painter Santi di Tito); certain aspects of his temperament, in which a lofty standard of moral rectitude was tinged with melancholy in later years; his professional difficulties with Bernini and his close friend, Algardi; a long record of disputes over payments for his sculptures, which in one case the patrons actually refused, in another relegated to the basement; his almost total lack of direct following among the younger artists in Rome.

Yet this interpretation seems suspect, for the very harmony it finds between Mochi’s life and art; one feels it may read implications into his stylistic development that are drawn from the external facts of his biography. Our discussion of his portraits suggests a different view, not only of Mochi’s art itself but of his position in the seventeenth-century development at large. I present this alternative here, in brief outline and at the obvious risk of oversimplification, in order to indicate the nature of the problem with which, as I believe, Mochi’s style confronts the historian.

Consideration of the portraits has made it clear that there was no sharp detour in Mochi’s artistic path. They span the pivotal period of his return to Rome, yet display an unusually coherent and consistent development. This may be defined as a concentration and purification of the two components that had chiefly characterized his art from the outset, namely, powerful emotion expressed through abstract, ideal forms. The process of distillation led him to a progressive “internalization” of emotional content on the one hand, and a progressive “dematerialization” of natural form on the other. I have no doubt that comparable analysis of his sculptures other than portraits would lead to the same conclusion. A critical test case is provided by those works made immediately before and after 1629. From the equestrian monuments in Piacenza to the Veronica in Saint Peter’s (1631–39), an evolution may be discerned running exactly parallel to that we have traced in the portraits—design becomes more abstract, linear elements are emphasized, movement is attenuated and the sense of weight and stability is diminished. In the latest works, the Baptism group for San Giovanni dei Fiorentini (1634ff.), St. Thaddeus for Orvieto Cathedral (1638–44)
and SS. Peter and Paul for San Paolo fuori le Mura (1638ff.), which develop from the early St. Philip for Orvieto (1609–10), Mochi followed this course to its conclusion with a ruthless logic. It may be fairly said of Mochi’s later work in general that, far from reflecting a reaction to Bernini, his are the only sculptures produced in Rome after about 1625 which one can imagine would have looked no different had Bernini never been born.

Even this point of view, however, permits the tacit assumption that Mochi’s art, perverse and atavistic, formed a stylistic backwater. But in fact he was far from alone in this respect. Similar trajectories may be defined, mutatis mutandis, in the careers of many other artists of the period. In their late styles, which likewise emerged in the second quarter of the century, Guido Reni, Guercino and Poussin, to name only the most notable cases, also turned toward an otherworldly idealism, becoming visually more astringent and psychologically more intense. It is indicative, not necessarily of a connection between them but of the similarity of their situations, that a number of these artists left Rome, while those who remained found themselves isolated, as occurred with Poussin and Mochi himself. So frequent is the pattern, indeed, that a broad antithetical to the main stream, must be regarded as one of the fundamental aspects of the period, and Mochi must be considered its leading exponent in sculpture.

Sometimes this trend took the form of a more rigorous classicism, but often, even in the work of the same artist, such as Guercino, it took other, more personal forms. Mochi’s development is peculiar only in the sense that it took place within a framework determined largely by his native Florentine heritage. It is this fact that makes his later works, which are frequently variants of earlier ones, seem repetitive and “archaic,” whereas they are better regarded as restatements of his earlier formulations made from the position to which his intervening development had led him. Bernini’s busts of Louis XIV and Gabriele Fonseca and his Ludovica Albertoni are also, in part, revisions of earlier works, along equivalent lines of heightened spirituality.

This last point is particularly important because it reveals the common ground that may, in the final analysis, be found between Mochi’s style and the general direction of seventeenth-century development, wherein the qualities of corporeality and permanence that had dominated Roman art at the beginning of the century gave way to values that seem at once ethereal and fugitive. It is paradoxical but true that Mochi’s strained, emaciated figures foreshadow the elongated, pirouetting types that emerged generations afterward. His draperies, from which all substance seems to disappear, anticipate the flickering, flamelike drapery patterns of the later period. Even the very personal, high-pitched expressive content of his images has its later counterpart in the form of emotional refinement and evanescence. In this context the fact may be understood that what influence Mochi had—and it has probably been underestimated—took the form virtually of a revival at the end of the seventeenth and early in the eighteenth century.

Notes on Mochi's Testament, Death and Legacy

Some confusion has resulted from what was evidently a misprint in a reference by Bertolotti to Mochi’s testament; he gave the date as January 12, 1615. A copy of the testament is preserved in the Archivio Capitolino, Rome, and actually bears the date January 12, 1654. Mochi lived in a house belonging to one Maria Catani, on the Via Gregoriana. He died there of a fever on February 6, 1654, and was buried in Sant’Andrea delle Fratte.

An inventory of Mochi’s possessions was taken on March 13, 1654. Besides a modest list of household furnishings, the inventory records the following works of art:
Tre quadri ordinarij de Retratti de Cardinali franzesi con Cornice dorate [last word cancelled] (fol. 329)
Vn quadro di tela d'Imperatore con la Mad. e S. Giovannino con cornice dorata (329v)
Vn Crocifisso di Bronzo con la Croce di legno orno senza piedi (ibid.)
Si dice esservi anco nell'eredità dei statue ciò è un S. Pietro et un S. Paolo di marmo che l'ha fatti fare dalla b. me. di d' Mochi li Pri di S. Paolo (330v)
Vn altra statua con un battesimo di Xro con S. Giovanni che dice haverlo fatto fare il S. Horatio falconieri di marmo (ibid.)
Vn San Giovanni picolo di marmo (ibid.)
Vn Cavallino di Cera con la figura (fol. 335)
The story of the refusal of the SS. Peter and Paul by the fathers of San Paolo fuori le Mura is told by the early biographers. A supplication for payment of five thousand scudi was submitted by Mochi's wife, Contessa, to Pope Alexander VII and the Governor of Rome (undated, but 1655 or shortly thereafter). A papal brief purchasing the statues was issued on November 20, 1657, and payment of one thousand scudi was made to the artist's son, Giovanni Battista Mochi, on April 15, 1658. We may add here a further document of interest, dated 1654, in which Bernini and Pietro da Cortona (who disclaims competence) evaluate the statues, the former at eight hundred, the latter at nine hundred scudi each:

Copia/ M. 10 III.° Sig.° mio oss.°
Di V S: m. 10 III.°

In niches in the same chapel with the portrait of Zuccarini (see 142 above) are three other busts which for convenience we shall label A, B, C, counting clockwise beginning after that of Zuccarini (in the left niche on the left wall); a fourth bust, D, is in a storage room above the main apse. These portraits may, with one possible exception, be linked with the four, and only four, otherwise unidentified busts of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries known to have existed in the Pantheon.

Bust C (Fig. 26) is that of the English poet and professor at the university of Rome, James Albane Gibbes (1661-77). Gibbes died at the age of sixty-six, having provided for his tomb in the Pantheon in his will. He left two hundred and fifty scudi for his bust and two accompanying inscriptions, the texts of which he supplied. The monument was to be placed “a man destra della Cappella di San Nicolò, nel Corno dell'Evangelo, e dirimpetto al Deposito di Mon-

309, 310. It is significant in our context that Mochi's late works are involved.
83 A. Bertolotti, Artisti veneti in Roma nei secoli XV, XVI e XVII, Venice, 1884, 66.
85 AVR, S. Andrea delle Fratte, Moti, iii, 1647-85, fol. 82; cf. Thieme-Becker, Lexikon, xxxiv, 601.
86 ASR, 30 Not. Capit., Uff. 21, Istrumenti, 1654, 1 fols. 329-30v, 335r-v.
87 Hess, Künstlerbiographien, 135; Pascoli, Vite, ii, 422.
88 Printed in full by Bertolotti, in Archivio storico artistico archeologico e letterario della città e provincia di Roma, 3, 1878-79, 303f.
90 ASR, Tribunale del Governatore, Miscellanea artisti.
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