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V

Five New Youthful Sculptures by Gianlorenzo Bernini
and a Revised Chronology of His Early Works*

IN 1606 the Archconfraternity of the Pietà, proprietor of the Basilica of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini in Rome, determined to erect a hospital

N.B. 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.

* It gives me great satisfaction to record the debt I have incurred to Professor Italo Faldi of the Soprintendenza alle Gallerie of Rome. He has facilitated and encouraged my efforts, often at unconscionable expenditures of his time and energy, in a spirit that can only be described as fraternal. I deem it a privilege that my contribution may be regarded as an extension of Faldi’s own revolutionary work on Bernini’s early chronology.

The substance of this article was first presented in a lecture delivered at the American Academy in Rome in January 1996. I am grateful to Professor Frank E. Brown, the Academy’s Director, for providing that opportunity. The Marchese Giovanni Battista Sacchetti, President of the Archconfraternity of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, and Professor Guglielmo Matthiae, Soprintendente alle Gallerie del Lazio, gave their ready cooperation in matters concerning the restoration and installation of the busts found at San Giovanni. The costs of cleaning, restoring, and installing the busts were covered by a contribution from Washington Square College, New York University; Professor H. W. Janson and Dean William E. Buckler were instrumental in obtaining the funds. Thanks are due to Prince Urbano Barberini, who gave his consent nearly a decade ago to my researches in the archive of the Barberini family, preserved in the Vatican Library; to my wife, Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, whose labors brought to light the bulk of the documents I shall cite from the Barberini archive (Mrs. Lavin will soon publish the seventeenth-century Barberini inventories); and to Dott. Carlo Bertelli, Director of the Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale in Rome, who, in effect, placed at my disposal that organization’s expert personnel and resources.

After this article was set in type a book by C. D’Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma, Rome, 1967, dealing in part with the same material presented here, became available to me; the work is largely polemical and, while it provides useful new information concerning the period, it contains nothing that affects my conclusions.
flanking the south side of the church, between it and the Tiber. The confraternity had been founded in the fifteenth century, and the hospital, one of many such national institutions in Rome, was to provide charitable aid and hospitality to Florentines, whether pilgrims or permanent residents in the Holy City, in need of assistance. Construction of the hospital began in December 1607. It was a fairly imposing structure of three stories, with a main central entrance and a balconied window above, flanked on either side by two smaller doorways.

The funds for the construction and maintenance of the hospital were to come chiefly from donations made by members of the Florentine community in Rome. The three important donors in the first half of the seventeenth century, all of whom were honored by the confraternity with commemorative monuments closely related to one another in type and in physical location. The first of the three was Antonio Coppola, who is described in his commemorative inscription as an ‘eminent’ surgeon. Coppola died on February 24, 1612, at the age of seventy-nine, having willed worldly goods to the hospital. He was the first person to do so, and

---

2 ASGF, Busta 310, ‘Scritture diverse Spettanti alla V. Chiesa Compagnia della Pietà et Ospedale di S. Gio. de’Fiorentini,’ fol. 120.
3 The façade of the hospital is shown in a mid-eighteenth-century engraving inscribed ‘Barbault del.’ and ‘D. Montagu sculp.’ (Rome, Palazzo Venezia library: Roma. XI. 38. IX 2). The façade of the church, by Alessandro Galilei, was built in 1733–34 (cf. Rufini, 34–35). A photograph showing the central portal of the hospital during the demolition (1937) is in the Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale, Rome (E. 21746).
4 See note 6 below for the inscription.
5 A copy of Coppola’s will (along with that of Antonio Cepparelli) is found in ASGF, Busta 606; it is notarized May 30, 1611, by Bartolomeus Dinus, notary of the Camera Apostolica.

On February 19, 1612, five days before he died, Coppola also gave the funds for building the Cappella della Madonna in the transept to the right of the high altar in San Giovanni. The contract for the chapel, with Matteo Castelli, was signed on August 30, 1612, and on June 3, 1614, Simone Castelli accepted final payment for the work. (Documents, including a signed drawing by Castelli, in ASR, 30 Notai Capitolini, Not. Bart. Dinius, Busta 24, fols. 67–68, 440 ff.; cf. Rufini, 59 ff. Photograph of the drawing: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome, E. 42132).
in recognition of this signal benefaction the confraternity determined to erect an appropriate inscription and a marble portrait bust in the hospital.⁶

The second benefactor with whom we shall be concerned was Antonio Cepparelli. A member of a noble patrician family of Florence, he died on April 18, 1622, at the age of sixty-five, having also left a legacy to the hospital.⁷ The confraternity again decided to record its appreciation in the form

⁶ The inscription reads as follows:

ANTONIO . COPPOLAE . FLORENTINO
CHIRVRGO . INSIGNI
QVI . PRIMVS . OMNIA . SVA . BONA
XENODOCHIO . RELIQVIT
EIVSDEM . XENODOCII . DEPVTATI
QVIBVS . MANDATA . TESTAMENTI . EXECVTIO
OPTIMO . BENEFACORI . POSVERE
ANNO . M . DC . XIII . MENSE . IVNII
VIXIT ANNIS LXXIX
OBIIT . DIE . XXIII . FERRVARI
M . DC . XII

(Forcella, VII, 16, No. 30).

Coppola was buried in the nave of the church, where his tomb inscription, which he had prepared six years before his death, is still to be seen:

D . O . M
ANTONIVS . DE . COPPOLIS
CHIRVRGVS . FLORENTINVS
ANNOS . NATVS . LXXIII
CASVM . FVTVRE [sic] . MORTIS
ANIMO . REVOLVENS
VIVES
MONVMENTVM . POSVIT
ANNO . SALVITIS . M . DCVI
OBIIT . DIE . XXIII . FEBRVARII
M . DC . XII
AETATIS . SVAE . LXXVIII

(Ibid., No. 29).

⁷ Cepparelli’s death is recorded in the ‘Libri dei Morti’ of the parish of SS. Celso e Giuliano, where he had died in the Inn of the Sign of the Cat:

A di 18 Aprile. Antonio Cepparello gentilhomo fiorentino di età di anni 70 incirca alla Camera locanda della insigna della gatta doppo ri tutt li ss. sacramenti et raccoman. di anima mori et fu septe a S. Giovanni di fiorentini
(Rome, Archivio del Vicariato, SS. Celso e Giuliano, ‘Morti dal 1617 al 1624,’ fol. 98r), and in that of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini (ibid., San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, ‘Liber III Defunct. ab Anno 1600 ad 1626,’ fol. 63v).

Cepparelli was born on March 27, 1557 (Florence, Archivio dell’opera del duomo, ‘Maschi dal 1542 al 1561, Lettere A G,’ fol. 37v).
of a portrait bust and accompanying inscription. Both the record of the deliberations of the confraternity on this occasion and the inscription itself specifically state that the new monument was made in emulation of that to the earlier Antonio (see Appendix, Doc. 20). This provision was carried out literally, since the two monuments were similar in form and were installed next to each other in a room in the hospital, and since, as we shall see, the same artist executed the busts.

The third benefactor was Pietro Cambi, who died in 1627, to whom the hospital also dedicated a portrait bust and inscription. The bust, which

---

8 The commemorative inscription in the hospital, now lost, is recorded:

ANTONIO . CEPPARELLO
PATRITIO . FLORENTINO
HOSPITALE
PIAE . AEMVLATIONIS
ALTERIVS . ANTONII
MONVMENTVM
STATVIT
ANNO . FVNDATAE . SALVTIS . M . DC . XXII
(Forcella, VII, 21, No. 46).

Cepparelli was also buried in the nave of the church, with the following inscription, still extant:

D. O. M.
ANTONIO CEPPARELLO
CLARA NATALIVM NOBILITATE
FLORENTIAE GENITO
ILLVSTRI PIETATIS EXEMPLO
ROMAE EXTINTO [sic]
XENODOCHIVM NATIONIS
AETERNAE MEMORIAE TVMVLM
REDDIDIT
A QVO MAXIMI PATRIMONII
CVMVLM ACCEPIT
CETERISQVE
QVI . HVIVS . MAGNANIMITATEM
PIE . AEMVLATI
POSTERIS . DOCVMENTVM
RELIQVERINT
SIBI . MONVMENTVM . MERVERINT
AN . SAL . MDCXXII
(Forcella, VII, 21, No. 47).
repeats the form of the Coppola portrait, was executed during 1629–1630 by Pompeo Ferrucci (Fig. 10).9

The location of the monuments is given in a manuscript description of the churches and pious institutions in Rome written toward the middle of the seventeenth century by Giovanni Antonio Bruzio. Bruzio copied the inscriptions, and noted that the memorials were in the hospital, at the side overlooking the Tiber, above the door leading to the balcony; the monument to Coppola was in the center, that to Cepparelli on the right, and that to Pietro Cambi on the left.10 In 1876 the inscriptions were polished by Forcella, who also records the existence of the portraits. Their authorship seems to have been quite lost to history; they are not mentioned by Bernini’s biographers, and he is not named on the few occasions when they appear in Roman guidebooks.11

In 1937 the hospital was demolished to make way for the present structure.12 The three busts and the inscription commemorating Coppola were salvaged and deposited in the sub-basement of the church by some far-

9 Docs. 24 ff. The inscription to Cambi, now lost, bore the date 1627; it is transcribed in Forcella, VII, 24, No. 5. On Ferrucci, cf. V. Martinelli, ‘Contributi alla scultura del Seicento; II. Francesco Mochi a Piacenza; III. Pompeo Ferrucci,’ Commentari, 3, 1952, 44 ff.

10 ‘Sono poi nel d’ ospedale dalla parte che risponde sopra il Tevere sopra la Porta, la quale s’ entra nella Renghita queste memorie sotto i busti fatti di marmo dei mentovati Benefattori, e prima nel mezzo parimente intagliata in marmo . . . [Coppola’s inscription] . . . a man destra . . . [Cepparelli’s inscription] . . . a man sinistra . . . [Cambi’s inscription] . . .’ (BV, ms Vat. lat. 11888, fol. 321v).


12 ASGF, unnumbered volume concerning the new building; cf. fascicules labeled ‘Licenza abitabilità’ (documents dated November 5, 1937) and ‘Cerimonie sulla Posa della prima Pietra e della inaugurazione uffiziale del nuovo fabbricato’ (May 1938).
   (photo: David Lees, Rome).
Rome, San Giovanni dei Fiorentini (photo GFN).

sighted individual, who also took the precaution of writing the subjects’ names on the busts in pencil, making the identifications positive.\footnote{Over-all heights of the busts: Coppola 67 cm.; Cepparelli 70 cm.; Cambi 74 cm. During their stay in the basement, at some point when the walls and ceiling were redecorated, the busts were heavily splashed with whitewash. Wherever it touched, the whitewash left the marble surface irrevocably discolored. Otherwise, the busts are almost perfectly preserved, the only exceptions being the missing left ear of Coppola and left tip of Cepparelli’s collar. Photographs of the busts before cleaning, with the areas of whitewash covering the penciled names removed, are in the Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome.}

The key to the discovery, which took place in September 1966, was a 4-volume manuscript catalogue of the archive compiled by Giuseppe Tomassetti (‘Catalogo delle Posizioni, Pergamene e Scritture esistenti nell’Archivio dei Pii Stabilimenti di S. Giovanni della Nazione Fiorentina, compilato negli anni 1877–1879’; cf. Rufini, 29). The alphabetical index, under ‘Bernini,’ refers to the payments for the bust of Cepparelli (cf. Parte III. Ospedale e Consolato, 103). I first became aware that the Coppola monument had existed from the reference to it in the decree of the confraternity commissioning that to Cepparelli (Doc. 20). In turn, the existence of both of them in the nineteenth century, as well as that to Cambi, was confirmed by the entries in Forcella’s Iscrizioni (notes 6, 8, 9 above), where the busts are also mentioned. Tomassetti’s index refers to the payments for the Cambi bust, but the Coppola monument seems to have escaped him entirely.

The portraits came to light when, upon my inquiry, Commendatore Massimiliano Casali, secretary of the Confraternity, recalled seeing certain busts in the basement years before, and led me to them. Professor Faldi saw to their removal from the basement and to their cleaning and restoration. This was carried out by Signor Americo Bigioni, restorer at the excavations at Ostia. The procedure was as follows: (1) In order to avoid possible corrosion the original iron hooks in the backs of the busts of Coppola and Cambi (photographs in the Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome), which had been held in place by a filling of lead, were replaced by bronze rings. (2) The busts were washed and the hard calcium deposits of the whitewash were removed with a scalpel. (3) To remove greasy dirt the surface was cleaned with alcohol, carbon tetrachloride, and acetone. (4) The busts were then treated with a transparent acrylic polymer consolidant, trade name ‘Pantarol.’ (5) To eliminate the blanched effect left by the chemical solvents and restore a certain lucidity to the surface, a final coating of natural beeswax was applied.

Though I am not qualified to judge from a technical point of view, the visual results of stages 3–5 are to my mind unfortunate. The beeswax combined with the Pantarol gave the white-grey Carrara marble a yellowish cast and satinylike texture. I am also not convinced that it was necessary to remove the original iron hooks, since the lead filling had effectively prevented corrosion at the point of insertion into the marble.

In January 1967 the busts of Coppola and Cepparelli were permanently installed on the piers flanking the entrance to the sacristy of San Giovanni. They were placed on two consoles, contemporary but certainly not the originals, that were also found in the basement storeroom. The original inscription honoring Coppola was placed under his portrait, and under that of Cepparelli a copy with the text taken from Forcella. The bust of Cambi was placed in the archive of the confraternity.
The first reference to the Coppola bust (Figs. 1–3, 7–9) occurs in a record of the meeting of the confraternity on March 8, 1612, about two weeks after his death. 'Let four scudi be paid for the bust (casso) of wax made for the head of the said Messer Antonio Coppola and let Piero Paolo Calvalcanti along with Signor Francesco Ticci commission the sculptor Bernini to make the marble head of the said Messer Antonio Coppola, to be placed in the hospital.' (Doc. 1). Four months later the bust must have been finished, for at the meeting of the confraternity on July 16, 1612, the following action was taken: 'A check was issued to pay the sculptor Bernini that which is due him for the marble head of Messer Antonio Coppola, and the amount was left blank, and an order was given to Signor Andrea Pasquali that he along with Signor Francesco Ticci try to pay as little as possible.' (Doc. 2). The price had been settled a month later when, on August 10, 1612, fifty scudi were paid to Pietro Bernini, to cover the entire cost of the bust (Doc. 4). During August and September payments were made for a gesso mold of Coppola's head and for his painted portrait (Docs. 3, 5). According to the inscription the monument was installed in June 1614; the inscription itself was not actually paid for until the end of the following year (Doc. 6). The reason for this delay was probably that the hospital was not yet completed during 1613–1614, as payments to various workmen show.

These records are of considerable interest even apart from the fact that they help to identify the author of the bust and fix very precise dates for its installation.

A fourth bust was also found in the basement, where it still remains; it is a curiously archaizing work, sixteenth-century in type, but with a complex and asymmetrical treatment of the drapery that suggests a later period. It is perhaps to be identified with a bust of Antonio Altoviti recorded by Forcella along with a commemorative inscription, dated 1698; the location, whether in the hospital or in the church, is not given (Forcella, VII, 35, No. 83).

The number of letters specified in the stonecutter's bill (Doc. 6a) corresponds to that in the preserved inscription, i.e., 225. The present dimensions (835 x 560 mm.) are smaller than those mentioned (4 1/4 x 4 1/2 palmi = 1059 x 1003 mm.), indicating that the inscription was cut down, probably when the other monuments were added to form a group. The dimensions of the Cambi inscription were 780 x 353 mm. (3 1/2 x 1 1/2 palmi; cf. Doc. 28). Roman palmo = 223 mm.

One payment may perhaps refer to the railing of the balcony of the room in which the monuments were installed (see note 10 above): 'p avere rimesso sotto lo ispidale el chancelllo chon mia ranpini echiodi eseghato la ispaliera delli ufiziali che si dividia in 2 pezi erimesso le banche atorno che erano chavate p el fiume — V 1' ('Conto di lavori fatti p servizio dello ispidale di san giovanni de fiorentini fatti dalli 20 di aprile 1613 insino alli 22 di febraro 1614'); ASGF–205, near the beginning of the volume. Other payments to muratori and scarpellini for work during 1612–14 occur in the same volume.
execution — March to July 1612. The references to wax and gesso forms show that the portrait was based on a death mask made before Coppola was interred. The order to pay for the portrait (Doc. 2) has two features that are, in my experience, unique. The decree provides that a blank check (‘mandato in bianco’) be issued; this is the first time I, at least have encountered a bank draft of this kind in payments of the period. Furthermore, the representatives of the confraternity are ordered to ‘try to pay as little as possible.’ This, too, is new to me, and indicates that the price for the bust had not been agreed upon in advance. Both these exceptional features suggest that the circumstances of the commission were unusual. In 1612 Pietro Bernini was fifty years old and one of the leading sculptors in Rome, having recently completed two major papal commissions. The confraternity would scarcely have been in a position to deal with an artist of Pietro Bernini’s stature in the manner implied by the blank check and the order to pay as little as possible — especially for a commission that had already been accepted and carried out. On the other hand, this is exactly what one would expect if the person who actually executed the work was a minor. Gianlorenzo Bernini was born on December 7, 1598. At the time of the commission of the Coppola bust his age was thirteen years and three months. We know of several other instances during the following years in which the father, acting as an agent, received the payments for work done by his prodigious son.

Even apart from the peculiarities of the financial arrangements, however, and even if the bust itself were not preserved, we could deduce which Bernini carved it. Pietro Bernini never made portrait busts. None are men-

---

16 The Assumption of the Virgin (1607–10) and the first version, now lost, of the Coronation of Clement VIII for the chapel of Paul V in Santa Maria Maggiore (see note 37 below).

17 Bernini’s birthdate is recorded by Baldinucci and Domenico Bernini; Fraschetti’s effort to find the baptismal record in Naples was fruitless (Bernini, 2 n. 1).

18 We shall discuss two such occasions below (pp. 246 and 265): the angels for Sant’ Andrea della Valle, 1618, for which Gianlorenzo later received a retrospective payment on his own (Doc. 17a); and one of the payments for the bust of Cepparelli, 1622, made out to Gianlorenzo and signed for by Pietro (Doc. 22b). In later years, at Saint Peter’s, Pietro became simply an administrator for work done under his son’s direction (Pollak, II, passim; cf. H. Hibbard and I. Jaffe, ‘Bernini’s Barcaccia,’ BurlM, 106, 1964, 169), and received a number of payments on behalf of Andrea Bolgi (Muñoz, 459). Cf. also the case of the portrait of Cepparelli by Pompeo Caccini, whose son accepted the payment (below, note 120).
tioned in the sources, none are recorded in the documents throughout his long life, and none are preserved. A portrait presumably by him does exist, which we shall consider shortly (cf. Fig. 12 and note 37; but it is of a very special kind, and later than the bust of Coppola. The documents alone would thus confront us with the choice either of imagining the bust to be a work of the father, who never before and never afterward did a thing of this kind, or of assuming it to have been in fact executed by the son, who became one of the greatest portrait sculptors of all time and concerning whom the early sources consistently tell us that it was precisely his amazing precocity as a portraitist that brought him his first, childhood fame. We have no less than three monuments executed jointly by the son and the father before Pietro's death in 1629, and in each case it was the son who did the portrait bust, while the father was responsible for the accompanying figures. A significant point also, is that the bust of Antonio Cepparelli, ordered by the confraternity a decade later with the specific intention of emulating the first memorial, was commissioned from Gianlorenzo. Finally, documentary evidence for Gianlorenzo's authorship of the Coppola bust is afforded by a payment made by the confraternity in May 1634 (Doc. 29). A woodworker was then paid for installing in the basement of the hospital two terra-cotta portraits, doubtless the preparatory models for the busts of Coppola and Cepparelli. The document makes no distinction in the authorship of the terra cottas, saying that both were 'by the hand of Bernini.' The workman was paid for 'the bases, iron clamps, etc., made for maintenance of the two clay heads made by the hand of Bernini, which are kept under the hospital. . . .' Unhappily, I found no trace of the two models.

The portrait of Coppola is an unforgettable image of an emaciated old man with sunken cheeks and cavernous eye sockets. The spidery fingers cling without force or tension to the drapery that envelops the figure like a shroud. Here, the difference between life and death has been obliterated. It is the figure of a man in suspended animation, emotionless and timeless, yet

---

19 For the bibliography on Pietro see Pope-Hennessy, Catalogue, 122. Significantly enough, the one portrait bust attributed to him in a seventeenth-century (French) source, that of Cardinal de Sourdis in Bordeaux, is actually the work of Gianlorenzo (see note 100 below).

20 Discussed below, pp. 202 ff.

21 See the works for Cardinal de Sourdis in Bordeaux, the tomb of Cardinal Dolfin in Venice, and that of Cardinal Bellarmino in the Gesù, discussed below.

22 Unhappily, I found no trace of the two models.
with the penetrating effect that only the spectre of death can have upon the living.

The bust is a challenge to the very notion of *juvenilia*, by which we mean works displaying characteristics attributable to the artist's youth alone, independent of his own personality or the period in which he lived. The stiff posture, the relatively small head poked on the long, barrel-like torso cut in an arc at the bottom — elements such as these lend the bust a quality of abstraction common in children's art that might, conceivably, lead one to suspect it was the work of an adolescent. It would also have to be admitted, however, that the portrait owes much of its disquieting effect to these same elements. A somewhat analogous problem is raised by the fact that the bust was made from a death mask. It might be argued that the mask made possible a greater degree of realism than would have been attainable otherwise. But the spectral quality of the image as a whole cannot be explained in this way, since it depends as much on the pose and composition as on Coppola's physical features. Bernini seems to have been caught by the idea of infusing in what is ostensibly the portrait of a living person some of the 'deathliness' of a corpse.23

If it is astonishing, to say the least, that a thirteen-year-old could conceive and execute an image of such affective power, it is equally disconcerting to realize that the work constitutes an important innovation in the history of modern portraiture. In the course of the sixteenth century in Rome there had developed an austere, 'classical' tradition of portraiture characterized, especially toward the end of the century, by compact, tightly drawn silhouettes, hard surfaces and sharp edges, and psychological effects of an often aggressive intensity (cf. Fig. 6).24 Although this type continued well into the first quarter of the seventeenth century, after about 1600 there is evidence of a tendency to mitigate its severity, with softer textures and more relaxed facial expressions.25 The Coppola bust takes its point of departure from this phase of the development. With its closed outline and simple, almost geometric shapes it adheres closely to the classical tradition (which, indeed, Bernini never entirely forsook). In other respects, however, it

---

23 The underlying attitude is essentially the same as that which led Bernini in later years to develop his famous 'speaking' likenesses to preserve the vitality of the living.

24 The development is made sufficiently clear in Grisebach's *Römische Porträtbüsten der Gegenreformation*, cf. 19 ff.; it should be borne in mind that Grisebach's survey is confined almost exclusively to portraits made for tombs, and omits papal portraits entirely.

reflects a spirit fundamentally different from that which had prevailed in Rome in the wake of the Counter Reformation.

To begin with, the form of the bust, cloaked around the shoulders with the right hand emerging to grasp the edge of the drapery at the front, is based on an authentically classical portrait type that had developed from Greek representations of philosophers, poets, and orators (Fig. 4). It has been thought that Bernini revived this ancient formula a good many years later, in his portrait of Giovanni Vigevano in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Fig. 46); later still he used it again, with variations, in the bust of Thomas Baker in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The device is one of several Bernini adopted in his lifelong concern with the problem of suggesting the missing parts of the body; yet, he always avoided an effect of arbitrary truncation; in the Coppola portrait the curvature and rounded forward edge of the lower contour assure that the observer perceives the bust as an ideal, self-sufficient form, not as a kind of fragment.

Bernini was not the first to study this ancient portrait type. His interest in it had been anticipated in two busts of members of the Pio da Carpi family in Santa Trinità dei Monti in Rome, made in the latter part of the sixteenth century (Figs. 5, 6). There is, however, a profound difference in the

---


27 Cf. Wittkower, 1953, 20–21, who was the first to emphasize the dependence on Roman prototypes. On the dating of the bust of Vigevano, see below; on the Baker bust, Wittkower, 1966, 208, No. 40, Pl. 64.

The formula was also adopted by Giuliano Finelli for his bust of Michelangelo Buonarroti, Jr., in the Casa Buonarroti in Florence. We may note that this portrait must have been made during Buonarroti’s visit to Rome in 1630 (A. Nava Cellini, ‘Un tracciato per l’attività ritrattistica di Giuliano Finelli,’ *Paragone*, 1960, No. 131, 19), as is evident from a letter written on December 28 of that year by Finelli to Buonarroti, acknowledging the latter’s praises: ‘... e se i Pittori, e gli scultori e i gentilli... sono ritornati a rivedere il ritratto, e gli sono mostrati invidiosi si assicuri da scritore, che gli sono, che hano la vera emulatione all’Originale...’ (BLF, MS Buonarroti 42, No. 910).

28 On this point, see Wittkower, 1953, 21.

29 Contrast Baccio Bandinelli’s bronze bust of Cosimo I de’ Medici recently published by Heikamp (Pls. 45, 47, 48), which gives something of the effect of an ancient statue fragment; in the draft of a letter to the Duke, Bandinelli anticipates the objection that it seems ‘incomplete’ by suggesting that arms and legs might easily be added (Heikamp, 58).

30 Grisebach, 100 ff. Professor James Holderbaum called my attention to the fact that the bust of Cardinal Pio da Carpi is a documented work, 1567–68, by Leonardo da Sarzano (A. Bertolotti, *Artisti Subalpini in Roma nei secoli XIV, XVI e XVII*, Bologna, 1884, 102;
interpretation of the classical formula. In the earlier works it is used for what might be called ulterior motives. Cardinal Pio’s hand is extended in a gesture that invites the beholder to prayer at the altar, and the hand of Cecilia Orsini holds a rosary that serves to demonstrate her piety. In Bernini’s portrait there are no such ulterior motives. Although Coppola’s dress is modern, the purely expressive significance of the classical device, which creates a mood of contemplative introspection, is understood and retained. Coppola is psychologically disarmed, so to speak, and this feeling of intimacy is one of the factors that most clearly distinguish the bust as a new departure. The fresh and unvitiating approach to the art of antiquity, also, is characteristic of Bernini’s early work, as we shall have occasion to observe again.

While the study of antiquity played an important role in the conception of the Coppola bust, many aspects of its style can also be traced to Bernini’s father. This may be seen from a comparison with Pietro Bernini’s relief of the Assumption of the Virgin in the sacristy of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome (1607–1610), a work that had itself made an important contribution to the transformation of Roman sculpture in the first decade of the century (Fig. 27).31 Here we find similarly flat, angular folds of drapery that establish linear patterns of movement; beards and hair that are not described in detail but are treated as coherent masses from which tufts emerge; and most especially, an extraordinary bravura of technique with daring perforations and undercuttings that create an intricate play of shadows and emphasize the fragility of the stone (cf. Fig. 3).

Yet the Coppola bust has none of the outré visual and expressive effects of Pietro’s relief. An initial insight into the peculiar stylistic quality of the portrait is suggested by the scarcely perceptible deviation of the head to the left of the central axis; at the same time, the eyes turn slightly to the right. Optical refinements of this kind, exquisite in their subtlety, pervade the whole work. At some point in his life Coppola must have received a blow to the cranium, and a special fall of light is necessary to study the complex configuration of the depression it left in his forehead (Fig. 7). The rings

---

31 See the documents in Muñoz, 466–67.

---

W. Gramberg, review of Grisebach, ZfK, N.F., 6, 1937, 50). Cecilia Orsini’s bust must be a decade later; she died in 1575.

Miss Ann Markham has called my attention to Holbein’s portrait of Hermann Hildebrandt Wedigh in Berlin, dated 1533, which may be derived from the same classical bust type, though here the left hand is included as well (Hans Holbein d. J., Klassiker der Kunst, Berlin–Leipzig, n.d., Pl. 98).
around the irises of the eyes are not sharp and clear, but irregular and tremulous. The lachrymal ducts at the corners of the eyes are not reproduced in their actual shape, but their watery sparkle is faintly suggested by two small drill-holes. The transition from skin to hair and to the tufted mass of the beard is practically invisible. The tiny mounds on the buttons of Coppola’s garment are only vaguely separated from the larger spheres below (Fig. 9). The fingernails are barely defined. The marble is nowhere brought to a high polish, but is abraded to give a slightly granular texture; light, instead of being reflected, is broken up by the crystalline structure of the surface, and the result is a veiled effect, smooth yet soft and translucent.

This particular kind of optical refinement, the muted impressionism, as I am tempted to call it, seems to have been Gianlorenzo's creation; it introduced a new attitude toward sculptural form, and marks a significant stage in the young Bernini's development.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the innovations we have noted in the Coppola bust — the suggestion of a whole rather than a severed body, the psychological intimacy, and the effect of solid form dissolved by light — are closely interconnected. Together they serve to establish a direct, unself-conscious relationship between the spectator and the subject.

32 This device occurs, with the holes drilled much more deeply, in Pietro's Assumption relief (the right eye of the Virgin, Fig. 26, and the right eye of the angel facing right in the embracing pair to the left of center, Fig. 28), where it is doubtless meant to accent the corner of the eye from a distant viewpoint. (The relief was originally intended for the outside façade of the Cappella Paolina.) Such drill-holes often appear singly in Roman imperial sculpture, and in this form they were well known in the early seventeenth century (Grisebach, 59, 61; cf. also Fig. 29). But I have found no precedent for their use in pairs. Gianlorenzo used the device again in the Santoni bust (Fig. 11; see below).

33 Pietro's Assumption relief provides an interesting illustration of the experimentation with surface textures passed on from father to son. Pietro left the surface without the final polish; the parallel hatchings of a fine-clawed chisel, the next to last stage in the execution, are visible uniformly throughout (Figs. 26, 27, 28). This device also must have served to strengthen the forms seen from afar. In establishing the final payment for the work, which had already been installed in the sacristy, the appraisers offered a higher sum to be paid when Pietro gave it its final polish 'so that it would not collect dust and blacken with time,' a procedure that evidently was not carried out. Ironically, the situation was almost duplicated years later when Gianlorenzo used the same technique for his figure of St. Longinus in Saint Peter's (Wittkower, 1966, Pl. 43). A reference to this treatment is apparent in a petition submitted in 1642 by Francesco Mochi requesting that weekly dusting of his figure of St. Veronica be discontinued; 'the statue being finished in all its parts, dust has no place to attach itself' (Pollak, II, 451, No. 1754).
One of the most important implications of the Coppola bust for our understanding of Bernini’s development is that it confirms the early biographers’ accounts of his precocious genius. Filippo Baldinucci and Bernini’s son, Domenico, report in their biographies of the artist that his first work in Rome was the portrait of Monsignor Giovanni Battista Santoni in Santa Prassede (Fig. 11). Baldinucci says that Bernini executed the bust ‘shortly after he completed the tenth year of his age,’ and Domenico Bernini mentions it in connection with works made when his father was ten. It was owing to the success of this portrait, we are told, that the boy was introduced to the Borghese pope Paul V in whose presence he drew a head. This was the beginning of his fabulous career.

The earliest date that modern writers have been willing to assign to the bust of Santoni is 1613, and usually 1615–1616 is given. Comparison
with the Coppola bust shows that there are many similarities, as, for example, the use in both cases of the double drill-holes at the corners of the eyes. There is a further similarity between the two works in that the bust of Santoni also owes a considerable debt to ancient portraiture. In the powerful sideward thrust of the head, the knitted eyebrows and penetrating grimace, and in the peculiar treatment of the hair and beard which envelop the face with tightly packed nodules of light and dark, it recalls the familiar busts of the emperor Caracalla. Santoni’s locks, moreover, though different in form from those of Coppola, have a similarly gentle, granular texture, and depart radically from the meticulously defined and polished strands or curls typical of sixteenth-century portraits in Rome.

Nonetheless, despite its similarities to the bust of Coppola, that of Santoni is clearly earlier. The sharp features and somewhat exaggerated grimace have many sixteenth-century precedents, as do the small cut of the torso and the polished skin. In general, the soft impressionism of which we have spoken is here less developed, and it is evident that essentially Baldinucci and Domenico Bernini were right. In fact, I think it can be shown that the date specified by Baldinucci, early 1610, was exactly right. Here I follow the lead of Grisebach, who suggested that investigation of the life of Giovanni Battista Santoni’s nephew, Giovanni Antonio, who ordered the work, might reveal the occasion for the commission — long after the sitter’s death — and hence its date. The elder Santoni, who had died in 1592, had been bishop of Tricarico. The inscription on the monument says


37 An analogous facial expression appears on the head of Clement VIII in Pietro Bernini’s relief of the Pope’s coronation on his tomb in Santa Maria Maggiore (Fig. 12). There was a time when, because of this similarity, I thought the Pope’s head might have been the work of Gianlorenzo, and this may indeed be the case. But the relief dates 1612–14 (cf. Muñoz, 469–70), that is, after the bust of Coppola. I now suppose Pietro was here taking a leaf from his son’s book. An earlier version of the Coronation relief is mentioned in documents of 1611–12 (Muñoz, 469).

38 Although Bernini had lived ten years on December 7, 1608, he did not cease being ten years old, i.e., he did not complete the tenth year ‘of his age’ (cf. note 35 above) until his eleventh birthday in December 1609. This way of reporting a person’s age is still common in Italy.

39 Grisebach, 152.
that it was erected in his honor by his nephew, who is himself described as bishop of Policastro. The younger Santoni was named bishop on April 26, 1610, and he must have ordered the memorial to celebrate his achievement of the same rank as his uncle. The bust would thus have been carved early in 1610, just as Baldinucci says.

Another work that must be dated much earlier than heretofore is the under life-size group of the Amalthean goat suckling the infant Jupiter and a satyr, in the Villa Borghese in Rome (Fig. 15). Since it was first identified thirty years ago, it has been universally recognized as one of Bernini’s earliest works, and has generally been placed close to the Santoni bust c. 1615. This dating seemed to find confirmation with the discovery in the Borghese archive of a carpenter’s invoice, dated August 18, 1615, which includes a base for the group. The bust of Coppola now rules out so late a date. There are certain analogies with the Santoni bust (compare the hair on the goat’s projecting leg with that above Santoni’s forehead), but the skin is here even harder and more highly polished, and the transitions between forms still sharper. There are also awkward passages; the satyr’s left hand is ‘out of drawing’ (Fig. 13), and the goat’s turned-under right front hoof is shown incongruously flat and concave (not visible in Fig. 15). In fact, the documents provide good reason to suppose that the Borghese group dates perhaps half a year earlier than the Santoni portrait. In the same invoice of 1615, the woodcarver who made the base for the *Amalthean Goat* listed a base for a comparable group of Hellenistic inspiration, also still in the Villa Borghese, by an unknown sculptor of the period, showing three sleeping putti (Fig. 14). In this case, however, a payment is preserved for the purchase of the group, in June 1609. Evidently it was acquired for one pur-

40 See Forcella, II, 507, No. 1530.
43 Faldi, 1953, 146, Doc. XII.
44 Cf. Wittkower, 1966, 173, who also emphasizes the similarities to the putto heads in the frame of the Santoni monument.
45 Faldi, 1954, 13–14, No. 6; cf. 14, Doc. III. The group, of which many duplicates are known (partial list in Faldi), seems to be by the same hand as the groups of wrestling putti in the Doria Gallery attributed to Stefano Maderno (see below).
46 Ibid., 14, Docs. I, II.
pose in that year and then was put on a base of its own six years later. There is little doubt in my mind that Bernini’s group formed part of the same decorative program and that it, too, was made early in 1609.\(^47\) The work may well have been among the ‘picciole Statue’ which Domenico Bernini appends to his reference to the Santoni bust, saying that his father made them at the age of ten, and that they were seen and much admired by Annibale Carracci.\(^48\) In that case, the dates would correspond perfectly, since Carracci died in July 1609.

In 1961 Antonia Nava Cellini published a life-size figure of a little boy with a delicious smile and two buck teeth, who is seated astride a dragon, pulling its mouth apart (Figs. 16–18).\(^49\) A hole runs from the bottom through the mouth of the dragon, showing that it was intended as a fountain, and there are one or two rust stains indicating that it may have been used as such for a time. Nava Cellini attributed the work, which is now in a private collection in New York, to Pietro Bernini, and supposed, very reasonably, that the sculpture had been made for the Borghese family, one of whose emblems is a winged dragon. She suggested a relatively late date, about 1620, and observed, significantly, that the father was here working under the influence of the son.

Documents from the Barberini family archive, now in the Vatican Library, indicate that the work is by Gianlorenzo, not Pietro Bernini. The group corresponds exactly to the description of a sculpture that appears repeatedly in the inventories of the Barberini family art collections throughout the seventeenth century. It is mentioned in 1628 as having come from the house of Don Carlo Barberini, brother of Maffeo Barberini, who had become Pope Urban VIII in 1623: ‘Un putto a sedere sopra un drago moderno al naturale.’\(^50\) In an inventory begun in 1632 by Nicolò Menghini it

\(^47\) It is worth noting that in October 1609 the Pope purchased a considerable collection of antique sculptures that had belonged to the sculptor Tommaso della Porta (cf. Pastor, XXVI, 448).

\(^48\) Quoted in note 35 above.


\(^50\) BVAB–1, fol. 28, ‘Diverse statue venute di Casa dell’Ecc.mo S.r D. Carlo,’ the entry dated July 28, 1628. The ‘house’ referred to here was the palace in the Via dei Giubbonari; it had originally belonged to Maffeo, who gave it to his brother shortly after his election to the papacy (BVAB, Ind. II, Cred. II, Cas. 29, Mazz. IX, Lett. C, No. 3, ‘Seconda donazione fatta da Papa Urbano VIII al Eccsm.’ D. Carlo Barberini,’ Sept. 22, 1623). The brothers are later reported as having built the Giubbonari palace jointly (cf. Pastor, XXVIII, 30). As
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is listed as ‘Un putto qual tiene un drago alto palmi 2½; fatto dal Cavalier Bernini.’ Two and one-half palms is 55.7 cm.; this is precisely the height of the New York piece. In 1632, Bernini was overseeing the last stages of construction of the Barberini palace, and Menghini, himself a sculptor, was administrator of Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s sculpture collections.

The latest entry is in an inventory of the Pope’s grand nephew Cardinal Carlo Barberini, made in 1692, in which the figure is identified as Hercules: ‘Un ercoletto intiero à sedere sopra un Drago, che con una mano li rompe la bocca.’ In the margin next to this entry the following note was added: ‘Donato à Filippo V. Re di Spagna da S[ua] E[ccelenza] in occ[asi]one della Leg[atio]ne di Napoli.’ The event alluded to here is the arrival in Naples in 1702 of Philip V of Spain. The King’s arrival was an important occasion, and Pope Clement XI named Cardinal Carlo Barberini as his legate extraordinary to go to Naples and welcome the visitor. The Cardinal’s legation we shall see, the sculpture was in all probability commissioned by Maffeo, remaining in the Giubbonari palace until it was transferred to Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the Pope’s nephew, in 1628.

51 BVAB–2, fol. 7v. This entry was published by Pollak, I, 334, No. 960, and the connection with the work published by Nava Cellini was made independently by M. and M. Fagiolo dell’Arco, Bernini, 1967, Schedario, No. 3. The sculpture is also listed in the inventory of 1651: ‘Un altro Putto del naturale, che tiene un Drago p la Bocca alto p.’ (BVAB–3, fol. 1).

52 On Menghini, cf. Pollak, 1, 3, 164; 11, 131, 499 ff. To the list of his works given in Thieme-Becker (XXIV, 389) should be added a lost marble relief of the dead Christ surrounded by angels in San Lorenzo in Damaso commissioned by Cardinal Francesco Barberini (A. Schiavo, Il palazzo della Cancelleria, Rome, 1964, 99, 103) and a bust of St. Sebastian on a gray marble base in San Sebastiano fuori le Mura, popularly attributed to Bernini, but which is very likely identical with a sculpture by Menghini mentioned in the 1692 inventory of Cardinal Carlo Barberini: ‘un busto di un S. Sebastiano con pieduccio di bigio antico del Menghini’ (BVAB–4, fol. 262). Cardinal Francesco Barberini had been responsible for the new altar of St. Sebastian in the basilica (G. Mancini and B. Pesci, San Sebastiano fuori le mura, Le Chiese di Roma illustrate, No. 48, Rome, n.d., 37, cf. 69, Fig. 20).

53 BVAB–4, fol. 242. The work is mentioned by the Swedish architect Nicodemus Tessin the younger in the diary of his second visit to Rome (1687–88) as follows: ‘... ein Christkindlein mit dem drachen von einem discipel vom Cav. Bernini’ (Siren, 168). Tessin’s references to Bernini’s work in the Palazzo Barberini are generally rather garbled: he lists Mochi’s bronze equestrian statuette of Carlo Barberini as by Bernini (ibid., 165), Bernini’s St. Sebastian (see below, p. 231 ff.) as by Giorgetti (p. 167), the two putti by Gianlorenzo from the Barberini chapel in Sant’Andrea della Valle (see below, pp. 232 ff.) as by Pietro Bernini (p. 167).

54 Cf. Pastor, XXXIII, 28–29, with bibliography; Bottineau, 250 ff.
and the ceremonies held in Naples are described in many reports and dispatches, published and unpublished. These include lists of the numerous sumptuous gifts from the Pope and from the Cardinal legate himself, and foremost among the latter was Bernini’s little putto with dragon. In Cardinal Carlo’s own official report of the legation, we find ‘Una statuetta rappresentante un Ercholetto che sbrana il serpente in età puerile opera del s[igno]r Cavaliere Lorenzo Bernini.’ 55 A member of the King’s suite says in a published account that the Cardinal “inoltre presentogli un’altra bellissima statua, che rappresenta un’Ercole, che spezza un serpente, scolpita in finissimo marmo bianco similmente d’un sol pezzo, per mano del Bernini”. 56 I have found no subsequent trace of the sculpture until the first decade of the present century, when it appeared in a private collection in Paris as by an anonymous French sculptor of the eighteenth century. How it came about that this once so prestigious work lost its identity and disappeared remains a mystery. 57

Equally mysterious is the destination and meaning of the piece. It is clearly based on the classical motif of the infant Hercules killing the snakes, for which the dragon has been substituted (Fig. 20). 58 It must surely have had something to do with the Borghese, and we may question where a


56 A. Bulifon, Giornale del Viaggio d’Italia dell’ Invittissimo e gloriosissimo Monarca Filippo V. Re delle Spagne e di Napoli, etc., Naples, 1703, 171. Other references to the gift are found in BV, MSS Barb. lat. 5638, fol. 288v, 289; 5041, fol. 38v; 5408, fol. 21; MS Urb. lat. 1701, fol. 38v, 39; BVAS, MS Bolognetti 64, p. 486; F. Biandini, Descrizione della solenne legazione del Cardinale Carlo Barberini a Filippo V . . . , Rome, 1703, ed. P. E. Visconti, Rome, 1858, 81.

57 Bottineau, 250 n. 274, connected the work given by Cardinal Carlo Barberini to Philip V with that described in the Barberini inventory entry published by Pollak, and states that he found no reference to it in the Spanish king’s inventories.

In 1905 the sculpture was purchased from the Gallerie Sempé in Nice (now defunct) by the Baron Lazzaroni, who kept it in his house in Paris. On the Baron’s death in 1934 it was brought to Rome and in 1955 it was sold to a Florentine art dealer. (Information from Sig. Torre, administrator of the Lazzaroni properties, Palazzo Lazzaroni, Via dei Lucchesi 26, Rome.) It was acquired by the American collector in 1966.

connection with the Barberini can be found. A clue, at least, seems to be provided by a poem written by Maffeo Barberini before he became pope. It appears in the first edition of his poetry, printed in Paris in 1620. The poem is about a bronze dragon that stood in the Borghese garden, and its theme that this dragon is not a fearful monster who stands guard, but a tamed host who welcomes the visitor to the delights of the garden:

I do not sit as guardian, but as a host to those who enter. 
This villa is not more accessible to its owner than it is to you.

Later in the poem there is a reference to Hercules, through the Hydra. The idea of the Borghese garden as a habitat of the tamed and gentle dragon seems, indeed, to have been a theme basic to the conception of the villa. A poem specifically linking this idea to Hercules and the garden of the Hesperides is printed on the verso of the title page of Manilli’s description of the villa in 1650:

Here in the garden of the Hesperides
the guardian dragon does not assail in anger
the wandering Hercules. . . .

Here, tired from his journey
And from so many noble labors,
Reposes Alcides [Hercules] . . .


Draco aereus in fronte laureti, in viridario
Illustrissimi Cardinalis Burghesij
Non sedeo custos, adsto venientibus hospes,
Non magis haec Domino, quam tibi Villa patet.
Hic requiem captare licet, passimque vagari,
Aëris hic haustu liberiore frui,
Nec species animu turbet metuenda Draconis,
Non ego, quae flamnis Hydra perempta cadat.
Non ego sum Python, feriant quem spicula; lauros
Ecce mihi credit Cynthiae ipse suas.

60 J. Manilli, Villa Borghese fuori di Porta Pinciana, Rome, 1650:
Qui d’Hesperio Giardino
Drago custode non assale irato
Hercole peregrino:
We have also the testimony of the official biographer of Urban VIII that the Borghese garden was one of Maffeo Barberini’s favorite haunts before he became pope; he often foregathered there with his learned friends to discuss art and literature. One can easily imagine him commissioning such a sculpture as an allusion to the pleasures of the Borghese garden, where wild nature had been dominated.

The sculpture belongs to the same category of genre or quasi-genre groups inspired by Hellenistic art of which the *Amalthean Goat* provides an example (Fig. 15). Works of this kind, in fact, enjoyed a veritable revival in Rome around the turn of the seventeenth century; besides the three sleeping putti mentioned earlier (Fig. 14), we may note a pair of groups of three wrestling putti attributed to Stefano Maderno in the Palazzo Doria in Rome (Fig. 21) and two closely related groups of Bacchic putti, one of which bears the initials of Pietro Bernini (Figs. 22, 24–25; cf. also Fig. 23).

Sculptures of this kind have a common stylistic denominator in that the figures create complex interweaving forms that move outward in all directions. By contrast, Bernini’s groups seem clear and unencumbered. A single, dominant entry into the world of the sculpture is provided by a member that projects into the spectator’s space. From this point the eye is led in a spiral movement back into the composition, where a transverse axis, in one

In quest’ HORTO beato,
Di Gioue à l’alto Augel fatto consorte
Amico arride à le BORGHESIE porte.
Qui stanco dal camino,
E da tante sue nobili fatiche
Riposa Alcide, in queste piagge apriche.

61 A. Nicoletti, *Della vita di Urbano Ottavo*, I, BV, MS Barb. lat. 4730, 532; cf. Pastor, XXIX, 422.

62 The attribution to Maderno is due to Riccoboni, 142–43 (cf. Fig. 184 for an illustration of the group not reproduced here); the attribution is rejected by A. Donati, *Stefano Maderno scultore 1576–1636*, Bellinzona, 1945, 55–56.

63 The groups, whose present whereabouts is unknown, are mentioned by A. De Rinaldis, *L’Arte in Roma dal Seicento al Novecento*, Bologna, 1948, 205, as having been in the hands of the Roman dealer Sangiorgi. One (Figs. 24–25), which bore the initials *PBF* on the base, was published by Faldi, 1953, 144, Fig. 7. The other work (Fig. 22) came from the Palazzo Cardelli, where it was seen by Fraschetti (431 n.), who identified it with an entry in an inventory taken in 1706 of Bernini’s palace; it was reproduced in *Galerie Sangiorgi. Catalogue des objets d’art ancien pour l’année 1910*, 26 (where the Cardelli provenance is mentioned and the dimensions 90 x 85 cm. given). Cf. A. Santangelo, ‘Gian Lorenzo Bernini (attr.): “Baccante,” *BdA*, 41, 1956, 369–70.
22. Attrib. to Pietro Bernini, Bacchic group. Whereabouts unknown (from Galerie Sangiorgi).


case the two figures of Jupiter and the satyr, in the other the putto's torso, establishes a definite vertical plane facing the observer frontally. Strikingly similar, also, is the cross-torso movement of the right arm of both the infant Jupiter and the putto. Here, again, Bernini had some difficulty in rendering the infantile hand; the little finger of the putto's left hand is scarcely articulated (Fig. 19), and that of the right hand seems flat and boneless.

Despite these analogies with the Amalthean Goat, it is evident that the Boy with the Dragon is substantially later. A difference in date is suggested, to begin with, by the analogies with the comparable works by Bernini's father. The Amalthean Goat, on the one hand, is related to Pietro's signed Bacchic group (Figs. 24, 25) in subject matter, in the conception of the figures and facial types (though Gianlorenzo's are not so bulging fat), and in aspects of technique such as the polished surfaces and the treatment of hair and vine leaves. A relatively early date for Pietro's sculpture is indicated by its close similarity to a lost fountain group in the garden of the Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola, where Pietro had worked at the beginning of his career, which must have been made shortly before 1578 (Fig. 23). On the other hand, the physical type of the 'Ercoletto,' particularly the head, presupposes the angels in Pietro's Assumption relief of 1607–1610 (Fig. 28, cf. especially the head turned toward the left at the far left). At the same time, the pudgy and expressively distorted forms of Pietro's angels have been greatly refined. With its impish but graceful smile and heavy overhanging eyelids that veil the eyes, the putto displays, in even more sophisticated fashion, the kind of psychological intimacy and technical subtlety found in the Coppola bust. (Compare, for example, the delicate striations and soft tufts that mark the emergence of the hair from the head, Fig. 1; and the perforated locks in the back at the base of the skull, Fig. 3) Moreover, the stiff-

--

64 Mr. Loren Partridge, who is writing a dissertation (Harvard University) on the Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola, has brought to my attention the records of this fountain, whose theme and composition were very similar to those of the signed Pietro Bernini group — a goat being milked by several putti (one of whom, evidently the infant Hercules, held a snake). The fountain is recorded in a description of a papal visit to the palace in 1578 (J. A. F. Orbaan, Documenti sul barocco in Roma, Rome, 1920, 386), in an anonymous drawing in the Bibl. Nat., Paris, which Mr. Partridge has generously allowed me to publish (Fig. 23), and in a painted vignette in the palace attributed to Antonio Tempesta (photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome, E. 57825). Pietro Bernini is said by Baglione, 304, to have gone to Caprarola under Gregory XIII (1572–85), working there for a summer. Though Baglione mentions only his activity as a painter, it is tempting to see in the fountain an early work by Pietro himself (born 1562), or at least the prototype for his other groups of this kind.
ness of pose that marked both the figures in the Amalthean Goat and the Coppola bust is here replaced by an easy, flowing movement.

A likely date for the work is suggested by a comparison of the treatment of the boy’s hair with that of the figure of John the Baptist which Pietro Bernini executed for Maffeo Barberini as part of the decorations in the family chapel in Sant’Andrea della Valle in Rome (Fig. 29). Fundamentally, they are very different; the hair of the father’s work consists almost entirely of circular curls with deep drill-holes at the center of each whorl, whereas in the son’s there are no circular curls and practically no drill-holes. Nevertheless, the frothy effect created by fragile undercuttings and continuous, wavy grooves on the surface is similar in both, and they must be very close in date.

Heretofore, we have had no firm date for Pietro Bernini’s statue of the Baptist; but documents in the Barberini archive, which contains many records of the decoration of the chapel, make it possible to fix the period of execution with some accuracy. The commission for a statue of the Baptist had originally gone to Nicolò Cordier, the French sculptor working in Rome;65 Cordier died, however, in November 1612, leaving the figure only blocked out. Pietro Bernini probably began work in the latter part of 1613, when he was given credit for the unfinished block which he agreed to accept in partial payment for the new figure of the Baptist he was to execute in another piece of marble; the sculpture was finished and set in place by May 1615.66

65 Cordier’s contract, dated October 17, 1609, is preserved (BVAB–5, No. 80). Cordier received an initial down-payment of 50 scudi on the same date (BVAB–6, p. 8). Another payment of 50 scudi was made to Cordier’s heirs on June 15, 1613 (BVAB–7, p. XXXI).

66 “Pietro Bernino deve dare Scudi Sessanta di mma che p tanto sie Contentato di Pigliare un Pezzo di Marmo abbozzato da Niccolo cori detto Franciosino p fare un San Gio: Batta et detti Scudi Sessanta di mma Sono p a buon conto dell V 300 che sie contentato della fatt di una Statua di San Gio: Batta che far deve in un altro pezzo di Marmo. . . .” (BVAB–7, p. 126; undated, but the entry is repeated on p. 31 of the same volume, immediately following the payment of June 1613 to Cordier’s heirs, cited in the preceding note.)

Pietro received final payments of 200 and 40 scudi respectively on May 25 and June 20, 1615 (BVAB–9, p. 24). A workman was paid on May 5, 1615, for installing Pietro’s Baptist in the chapel (BVAB 8, p. 4).

A recollection of these events occurs in Fioravante Martinelli’s manuscript description of Rome (c. 1662; see Bibliography), p. 17. In a marginal addition to the text it is stated that Pietro continued and finished the work begun by Cordier: ‘fu principiato dal franciosino Nicolò Cordiere, ma p difetto di morte fu seguitata e terminata [by Pietro Bernini].’ Though possible, it seems unlikely that Pietro failed to adhere to the original intention (see the
Thus, a date about 1614 seems most likely for Gianlorenzo’s *Boy with the Dragon.*

preceeding note) of using a different piece of marble. The same thing happened a few years later, as we shall see, when he again accepted a piece of marble in partial payment for the four putti for the side doors of the chapel, which were carved from a different block (see below).

What must have been a closely related work by Gianlorenzo is recorded in various inventories of the Ludovisi collection: ‘Un’ Puttino di marmo bianco, qual’ piange che una vipera l’ à morsicato alo p. 2; [sic] in Circa con’ un balastrato di marmo bigio alto p. 4 et’ un’ piedistallo di marmo bianco che in ogni facciata vi è un’ quadretto di marmo mistio’ (BVAS–ABL, Prot. 611, No. 43, ‘Con segna di massaritie, statue, e Piture della Vigna di Porta Pinciana a Gio. Ant.’ Chiavacci Guardorobba,’ dated November 2, 1623, p. 45); ‘Un puttino di marmo piangente à sedere in una mappa di fiori morsicato dà una vipera, sopra una base di marmo mischio — mano del Cavalr® Bernino’ (January 28, 1633, published by T. Schreiber, *Die antiken Bildwerke der Villa Ludovisi in Rom*, Leipzig, 1880, 31); ‘Un Putto moderno opra del Sig.’ Cavalier Bernino, siede trà l’Herba morso da un serpe’ (BVAS–ABL, Prot. 611, No. 56, ‘Inventario di tutte le Massaritie, Quadetri, et altro, che sono nel Palazzo del Monte posto nella Villa à Porta Pinciana che era del Cardinal del Monte, al p’nte dell’Ecc.’ ‘Pn’pe Don Nicolò Ludovisi,’ April 28, 1641, fol. 46v); ‘n’2. putti uno del Bernino, e l’altro dell’Algard long. p.’‘

According to Bellori a companion piece for this sculpture, a boy riding on a tortoise and playing a reed pipe, was one of Alessandro Algardi’s first works in marble; Bellori also gives allegorical interpretations of the two works: ‘Fecevi [i.e., Algardi, for the Villa Ludovisi] d’inventione un putto sedente di marmo, appoggiato ad una testudine, e si pone li calami alla bocca, per suonare, inteso per la sicurezza; di cui è simbolo la testudine, e l’innocenza del fanciullo, che suona, e riposa sicuro. Questo gli fu fatto fare dal Cardinale, per accompagnamento di un’ altro putto, che duolsi morsicato da un Serpente ascoso fra l’herba, inteso per la fraude, e per l’insidia; e si è qui descritto per essere delle prime cose, che Alessandro lavorasse in marmo; benche fuori del l’eccellenza.’ (G. P. Bellori, *Le vite de’ pittori, scultori et architetti moderni*, Rome, 1672, facs. ed. Rome, 1931, 389.) In fact, Algardi’s piece, which is now lost, is mentioned along with Bernini’s in the Ludovisi inventories cited above (except that of 1623). Algardi was paid for his sculpture on December 24, 1627: ‘E a di 24 di Dicembre ∇ 50 m.a pagati ad Alessandro Algardi scultore per prezzo di un’ Puttino di Marmo fatto p n’o serv.‘, et messo in da Vigna’ (BVAS–ABL, Libro Mastro B, 1625–29, p. LXI). *Cf.* Y. Bruand, ‘La Restauration des sculptures antiques du Cardinal Ludovisi (1621–1632),’ *Mémoire de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France*, 6th ser., 3, 1893, 200; on the date *cf.* K. Garas, ‘The Ludovisi Collection of Pictures in 1633–1,’ *BurIM*, 109, 1967, 287 n. 3).

Bernini’s *Putto morsicato* has recently come to light, and was acquired by the Staatliche Museen, Berlin–Dahlem; the publication by U. Schlegel (*Zum Oeuvre des jungen Gian Lorenzo Bernini,* *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 9, 1967, 274 ff) appeared after the present article had gone to press. Though Schlegel fails to identify the sculpture with that mentioned in the 1633 Ludovisi inventory which she quotes, she ascribes it to Gianlorenzo. But she regards it as contemporary and forming a pair with the *Boy with a*
Two closely related works follow, the *St. Lawrence on the Grill* in the Contini-Bonacorsi Collection in Florence, and the *St. Sebastian* in the Thyssen collection in Lugano (Figs. 30–32).\(^6\) Larger in scale than the genre groups, yet under life-size, they form a kind of transition to the monumental series for Scipione Borghese that begins at the end of the second decade of the century. Both show the soft, translucent treatment of the marble found in the Coppola bust and the *Boy with the Dragon*, and the beards in particular have the same emergent tufts as in the portrait. Clearly, no great interval can separate the *St. Lawrence* and the *St. Sebastian*, though the jagged, irregular locks of the former, which recall the treatment of the satyr’s hair in the Amalthean group, suggest that it is the earlier of the two. The *St. Lawrence* belonged to Leone Strozzi, a wealthy Florentine living in Rome, and both Baldinucci and Dominico Bernini record that Bernini made it during his fifteenth year, that is, in 1614.\(^6\) This dating has been universally

\(^6\) Wittkower, 1966, 174, Nos. 3, 4, where they are dated 1616–17, 1617–18 respectively.

\(^6\) Baldinucci, 77–78, D. Bernini, 15. The figure appears in a Strozzi inventory dated July 8, 1632: ‘Un San Lorenzo sopra la graticola moderno’ (Florence, Archivio di Stato, Carte Strozzi, Quinta Serie, Filza 786, ‘Tomo XXXIV, Atti fatti per l’eredità del Sig. Leone Strozzi,’ fol. 8v).

Baldinucci reports that the *St. Lawrence* was made for Leone Strozzi; according to Domenico Bernini Gianlorenzo made it to honor the saint whose name he bore, and Strozzi acquired the work subsequently. It may be more than coincidence that at the time Maffeo Barberini was decorating his family chapel in Sant’Andrea della Valle (see below), Leone Strozzi was preparing his family chapel across the nave in the same church, the second chapel on the right (the bronze copies of Michelangelo sculptures that decorate the altar wall are inscribed with the date 1616; *cf.* S. Ortolani, *S. Andrea della Valle* Le Chiese di Roma illustrate, No. 4, Rome, n.d., Fig. 20). Among the members of the Strozzi family buried in the chapel was a well-known Cardinal Lorenzo Strozzi, named after the same saint (died 1571,
rejected by recent writers; but I no longer see any reason for doing so, especially since there is independent evidence to suggest that the *St. Sebastian* was made in the following year. Here I take up a hypothesis offered by Rudolf Wittkower that the *St. Sebastian* may have been executed in connection with the niche-like shrine commemorating that saint which adjoins the main Barberini chapel, the first on the left in Sant’Andrea della Valle.70

The main chapel, dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin, was built over the apse of an earlier church honoring the martyr, at the point where his body was supposed originally to have been discovered. In the small adjoining chamber, which is recessed into the interior façade of the present church, this fact is recorded by a painting by Domenico Passignano of the recovery of the martyr’s body and a lengthy inscription bearing the date 1616. Bernini’s *St. Sebastian* was owned by the Barberini, and was first inventoried in 1628 along with the *Boy with the Dragon*.71 Although there is no reference to the figure in the documents concerning the chapel, it is tempting to suppose that Bernini undertook the work, perhaps on his own initiative, having in mind the space now occupied by Passignano’s painting.72

Of particular significance is the fact that the St. Sebastian shrine was not at the outset part of the plan for the chapel. No mention of it is made in the original contract of 1604 with the marble workers, nor does the painting of St. Sebastian appear in Passignano’s contract of the same date, which includes only his works for the main chapel illustrating the life of the inscription in Forcella, VIII, 261, No. 652). We shall discuss presently the possibility that Bernini’s *St. Sebastian* was made with the Barberini chapel in mind, before the decoration was completed, but was then kept in the Barberini private collection; something of the sort may have happened in the case of the *St. Lawrence*.73


71 ‘*Un San Bastiano minore del naturale legato ad un tronco posto a sedere frezzato con suo scabellone minore dell’altri*’ (BVAB–1, fol. 28. In the case of the *St. Sebastian*, as in that of the *Boy with the Dragon*, the attribution to Bernini first occurs in 1632 in Menghini’s inventory: ’*E piu un San Bastiano di palmi 4½ alto fatto dal Cavaliere Bernini*’ (BVAB–2, fol. 7v; cf. Pollak, I, 334, No. 960).

Virgin. On the other hand, Passignano’s picture was paid for in October 1617, and it must have been in place for the inauguration of the chapel in December 1616. If Bernini did conceive his figure for the same location, 1615 would thus be a very likely date. This would be the first of no less than five works by Gianlorenzo that were intended for the chapel but were then kept in the Barberini private collection.

A further point of interest for the date, and perhaps even for the formal conception of the St. Sebastian, is suggested by the block of marble roughed out by Cordier as a John the Baptist and accepted as a down-payment for his own figure by Pietro Bernini. Judging from the payments, Cordier’s figure must have been about one-third complete. It is not clear from the documents exactly when the block was transferred to the Bernini studio, but it was certainly there by June 1615. This corresponds to the presumed date of execution of the St. Sebastian, and it seems possible that the block was cut down and adapted by the younger Bernini. The St. Sebastian is unusual, if not unique, in that the saint, instead of standing bound to a tree or column, is shown reclining upon a rocky base. Such a setting is appropriate...
to John the Baptist as an allusion to his sojourn in the desert; Pietro Bernini’s own *St. John* is seated on a rocky throne, as is the *Baptist* later made by Francesco Mochi, hoping to replace Pietro’s figure. All five of the other statues in the chapel are also more or less seated, so it is practically certain that Cordier’s figure was shown thus as well. It may be that Gianlorenzo, whether by choice or necessity, retained the seated posture and rocky formation in utilizing Cordier’s unfinished work.

Toward the end of the second decade the young Bernini’s style began to undergo a profound change. This is perceptible in the third and fourth of the new works to be discussed here. On February 7, 1618, Pietro Bernini signed an agreement with the then Cardinal Maffeo Barberini to make four cherubs to be placed on the lateral arches of the Barberini chapel (Doc. 9). The agreement says that the four cherubs were to be made from newly quarried white marble to be supplied by Pietro, and they were to be approximately 1.11 m. high. Pietro then goes on to state that, having himself already made the terra cotta models of the cherubs, nude with various flourishes (‘svolazzi’) of drapery, he promises to execute the sculptures before July 1619, ‘by my own hand, and by the hand of my son, Gianlorenzo.’ In par-

Bartolomeo Schidone, who died in December 1615 (Moir, I, 242; II, Fig. 312); and Honthorst’s *St. Sebastian* of c. 1623 in the National Gallery, London (J. R. Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst*, The Hague, 1959, 88–89). I have found none, however, in which the saint is shown seated on a rocky base, and which certainly precedes Bernini’s figure.

---


79 *Mary Magdalene* by Cristoforo Stati; *St. Martha* by Francesco Mochi; *St. John the Evangelist* by Ambrogio Buonvicino; portraits in niches in the St. Sebastian shrine of the Pope’s brother Carlo, attributed to Mochi (Martinelli, 1951, 231), and uncle Mons. Francesco, by Stati.

80 As far as I can see, documented collaboration between father and son begins in the intervening years, 1616–17, notably, in the pair of herms from the Borghese garden, executed April–July 1616, in which Gianlorenzo is said by an early source to have carved the baskets of fruits and flowers (V. Martinelli, ‘Novità berniniane. ‘Flóra’ e ‘Priapo,’ i due Termini già nella Villa Borghese a Roma,’ *Commentari*, 13, 1962, 267 ff.; see the just comments of Wittkower, 1966, 270). To this period also belong, in my view, the splendid, under-life-size figures of the Four Seasons in the Villa Aldobrandini at Frascati, discovered and soon to be published by F. Zeri; here the underlying conception of the figures appears to be Pietro’s while Gianlorenzo participated in the final execution.

81 This document and Doc. 12 were found independently and are alluded to by C. D’Onofrio, ‘Note berniniane 2. Priorità della biografia di Domenico Bernini su quella del Baldinucci,’ *Palatino*, 10, 1966, 206 caption.
tial payment, he accepts a piece of white statuary marble. This is the first document so far known in which Gianlorenzo is mentioned. The fact that Pietro bound himself legally, in a written guarantee, to employ his son in executing the final sculptures bears witness to the truly fabulous appeal of the young prodigy’s work. A few months later, in a letter we shall discuss presently, Maffeo Barberini himself speaks even more eloquently to the same point.

Pietro promised to furnish the sculptures in eighteen months. In fact, they were finished and mounted in place within six months, by July 1618 (Doc. 12). Subsequently, in inventories of the Barberini collections a pair of life-size cherubs by Gianlorenzo Bernini is variously listed, starting in 1632 in the inventory by Menghini: ‘Eppiu dui petti [putti] del Naturale a sedere con un pannino che li cingie fatti dal Cavalier Bernini.’ The inventory of 1651, also made by Menghini, explains that these cherubs had once decorated the papal chapel: — ‘Due Putti, che erano sul frontespizio della Cappella di Papa Urbano al naturale alti p.m. 4.’ It would seem, therefore, that two of the cherubs were made by Gianlorenzo and were subsequently removed from the chapel, as a souvenir of his work there. Of the cherubs presently in the chapel the two on the left are clearly of somewhat later date and replace those that had been removed (Fig. 34). There is good reason, stylistic as well as documentary, to suppose that they were executed about 1629 by Francesco Mochi (cf. Fig. 35).

82 Baldinucci, 153, says that works by Luigi Bernini, Gianlorenzo’s brother, were also to be seen in Sant’Andrea della Valle; there is no evidence for this in the documents for the Barberini chapel I have seen.

83 BVAB–2, fol. 7v; cf. Pollak, I, 334, No. 960.

84 BVAB–3, fol. 1. The figures are mentioned by Tessin, Jr., as by Pietro Bernini: ‘Zwéj kinder von marmer von dess Cav. Bernini vatter’ (Siren, 168). They appear in the inventory of 1692: ‘Due puttini di marmo bianco a sedere con gambe in cavalcate’ (BVAB–4, fol. 245); and they were still in the palace in 1755: ‘due Angeli moderni’ ([G. Monti] Nuova descrizione di Roma antica e moderna, Rome, 1755, 220).

85 I reproduce for comparison one of the putti on the bases of Mochi’s equestrian statues in Piacenza. According to Passeri, Pope Urban commissioned Mochi to make a St. John the Baptist for the Barberini chapel (ultimately brought to Dresden, see above, note 78) to replace that by Pietro Bernini; this must have been after his return from Piacenza in 1629 (cf. Passeri-Hess, 133 and n. 1). In fact, in a document dating sometime after 1628, a marble block for a St. John for the chapel in Sant’Andrea della Valle is recorded, which must certainly have served for Mochi’s figure (Pollak, I, 22, No. 86). The same document includes another block also for the Barberini chapel, to be used for a putto.

For the preceding observations, see Martinelli, 1951, 231 and n. 1, who also attributes these two putti to Mochi (miswriting ‘right’ for ‘left’). Martinelli, following P. Rotondi,

34. Attrib. to Francesco Mochi, Cherubs over the left-hand pediment. Barberini chapel, Sant’Andrea della Valle, Rome (photo: Museo Vaticano).
Piacenza, base of
Farnese monument
((from Dedalo, 5, 1924–25, 115).

36. Gianlorenzo Bernini,
Cherub over the
right-hand pediment.
Barberini chapel, Sant’Andrea
della Valle, Rome
(photo: David Lees, Rome).
38. Cherub over the right-hand pediment (detail). Barberini chapel, Sant’Andrea della Valle, Rome (photo: David Lees, Rome).

40. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Neptune and Triton*.
London, Victoria and Albert Museum.


44. Tomaso Fedeli after Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Antonio Barberini.* Rome, Sant’Andrea della Valle (photo: F. Rigamonti, Rome)
Rome, Galleria Borghese (photo: GFN).

46. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Giovanni Vigevano*.
Rome, Santa Maria sopra Minerva (photo: GFN).
47. Gianlorenzo Bernini, Bust of Cardinal Dolfin. Venice, San Michel all’Isola (photo: Böhm, Venice).


On the basis of these facts, it might be assumed that the son executed one pair and the father the other. The two cherubs on the right (Figs. 33, 36, 38–39), however, are not in the style of Pietro Bernini. In designing the models for the figures Pietro must have repeated the formula of his angel in the Pauline chapel of the papal palace on the Quirinal hill, which he had made a year before (Fig. 37). But the cherubs are composed in such a fundamentally different way that we must entertain the possibility that they, too, were executed by Gianlorenzo. Whereas the body of Pietro’s angel is twisted and extended laterally so as to conform to a flat, frontal plane, the Sant’Andrea cherubs are organized in depth, and the lower legs project forward over the edge of the pediment. We have observed this method of composition in Gianlorenzo’s work before, and, indeed, in their poses and the rhythmic movement of their bodies the cherubs are closely similar to the Boy with the Dragon.

An analogous point can be made concerning the physical types of the figures. The angels in Pietro’s Assumption relief (Fig. 28) have bloated bodies and faces, with strange, withdrawn glances. They contrast markedly with the sweet, open visages — much more classical in feeling — of Gianlorenzo’s infantile types, which we have seen developing in the Amalthean Goat and the Boy with the Dragon. The Sant’Andrea cherubs continue this development toward lither and more ‘extroverted’ types. Yet, they are subtly differentiated one from the other so as to form a counterpoint of mood and action. The right leg of the left-hand cherub is drawn up tightly, and its diminutive, catlike features seem to be mimicked in the crinkling drapery folds; its mischievous liveliness and intensity recall the Boy with the Dragon. The cherub on the right has a more expansive grace of pose and countenance, and more easily flowing drapery; its emotional awareness has a direct descendant in the figure of Ascanius in the Flight from Troy group in the Borghese Gallery (Figs. 41–42). Gianlorenzo, we now know, received payment for this sculpture in October 1619, little more than a year after the Sant’Andrea cherubs were finished. The comparison

‘Studi intorno a Pietro Bernini,’ Rivista dell’Instituto di archeologia e storia dell’arte, 5, 1936, 361 n. 8, further rejects the attribution of the right-hand putti to Pietro Bernini (Muñoz, 451).

The cherubs on the left pediment are substantially larger (left 94 cm. high, right 90 cm.) than those on the right (left 70 cm., right 75 cm.).

86 Pietro received payments for the Quirinal angel during the second half of 1616, and final payment in January 1617 (Muñoz, 470).

87 Faldi, 1953, 141.
is so close as to justify in itself attributing the cherubs to Gianlorenzo. The kind of contrapuntal balance created by the cherubs was to characterize Bernini's paired figures ever after; indeed, he seems consciously to have echoed them toward the end of his life, at the opposite end of the psychological scale, in the mourning angels for the Ponte Sant’Angelo, which are, so to speak, the alter egos of the pair in Sant’Andrea.

The drapery of both cherubs, caught by a wind and twisted into billowing, spiral folds, reflects the *svolazzi* of the models by Pietro Bernini mentioned in the agreement to execute the figures in marble. They may be taken, *pars pro toto*, as an indication of the stylistic relation between father and son, since we can form a good idea of what Pietro’s drapery flourishes must have been like from the spiral folds that embellish his works both before and afterward (Figs. 28, 37);\(^8\) they are invariably small, flat, cramped, and angular in conformation. In the Sant’Andrea cherubs, by contrast, the twisted drapery ends project dramatically out into the surrounding space, in different directions. Such great, turbulent swirls become a hallmark of the succeeding sculptures by Gianlorenzo; they occur repeatedly in the *Neptune and Triton* from the Villa Montalto in Rome, of about 1620–1621 (Fig. 40), in the *Pluto and Prosperine* of 1621–1622, and in the *Apollo and Daphne* of 1622–1624.

Finally, from the technical point of view also, the cherubs occupy an important place in Bernini’s early development. On the one hand, the soft, granular treatment of the surfaces again recalls the *Boy with the Dragon*. At the same time, they display many features that we shall see taken up and developed in the sculptures that follow. There is little of the veiled, blurry effect found in the earlier work; it is as though an object seen through a photographic lens, previously slightly diffused, is being brought into focus. The hair no longer consists of continuous, undulating waves but of separate, clearly defined locks whose shapes are marked by concentric striations.

Evidently, working from his father’s models, Gianlorenzo made all four cherubs — this, I suspect, in accordance with Maffeo Barberini’s own wish. Pietro’s collaboration, envisaged in the contract, must have consisted in helping his son bring the work to its speedy conclusion. Two of the figures were then dismounted and became part of the Barberini private art collec-

---

\(^8\) In the Assumption relief spiral drapery ends are seen at various points about the large angel placed diagonally at the right. See also the drapery of the allegory by Pietro at the right side of the Dolfin monument in Venice, 1621–22 (below, note 100).
tion, and are now lost. The other two were left to adorn the chapel. It is significant of the value attached to them that the two allowed to remain in the chapel were those on the right, the more advantageous position, readily visible to the visitor as he enters the church.

The father, it will be noted, continued in 1618 to receive payment, regardless of the son’s contribution. On the other hand, Gianlorenzo himself acknowledged the final quittance for his labors, in April of the following year, 1619. He was then paid fifty scudi for his bust of Maffeo Barberini’s mother (which we shall consider presently) to be placed in the chapel, by which payment the Cardinal also discharged the remainder of his obligation to Gianlorenzo for ‘all the works that he may have made for me together with his father up to the present day’ (Doc. 17a). The works covered retroactively in the last phrase can only have been the cherubs. The consideration was a token one (but the more significant therefore) since the sum was the same as had been paid seven years before for the bust of Antonio Coppola alone. The document is of further interest because it marks Gianlorenzo’s first appearance independent of his father; it is also the first recorded payment to him, and he is given the title of ‘Scultore.’

This last circumstance suggests what is the probable explanation for the peculiar terms of the contract and for the retroactive recognition of Gianlorenzo’s work; namely, that at the end of 1618 or early in 1619 Gianlorenzo had been admitted to the marble workers’ guild. Until he became a member of the Università dei Marmorari he was still an apprentice, not yet a ‘maestro.’ There is no record of precisely when he was enrolled in the organization, to which he became much attached, and to which he made handsome gifts later in his life. There are several pieces of evidence, however, which taken together tend to confirm the date suggested by the payments. One is a letter written from Rome to Florence in 1674, when the question arose whether the unfinished Pietà of Michelangelo now in Florence Cathedral, which had until shortly before been in Rome, was fit to be installed in the Medici chapel in San Lorenzo. The writer of the letter defends the piece and in support quotes Bernini’s praise of it, which he reports as follows: ‘But that which Bernini told me, I know is most true, and it is this: that the Christ, which is almost completely finished, is an estimable marvel, not only in itself but because Michelangelo made it when

89 Cf. A. M. Bessone Aurelij, I marmorari romani, Milan, etc., 1935, 196; Fraschetti, 102, 148.
he was past seventy years old; and that he [Bernini] having come of age, and consequently become a master, because he had become one at an early age, had studied it continually for months and months.⁹⁰

Bernini thus acknowledges his special debt to the body of Christ in Michelangelo’s work, having made a careful study of it at the time he became a maestro; this, he says, occurred when he was a ‘giovinotto.’ Normally, admission to the Roman guilds took place between the ages of twenty and twenty-five.⁹¹ Assuming the earlier date, he would have been admitted following his twentieth birthday in December 1618. The reason for this passionate interest in Michelangelo is suggested by another, equally remarkable letter, written on October 12, 1618, by Maffeo Barberini to his brother Carlo, who was then in Florence. In a postscript Maffeo says: ‘The Cavaliere Passignano once told me that Michelangelo Buonarroti still possessed here, toward the Palazzo d’Alessandrino, a statue begun by Michelangelo, and that he might be parted from it. If it can be obtained cheaply through Passignano, I would take it because the son of Bernini, who is having a great success, would finish it.’⁹² The passage testifies to the phenomenal success Gianlorenzo was then having, and in particular to the favor he enjoyed with Maffeo Barberini. It also reveals the hitherto unknown fact that there was in Rome, owned by Michelangelo’s grand-nephew, an unfinished work by or at least attributed to the master which, perhaps most astonishing of all, the young Bernini was considered capable of completing.⁹³ It is reasonable to associate this project for finishing one of Michelangelo’s works with the study of the earlier artist Bernini said he

⁹⁰ ‘Ma quello che ha detto il Bernino a me, so ch’è verissimo, et è questo: che il Cristo ch’è quasi finito tutto, è una maraviglia inestimabile, no solo per se, ma per averlo fatto Michelagnolo dopo l’aver passato l’età di 70 anni; e ch’egli uomo fatto, e consequentemente maestro, perché cominciò ad esserlo da giovinotto, vi aveva studiato sù mesi e mesi continui.’ Letter of Paolo Falconieri, November 17, 1674 (C. Mallarmé, L’ultima tragedia di Michelangelo, Rome, 1929, 80).


⁹² ‘Mi disse una volta il S. Cavaliere Passignano che al S. Michelangelo Buonarroti restava qui verso il Palazzo d’Aless: una statua comincia già da Michelangelo, et che ne Sarebba fatto fuori. Se si puo haver p buon mercato sotto mano col mezo del med Passign: la piglierei pche il fig. del Bernino che fa gñ riusce, la pftieronerebbe.’ (BV, MS Barb. lat. 10078, fol. 75v) The letter was discovered independently by C. D’Onofrio, who alludes to it in ‘Un dialogo-recita di Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Lelio Guidiccioni,’ Palatino, 10, 1966, 129.

⁹³ The problem of identifying the work in question will be discussed by the writer in a separate essay. Suffice it to say here that the most likely candidate seems to be the
undertook at the time he became maestro. In that case, the date of Maffeo Barberini’s letter, October 1618, would coincide with the other evidence suggesting that Bernini was admitted to the marble workers’ guild at the end of that year or early in the next, whereupon he became eligible to undertake and receive payment for work in his own name.

We have been able to define in the works discussed so far a significant phase in Bernini’s development between 1612 and 1618, that is, roughly between his thirteenth and nineteenth year. It was a period of soft, impressionistic technique and psychological subtlety that emerged from the rather strained expressiveness of the earliest efforts, and led to the monumental drama of the groups made in the early 1620s.

The moment of change found in the Sant’Andrea cherubs is represented in portraiture by the bust of Maffeo Barberini’s mother, Camilla Barbadori, recently discovered in the Statens Museum in Copenhagen (Fig. 43). Bernini was paid for this work, as we have noted, in April 1619, and he was to install it in the Barberini chapel in Sant’Andrea. It was followed by a companion bust of Camilla’s husband, Antonio, for which Bernini received payment, under the same terms, in February 1620 (Doc. 18). Toward the end of the decade, probably as part of the same ‘campaign’ that included the removal of the cherubs, the busts were also transferred to the Barberini private collection. They first appear there in an inventory entry of December

much-debated Palestrina Pietà, which was in fact owned by the Barberini, though Michelangelo’s authorship of the work is not thereby guaranteed.

The similarity of the legs of Bernini’s St. Sebastian to those of Christ in the Florentine Pietà has been emphasized (Wittkower, 1966, 174), and we may note the equally marked resemblance between the overall pose of Bernini’s figure and that of Christ in the Palestrina Pietà. It is tempting to imagine the St. Sebastian as a kind of prospectus that led to the extraordinary idea of having the young Bernini complete an unfinished work by Michelangelo.

Among the possible sources for the St. Sebastian, incidentally, should be considered the Louvre Pietà by Annibale Carracci, as suggested recently by D. Posner, ‘Domenichino and Lanfranco: The Early Development of Baroque Painting in Rome,’ in Essays in Honor of Walter Friedlaender, Marsyas, Suppl. Vol. II, New York, 1965, 144 n. 44. We may add that the painting, which was in San Francesco a Ripa in Rome, was engraved by P. Aquila, with a dedication to Bernini; cf. Mostra dei Carracci, ed. G. C. Cavalli, etc., Exhib. Cat., Bologna, 1956, 256, No. 112.

4, 1628, with yellow marble bases added (indicating they had originally been placed in oval or circular niches). To replace the busts, oval medallions of porphyry with relief copies had been made early in 1627 (Fig. 44), and these were installed in 1629 along with commemorative inscriptions in the narrow passageway connecting the Barberini chapel with that adjoining toward the east.

In the bust of Camilla everything has become sharp and clear. The surfaces are smoothly polished; contours and incisions are rendered with a new precision. The pose is strictly frontal, the drapery of the widow’s weeds falls in nearly straight, symmetrical folds that veil the shoulders. There is a tense, almost geometric abstraction that indicates a reaction against the earlier softness and vagueness. A similar quality of strained rigidity combined with smooth purity of shape and line pervades the *Flight from Troy*, which, as we noted, was paid for in the fall of the same year, 1619.

The commission for the *Flight from Troy* may well have been the reason for the delay in executing the bust of Antonio Barberini. This work has not yet come to light, but to judge from Tommaso Fedeli’s copy on the porphyry relief medallion (Fig. 44) it provided a striking, and probably deliberate, contrast to the companion portrait of Camilla. As opposed to the symmetrical arrangement of the earlier work, the shoulders were wrapped in a cloak whose broken, irregular folds must have obscured the relationships between shoulders, arms, and torso.

The significance of these differences becomes evident in what seems to have been Bernini’s next portrait, the bust of Giovanni Vigevano in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Fig. 46). A number of factors conspire to indicate a
date of about 1620 for the Vigevano bust. The treatment of the mustache and beard is extremely close to that of the head of Aeneas (Fig. 45). The arrangement of the drapery seems to reflect that of the lost portrait of Antonio Barbadori. As a *terminus ante quem*, we have the testimony of Vigevano’s will, drawn up in May 1622, in which he stipulates that he is to be buried in his tomb ‘newly made’ in the Minerva.

Bernini here takes up again the classically inspired motif of the right hand protruding through the enveloping drapery, which he had introduced in the bust of Coppola. There are fundamental changes, however. The torso is cut off at a higher level, and there is no hint of the existence of the right arm beneath the drapery. The hand now grasps the drapery firmly, squeezing it into a cascade of deep, complicated folds. These folds, instead of running directly out to the edge, cartwheel fashion, seem constrained to follow the semicircular curvature of the silhouette. The result of these devices is a cramped effect, which makes us ‘miss’ the forms that are not there. At the same time, the vigorous gesture and slightly parted lips (compare the lips of Ascanius and Aeneas, Figs. 42, 45) help to suggest an inner animation.

It will be seen that two complementary factors are involved at this stage in the development of Bernini’s portraiture. Though the bust of Coppola demonstrates that he was concerned virtually from the outset with the problem posed by the truncated human body, he now seeks to make the observer aware of the missing parts by emphasizing their absence. This ‘negative’ effect, in turn, is enhanced by the now smoothly polished surfaces and

---

97 I return, in effect, to the date originally proposed by Reymond, 58, followed by Wittkower, 1953, 21; Wittkower later shifted the bust to 1617–18 (1966, 174–75, No. 5).

98 *Il mio corpo voglio, che sia sepolto nella Chiesa di S. Maria della Minerva di Roma nella mia sepoltura fatta di novo.*

Item per ragione di legato, et in altro miglior modo lascio alla Sig. Laura Catani mia socera la mia sepoltura Vecchia, esistente nella detta Chiesa della Minerva, appresso alla detta Nova, dandoli faculta di posser levare la mia inscrizione che è nella lapide, et apporvi la sua nella qual sepoltura già vi è sepolto il quondà Gioseffe suo marito.

(ASR, 30 Notai Capitolini, Ufficio 28, Testamenti, Vol. 3 [Not. Vespignanus], fol. 87)

For the inscription placed by Laura Catani on the earlier tomb slab, *cf.* Forcella, I, 476, No. 1848. Vigevano died in 1630; for the inscription on his tomb, *ibid.*, 493, No. 1908.

99 The obscuring of a crucial part of the anatomy by an intricate mass of drapery became one of Bernini’s most effective devices; see the *St. Teresa* and, in portraiture, the busts of Francesco d’Este and Louis XIV, where it serves to disguise the truncation of the body.
clearly defined details, which serve to intensify the physical presence of the figure.

In the two portraits that follow, Bernini begins to exploit the positive implications of this approach. Both works, the bust of Cardinal Giovanni Dolfin on his tomb in San Michele all’Isola in Venice and that of Cardinal Escoubleau de Sourdis in Bordeaux (Figs. 47, 48), are parts of joint enterprises carried out by father and son. While Gianlorenzo made the patron’s portrait, Pietro executed accompanying figures: two female allegories for the Venetian cardinal’s tomb, a Virgin and an angel of the Annunciation for the French prelate. There is good evidence, albeit circumstantial, for dating the portraits. Giovanni Dolfin, who had lived for many years in Rome, returned finally to Venice in May 1621, where he died the following year; the bust must have been made shortly before his departure, i.e., early in 1621. Cardinal de Sourdis had come to Rome early in the spring of 1621, and he left to return to France by July 1622; in all likelihood the portrait was done toward the end of his stay.

In these works Bernini developed a distinctive, bow-shaped lower edge which became characteristic of nearly all his portraits during the first half of
52. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Monsignor Francesco Barberini.*
Washington, National Gallery.

53. Gianlorenzo Bernini,
*Bust of Monsignor Francesco Barberini* (view from beneath showing displacement of shoulders).
Washington, National Gallery.
54. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Antonio Cepparelli*,
Rome, San Giovanni dei Fiorentini
(photo: GFN).


59. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Antonio Cepparelli*,
Rome, San Giovanni dei Fiorentini
(photo: GFN).
Rome, Church of the Gesù (photo: GFN).
61. Gianlorenzo Bernini,  
_Bust of Antonio Cepparelli_,  
Rome, San Giovanni dei Fiorentini  
(photo: GFN).

62. Giovanni da Valsoldo,  
_Bust of Cardinal Albani_,  
Rome, Santa Maria del Popolo  
(photo: GFN).
the 1620s, and which he employed, with variations, repeatedly thereafter. The line flares upward and outward to form a sharp angle where it joins the lateral profiles. This outward flare tends to increase with succeeding works so that the point of intersection pierces the surrounding space — in marked contrast to the compact, self-contained silhouette of the earlier busts. Since the cut-off edge of the arms is relatively lower, more of the drapery hanging from the shoulders appears, giving an apronlike suggestion of hollowness. Most important, the elegant, soaring curve has an effect of buoyancy that emphasizes the emptiness below. As a result the observer is made aware of the absent arms and body, hence is encouraged to imagine their existence. At the same time, a sense of fragmentation is avoided by the regularity of the curve itself.

Bernini had first used the formula some years before, in the under life-size bust of Paul V in the Borghese Gallery. There, however, the curve rises more vertically, and the compactness of the outline is maintained. Although the motif has a variety of possible forerunners, the elegance and tension of Bernini’s curves seem most closely anticipated, curiously enough, by the springlike scrolls that form the lower edges of Nicolò Cordier’s busts of SS. Peter and Paul in San Sebastiano fuori le Mura (Fig. 49). Whatever the specific prototypes, it seems likely that Bernini’s interest in the device was revived by the peculiar nature of the Dolfin commission. In his will, Dolfin had stipulated that his tomb imitate those of the

103 An important role in this development, which culminates in the lateral flourishes of the busts of Francesco d’Este and Louis XIV, is played by the late (probably posthumous) portraits of Paul V and the busts of Gregory XV (1621–22). Wittkower, 1966, 175–76, No. 6(2), 179–80, No. 12; Martinelli, *Ritratti*, 13 ff. The increasing breadth of Bernini’s portraits has been observed by Rinehart, 442.

104 Wittkower, 1966, 172, No. 6 (1).

105 Venturi, X, 3, Figs. 538–39. These were commissioned by Scipione Borghese and paid for in 1608 (see the documents published by I. Faldi, *La scultura barocca in Italia*, Milan, 1958, 80). Cordier, in fact, seems to have been one of the most important influences on Bernini’s early development (on the *St. Sebastian*, see p. 231 f. above; on the Cepparelli bust, see p. 265 ff. below). The bust of Camilla Barbadori should be compared with Cordier’s head of Luisa Deti in the Aldobrandini chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Venturi, x, 3, fig. 527; cf. Martinelli, *Commentari*, 1956, 28), and the *Flight from Troy* is inconceivable without Cordier’s *King David* in the Cappella Paolina at Santa Maria Maggiore (Venturi, X, 3, Fig. 534). There are echoes of Cordier’s *St. Sebastian* in the Aldobrandini chapel (*ibid.*, Fig. 533) in Bernini’s *David* (the armor) and *St. Longinus.*
Contarini family in Santa Maria dell’Orto in Venice. And in fact, the bust of Gaspare Contarini, attributed to Alessandro Vittoria, has a lower silhouette of this basic type (Fig. 50).

The Dolfin and De Sourdis portraits also show an increasing crispness and precision in the treatment of details. Whereas Dolfin’s hair and beard


Architecturally, there is a resemblance between the Dolfin tomb (cf. note 100 above) and that of the Contarini (cf. F. Cessi, Alessandro Vittoria architetto e stuccatore [1525–1608], Trento, 1961, 52, Pl. 40, with an attribution to Vittoria). The Dolfin tomb, moreover, conforms to a common Venetian type in that it frames the entrance to the church, with the sarcophagus placed high above. This may help to explain the design of the next tomb with which the Berninis were involved, that of Cardinal Bellarmino in the Gesù (see below); in this case the architect is known — Girolamo Rainaldi, who shortly afterward also seems to have designed the Sfondrato tomb in Santa Cecilia, in which the same formula is repeated (Bruhns, 313–14, Fig. 235; for the correct date, cf. Martinelli, ‘Contributi alla scultura del seicento: IV. Pietro Bernini e figli,’ Commentari, 4, 1953, 148 n. 22).

The significance of this fact becomes apparent when it is realized that the Dolfin bust inaugurates a long dialogue that Bernini maintained with Venetian sculpture. The next major advance in what I should call the positive approach to implied form took place toward the end of the 1620s, in Bernini’s portraits of the Venetian cardinals Agostino and Pietro Valier, now in the Seminary in Venice (for the date, see below at the end of this note). Here, the busts are still broader and fuller, and the drapery is more complex and ‘active’; the result is an uncanny illusion of hollowness, hence the imagined existence of the rest of the body.

The closest precedents for Bernini’s broad, voluminous torsos are in fact Venetian, and particularly the portraits of Vittoria. More over, the fronts of Vittoria’s busts often have elaborate draperies arranged and cut so as to give a hollow, apronlike effect that anticipates Bernini. Thus, an important aspect of the development of Bernini’s portraiture, in which he moves away from the severe, tightly drawn silhouettes of Roman tradition, seems to reflect Venetian influence (for a Florentine component, see below, pp. 266 f.). It can hardly be coincidental that two essential stages in this development, those represented by the Dolfin and Valier busts, were reached in works made for Venetian patrons.

It should be emphasized that the comparisons with Vittoria’s portraits are never very precise; the relationship was one of spirit rather than detail. There are more specific connections with Vittoria in Bernini’s works other than portraiture; compare Bernini’s figure of Daniel in Santa Maria del Popolo with that by Vittoria in San Giuliano, Venice (Venturi, X, 3, Fig. 93, to which, however, should be added that in Rubens’s painting now in Washington, GBA, January 1966, Suppl., 50, Fig. 196), and Bernini’s St. Jerome in the Cathedral of Siena with that by Vittoria in the Frari (Venturi, X, 3, Fig. 71).
have a flamelike quality reminiscent of the Vigevano bust, the hair and beard of De Sourdis are defined by thin parallel incisions. What had been abstract and generalized is now becoming minute and specific.

In the final group of works we shall discuss, one of which is the new portrait of Antonio Cepparelli in San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, Bernini seems to draw the logical conclusions from the approach he had taken two or three years before; the group may be said to mark the climax and end of his early development. The first in the series is the portrait that adorns the tomb of Monsignor Pedro de Foix Montoya, now in the Spanish seminary in the Via Giulia, but originally in the Spanish national church of San Giacomo degli Spagnuoli in Piazza Navona (Fig. 51). Montoya died in 1630, but it has always been recognized, for stylistic reasons, that the bust must have been made substantially earlier. Documents from the archive of the Confraternity of the Resurrection, which was the proprietor of San Giacomo, provide evidence for a precise date. The minutes of the meetings of the confraternity record that in September 1622, Montoya peti-

The date of c. 1627 for the Valier busts proposed by Wittkower (1966, 194, No. 25) on stylistic grounds can be supported by documentary evidence. The Vatican Library contains some 32 letters written by Pietro Valier between March 1624 and February 1629 (he died in Padua in April 1629). The letters were all written from north Italy and form a continuous series without significant interruptions, except for a period of a year between May 1626 and May 1627. Precisely during this period, on September 14, 1626, there is a letter by Valier written from Rome. (1624: March 13, June 1, 15, 30, August 29, October 20 [three], November 16, December 26; 1625: March 3, August 23 [three], December 12, 20; 1626: February 5, May 30, September 14 [from Rome]; 1627: May 29, October 15 [two]; 1628: January 1, February 8, 15, 18, December 15, 18, 25, 31; 1629: February 1). Cf. BV, MSS Barb. lat. 7794, 7797, 8781.

I share Wittkower’s view that the two Valier busts are contemporary.  

108 In this respect Bernini seems again to return to the early bust of Paul V, where the hair and beard are also defined by fine parallel lines.  

109 A terminus ante quem is provided by an anecdote recounted by Baldinucci, Domenico Bernini, and Bernini himself (see note 114 below), according to which the bust was seen by Cardinal Maffeo Barberini before he became Pope Urban VIII (August 3, 1623). Cf. Wittkower, 1966, 181, No. 13, where the date 1621 is proposed.  

110 A history of the confraternity and its benefactors is given by Fernández Alonso (279 ff.; on Montoya, cf. 319–20), to whom I am indebted for facilitating my work in the archive. The archive is housed in the library of the Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos, Via Giulia 151.
tioned for permission to found a chaplaincy. He was, in turn, permitted to erect his sepulchral monument in the church. In December 1622 the confraternity decreed that construction of the tomb might not begin until the contracts of the donation were executed. The act of the donation was drawn up in January 1623; in it the location of the tomb is established, and the church undertakes to care for the portrait, which seems to have been already extant, and the rest of the monument in perpetuity. The bust was therefore most probably made at the end of 1622.

111 September 16, 1622: ‘Leí. yo el secretario un memorial, que decia como Mons. Pedro de Foix Montoia quiere fundar e esta Iglesia una Capellania anidiendo un Capellan mas y cometieren. a los SS. Bernardo de Cegama, y D. Botínete y D. Pedro de Alarcon p’ que con los SS. Adm. traten. del modo de esta fundacion con e dho mons.’ (AIEE–1191, fol. 91).

112 December 28, 1622: ‘Quese concluia en el negocio de la Capellania de Mons. Pedro de Foix Montoia conforme a su memorial y a la relacion qu’huzieron los SS. Adm. que es la contenida en dho memorial q’se me entrego y que en materia de comenzar a fabricar en su sepultura no pueda hazer cosa alguna hasta quese hagan los instrumentos dela dha fundacion’ (ibid., fol. 93v).

113 January 29, 1623:

Item convenerunt quod dictus R. D. Petrus in dt’a ecclesia in eo loco qui est a latere effigiei Petri de Chacon possit construere suum sepulcrum cum ornamento pro ut ipsi R. D’n o Petro suis expensis bene visum fuerit cum facultate etiam apponendi in terra unum lapidem cum sua inscriptione etiam si corpus suum fuerit repossitum in pariete vel etiam si extra Urbem defunctus et in quacumq. ecclesia extra Urbem sepultus fuerit quern locum nomine pt ae ecc’liae ipsi Dn’i deputati dt’o R. D. Petro liberum, et immunem concesserunt.

Iten erit obligata dicta ecclia’ quod si pt’us locus in quo apponenda est effigies, et sepultura aliquo casu seu eventu fuerit mutandus ad aliam partern dare in pt’a ecclia’ alium locum ad effectum apponendi dictam effigiem ornamentum et sepulturam talem, et aequo bonum uti erat primus et manutenere, ac conservare pt’am effigiem et ornamentum semper, et perp’uo pro ut fuerit finita, et perfecta, ita quod si fuerint rupta vel collapsa in partem, vel in totum teneatur dicta ecclesia illa reficere.

(Act notarized by Thomas Godover, AIEE–635, No. 120, foll. 89–90. The act was ratified by the confraternity on September 10, 1623; ibid., No. 121, fol. 98.)

114 From Montoya’s testament, dated May 27, 1630 (he died three days later), we learn, that work on the tomb was still in progress: ‘Item mando que la sepultura donde a de estar mi cuerpo enterrado sea en el muro de la dicha Santa Iglesia del Señor Santiago donde a de estar el Deposito, que tengo hecho, y en tierra, al pie de la dicha Sepultura, se ponga una piedra, y en ella, o. en la que a de estar en la pared donde a de estar el cuerpo, se ponga esta memoria, con las demas, que dejo instituidas y dotadas en la dicha Santa Iglesia de Señor Santiago de Nuestra Naçion Española’ (ibid., No. 148, fol. 4; for the inscriptions — a short one above the sarcophagus, a long one on the wall below the monument — cf. Forcella, III, 247, No. 612).
What had remained of generalized abstraction in Bernini’s treatment of
form seems here to have disappeared, leaving only the impression of tight,
vivid precision. We feel confronted directly by reality, and the very sharp-
ness of focus adds to the quality of inner tension and vitality the figure con-
veys. The hair consists entirely of fine, closely set lines that intensify the
effect of wiry tautness. While the drapery is in the main symmetrical, the
edge of the cloak (mantelletta) at Montoya’s right is folded back.115 This is
counterbalanced in a dynamic, asymmetrical fashion by the bowed sash at
the waist, placed slightly to the right of center. The folds of the cloak hang-
ning from the chest project forward, apronlike, and suggest an empty space
behind. There Bernini introduces the bow that falls startlingly over the
pedestal.116 By these devices, which work now in a ‘positive’ rather than a
‘negative’ way, he encourages the mind to imagine that the body continues
below the waist.

The portrait of Monsignor Francesco Barberini (the uncle of Maffeo),
now in Washington, D.C., must have been conceived within a very short
time after the bust of Montoya (Fig. 52).117 The drapery arrangement of

According to Baldinucci, 76, and Domenico Bernini, 16, the bust was already in place
when Maffeo Barberini saw it; but the evidence of Montoya’s testament seems to accord with
Bernini’s own recollection that Montoya left the bust in the artist’s studio for a long time
(Chantelou, 102–03).

In a marginal note added to the manuscript of Fioravante Martinelli’s ‘Roma ornata’ 63,
the architecture of the tomb is attributed to Orazio (not Niccolò) Turriani; cf. Hibbard,
1965, 237 n. 64.

We may note here that the busts of the Anima Beata and Anima Dannata, originally in
San Giacomo degli Spagnoli, now in the Palazzo di Spagna, have no connection with
Montoya (Wittkower, 1966, 177, No. 7). They were left to the church by one of the bene-
factors, Fernando Botinete, who died in October 1632, and are listed in an inventory of
1680 (AIEE, Busta 1333, ‘Inventà de la yglesia y Sacristí que Sirvio hast. el Año de 1680,’
fol. 133 ff., ‘cosas diferentes de Sacristia,’ cf. fol. 134v: ‘Mas dos Estatuas de Marmol blanco
del Bernino, con sus pieedestales de jaspe, son dos testas que rapresentan la una la anima en
gloria, y la otra anima en pena & las queles vienen con lo quedeso el D.’ Botinete a la

Bernini seems to have borrowed this motif from the bust of Martino Azpilcueta in
Sant’Antonio de’ Portoghesi, where the folded-back edge serves to reveal the insignia on the
vest below (cf. Grisebach, 145).

116 The bow is carved from the same block of marble as the bust; the pedestal and flank-
ing scrolls are a separate piece.

117 The bust is listed by Baldinucci, 176, and in 1627 in the inventory of Cardinal
Francesco Barberini (BVAB–1, fol. 27; cf. Fraschetti, 140 n. 1); also in 1635 in Menghini’s
inventory (BVAB–2, fol. 23; cf. Pollak, I, 334, No. 961).
Montoya is here repeated almost exactly, including the folded-back right edge of the *mantelletta*. A different kind of rhythm is established, however, by the head’s turning to the right, while the pleated surplice protruding from beneath the central opening of the cloak moves on a diagonal from upper left to lower right. Most important, Bernini here introduces a slight displacement of the shoulders; the left shoulder is forward with respect to the right (Fig. 53).\(^\text{118}\) There is thus a subtle but insistent hint of movement. The surface of the marble also is treated with greater ease and fluidity than in the Montoya bust, and is given a somewhat porous luster.

The first reference we have to the bust of Antonio Cepparelli is on April 23, 1622, five days after his death, when the Confraternity of the Pietà determined to commission it from Bernini (Figs. 54–55, 58–59, 61). The record is of interest, as we noted, because it refers to the earlier memorial to Coppola: ‘And let there be made a statue of marble with an inscription to the said Signor Antonio to be placed in the hospital, like that of Coppola, and Signor Girolamo Ticci was told to speak to the sculptor Bernini, that it be made as soon as possible’ (Doc. 20).\(^\text{119}\) Bernini’s first payment of twenty-five scudi was ordered in August the same year (Doc. 22a). The receipt itself is preserved, and is also a fascinating document; it is made out on the front to Gianlorenzo, while on the back it is signed by his father, Pietro, acting as his agent (Doc. 22b).\(^\text{120}\) There seems then to have been some delay, since Gianlorenzo received his final payment of forty-five scudi only at the end of the following year, in December 1623 (Doc. 23).\(^\text{121}\) The

It is dated 1626 by Wittkower (1966, 191–92, No. 24b), whereas Pope-Hennessy (Catalogue, 127, Pl. 144) proposes 1624–25. The tendency to date the work too late, despite its close similarity to the Montoya, presumably arose from the deceptive fact that it first appears, along with the busts of Maffeo’s mother (which was also dated too late), father, and niece, in the 1627 inventory. I hereby emphatically retract the doubt I once expressed whether the bust is completely autograph (review of Wittkower, in *AB*, 38, 1956, 259).\(^\text{118}\) The displacement may be gauged by the view from beneath showing the position of the shoulders in relation to the base.

\(^\text{119}\) On June 21, 1622, the painter Pompeo Caccini was paid for making a portrait of Cepparelli, recalling the portrait of Coppola that had been painted by Cosimo Dandini (Docs. 21, 5). Caccini, a Florentine, seems not to be otherwise documented in Rome (Thieme-Becker, V, 338).

\(^\text{120}\) Cf. also Doc. 22c. An analogous case was that of Pompeo Caccini’s portrait of Cepparelli, for which Pompeo’s son collected the money and signed the receipt (Doc. 21b).

\(^\text{121}\) The pattern of Bernini’s prices for portraits should be noted: 50 scudi for that of Coppola (1612) and those of Camilla Barbadori and Antonio Barberini (1619–20), 70 scudi for that of Cepparelli.
last reference in the documents is that of 1634, quoted earlier, concerning
the installation of the terra-cotta models for the two portraits by Bernini
(Doc. 29).

In composing the bust of Cepparelli, Bernini seems to have had in mind
a portrait attributed to Nicolò Cordier of a member of the Aldobrandini
family, in the Aldobrandini chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Fig.
56).\footnote{The attribution to Cordier is due to Riccoboni, 112. For the costume see also the bust
of Michele Cornia in Santa Maria in Aracoeli, also attributed to Cordier (Venturi, X, 3,
Fig. 544).} The resemblance includes not only details of costume and composi-
tion, notably the leather vest and the cape flung asymmetrically from the
front of the left shoulder to the back of the right, but also the physiogn-
omic structure of the head and the handling of features such as the eye-
lids and cheeks. The choice of this asymmetrical prototype is significant,
and in interpreting it Bernini brought into play and made explicit the inno-
vations that had been hinted at in the busts of Montoya and Francesco Bar-
berini. The myriad wrinkles in the drapery are smoothed and simplified.
The portion of the cape covering the left shoulder hangs in straight folds
that form an insistent diagonal down the side of the chest, recalling the
turned-back edges of Montoya’s and Barberini’s mantellette. The edge of
the cape visible above the right shoulder is bent up so that instead of creating a
closed outline it slices the air like a fin.\footnote{Cf. the turned-up folds of drapery behind the shoulders of Francesco d’Este and Louis XIV.} The edge of the cape returns to
view, in the form of a bent fold that moves diagonally across the lower right
part of the chest. This motif is a descendant of the diagonal folds underly-
ing the arms of Coppola and Vigevano; though here it appears through the
armpit and does not interrupt the wide-flaring, bow-shaped lower silhou-
ette, it anticipates the sideward-streaming masses on which the busts of
Francesco d’Este and Louis XIV seem to float. Cepparelli’s cape thus creates
a series of asymmetrical but counterbalancing diagonal accents that rotate
around his body. Within this halo of motion, the head is turned markedly
to the right and inclined downward, and the right shoulder is thrust for-
ward, the left back.

The drapery arrangement and the suggestion of movement make it pos-
sible to discern what now became an important new source of inspiration
for Bernini’s portraiture. In both respects the Cepparelli bust reveals a close
study of Florentine portraits of the preceding century, especially those of
Benvenuto Cellini. In the famous bronze bust of Cosimo I de’ Medici in the Bargello, the cloak similarly weaves from the front of the left shoulder behind the back, and reappears in front at the lower right side (Fig. 57). The Florentines also had introduced an element of movement in their busts, apart from the turn of the head, by showing one arm forward and the other back. This, too, is a device that Bernini subsequently adopted, though in radically altered form. It is important to observe, however, that in the Barberini and Cepparelli busts there is no such overt action; the arms hang vertically and nothing disturbs the figures’ ideal composure. On the other hand, Bernini creates a more profound vitality by actually shifting the relationship between the shoulders. And in the Cepparelli portrait he took a giant step beyond even the bust of Monsignor Barberini — in addition to the displacement of the shoulders, the torso itself is rotated slightly to the left. There are thus no straight axes, either in the horizontal or vertical


Admittedly, it is difficult to assume that Bernini knew the Cosimo I bust firsthand, since it was on the island of Elba from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century; however, a marble replica attributed to Cellini himself has recently come to light (W. Heil, ‘A Re-discovered Marble Portrait of Cosimo I de’ Medici by Cellini,’ BurlM, 109, 1967, 4 ff.). The bust of Altoviti was in Rome until the nineteenth century.

125 Cf. besides Cellini’s portraits, that by Bandinelli of Cosimo I cited above, note 29. In describing their busts of Cosimo, Cellini speaks of having given his ‘l’ardito moto del vivo,’ and Bandinelli of ‘l moto suo . . . che distende uno braccio allun[chando la mano da pacificare e popoli’ (quoted by Heikamp, 57–58).

126 Moving arms occur first in the portraits of Urban VIII and Richelieu (cf: Wittkower, 1966, 14). In these cases it is the lower rather than the upper part of the arm that seems to shift under the drapery; the device thus not only suggests movement, but also serves the illusionistic purpose of alluding to the lower extremities of the arms.

planes. Perhaps for the first time in the history of the sculptured bust, the whole body is conceived as if it were in motion. The figure has something of the romantic air of a dashing cavalier. Yet, the movement is relaxed, and the face, with its melancholy, world-weary expression (in his will Cepparelli speaks of an illness with which he was afflicted) conveys the vaguely tragic impression of a great reservoir of human energy that is past maturity.

The final work we shall discuss is the portrait of Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino in the Gesù, which originally formed part of a large monument placed in the apse of the church to the left of the main altar (Fig. 60). This is one of the instances when the portrait was made by the young Bernini, while the two flanking allegories were carved, partly or entirely, by the

127 ‘Item: voglio che il Corpo mio morendo a Roma di questo male . . .’ (ASGF, Busta 606, Testament of Cepparelli, April 12, 1622, Not. B. Dinius, p. 3). On May 31, 1622, the confraternity paid 3 scudi to Madonna Lena, a Bolognese, of the Inn at the Sign of the Cat, where Cepparelli died (see note 7 above), for her services to him during his last illness: ‘. . . a m’lena bolognese Camera locanda alla gatta quanto lei ha da havere p del q. Sig. Antonio Cepparelli mette è stato in casa sua amalato, et p tt. servitio che lei pretende haverli fatto nella malattia’ (ASGF–205, middle of volume, ‘130’ written on back).

128 Some further points concerning the Cepparelli bust should be noted. The form of the cartouche on the base is close to that on the busts of Cardinal Dolfin, and more particularly, because the ends are bent around the corners, to those of Cardinal de Sourdis, Francesco Barberini, and the early bust of Urban VIII (Wittkower, 1966, Pl. 32; also the disputed bust of Antonio Barberini the elder, ibid., Fig. 30).

The surface of the Cepparelli bust has a gentle luster (somewhat marred by the discoloration caused by the coating of whitewash) that recalls the bust of Francesco Barberini and looks forward to that of Cardinal Bellarmino. In this respect it is paralleled by that of Carlo Antonio dal Pozzo recently rediscovered and published by Rinehart, 437 ff., though there, to judge from photographs, the polish is more uniform. There is also a marked resemblance in the physiognomies of the heads (Dal Pozzo had died in 1607); in the slightly parted lips; in the treatment of hair, beards and collars; and in the shape of the silhouette. The two works must be virtually contemporary.

The bulging pupils, which lend a powerful climax to the forward thrust of Cepparelli’s head, have no real duplicates in Bernini’s portraits. He used rounded, convex pupils again in various forms, however (Wittkower, 1966, Pls. 36, 61, 83, 91, Fig. 53). Instances of unique or individualized treatment of the pupils are not unusual in Bernini’s work; e.g., the eyes of Anchises and those of Gabriele Fonseca (ibid., Pls. 15,116).

A faintly incised line may be seen running vertically along the central axis at the back of the Cepparelli bust (Fig. 61). It seems possible, especially in the absence of any horizontal or vertical axes in the bust itself, that the incision served as a reference line for measurements taken in the course of execution.
father and another assistant. When the apse of the Gesù was renovated toward the middle of the nineteenth century, the tomb was dismantled, a door inserted, and the portrait given an entirely new framework; the allegorical figures were lost.

It has heretofore been possible to date the portrait only within relatively wide limits. Bellarmino died on September 17, 1621, and we know from a contemporary dispatch that the monument was not unveiled until August 3, 1624. Documents in the Jesuit archive now make the situation clear, and show that the portrait has a most remarkable history. In his testament Bellarmino had expressed the wish to be buried without pomp in the common grave of his Jesuit brothers. The general of the order complied with the wish, but only for one year, at the end of which time he ordered that the famous jurist and theologian, who was renowned for his ascetic piety and was already being proposed for canonization, be provided with a fitting memorial. His body was exhumed on September 14, 1622, and resealed in a casket of lead. A diary of the church subsequently records that on

---


A seventeenth-century drawing of the tomb in its original form survives (illus. in Fraschetti, 35; Bruhns, Fig. 237). The tomb is faintly visible in the painting by Andrea Sacchi of the interior of the Gesù, now in the Museo di Roma (1639; Pecchiai, Pl. IX opp. p. 88).


In the diary of the work on the apse the following references to the allegories are found, under the date August 16–21, 1841: ‘Disfatto il Monumento del Ven: Card. Bellarmino, e il suo Busto con le due statue laterali portate nell’oratorio della Compìa della B. Morte’ (ARSI–5, fol. 1); ‘Erano traslocate da d. Oratorio al Magazzino di S. Venanzio le due statue che ornano il Mausoleo del Ven. Card.’ Bellarmino’ (ibid., fol. 5). The church of San Venanzio, which stood near Piazza Santa Maria in Aracoeli, was recently demolished (M. Armellini, Le chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX, Rome, 1942, 1, 675 ff.); I have found no trace of the warehouse mentioned.

131 Pollak, I, No. 332. G. Gigli refers to the tomb in describing, ex post facto, the death of Bellarmino and the decorations in the Gesù for the canonization of saints Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Xavier (March 1622; Diario Romano, ed. G. Ricciotti, Rome, 1958, 54, 59).

132 The story is first told in published form by Fuligatti, 347 ff. Cf. also ARSI–1, 2, 3.
August 3, 1623, the new sepulchre was begun; Bernini’s portrait must therefore have been made during the twelve-month period between that date and the unveiling in August 1624.

The sources also shed considerable light on Bernini’s conception of the portrait. When the corpse was exhumed in 1622 a careful account of the event was kept. It records that the body was found in part undecayed; the head and torso were preserved intact, along with the arms and hands. This fact is of great significance because bodily incorruption was one of the important signs of divine grace. The body was reinterred at once, that is, before Bernini’s portrait was made. The casket remained unopened thereafter until the dismantling of the tomb in the nineteenth century. Again a record was kept, and it states that when the body was exposed it was found in cardinal’s garb and in the same pose that Bernini had given the figure. It is clear, therefore, that the peculiar cut and pose of Bernini’s portrait — long to the waist and including arms and hands in an attitude of prayer — were intended as a specific reference to the grace of incorruptibility that was accorded the future saint. The pious gesture and worshipful expression are also intended to dramatize Bellarmino’s saintliness, in death no less than in life. Bernini’s portrait was thus conceived as an instrument of propaganda in the Jesuit order’s campaign to achieve canonization for one of its most illustrious members.

From the stylistic point of view Bellarmino seems to epitomize the development we have been tracing. The vivid precision of the Montoya is there, but as in the Cepparelli the edges are not quite so sharp, the transitions easier and more relaxed. It is as though in this series of portraits pent-up tensions had been released. The Bellarmino, indeed, presents a veritable counterpoint of movement: the hands forward, body and head to the left, and shoulders inclined. Bernini here takes up once more the lead provided

133 August 3, 1623: ‘Si comincio la sepoltura del Card. Bellarmino’ (ARSI–4, fol. 43v).
134 ‘Il corpo era parte intiero parte corrotto. Il capo et il busto erano intieri con gran parte delle braccia et mani. Il rimanente erano ossa con de nervi . . . La sera vestito con tonicella pianeta stola et mani polo di taffetta pavonazzo fu collocato in una cassa di cipresso con fodera di piombo et posta a sepellire . . .’ (ARSI–2; cf. Fuligatti, 348).
136 Bellarmino was finally canonized only in 1930; for a recent bibliography and summary of the controversies concerning his views on the temporal authority of the pope, cf. *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, Freiburg, 1957 ff., II, cols. 160 ff.
by the bust of Cardinal Pio da Carpi in Santa Trinità dei Monti (Fig. 5); Bellarmino’s head and glance are inclined toward the worshiper approaching the choir from the crossing, while the joined hands are directed toward the office taking place at the altar. At the same time, the motif of the deceased shown in an attitude of prayer had a long prior history in sepulchral art; an example that Bernini certainly studied was the bust of Cardinal Albani in Santa Maria del Popolo, where the hands are frontal while the head turns toward the altar (Fig. 62). But Cardinal Pio, does not actually worship, and Cardinal Albani has no relation to the observer.

Thus, Bernini’s figure is not intended simply as a didactic invitation to the visitor, on the one hand, nor as a kind of figural equivalent of an inscribed prayer, on the other. Rather, Bellarmino is shown in a specific and intensely personal moment of spiritual communication. Traditions that had served mainly to record the aspect of what was dead are fused in order to recreate the spirit of what was once alive.

* * *

The material assembled here coincides with a ‘natural’ phase of Bernini’s career, that is, from its inception until the year 1621 when Maffeo Barberini, as Pope Urban VIII, became his chief patron. Yet, the discussion can in no sense lay claim to being a comprehensive treatment of his development during this period, if only because a number of the most important works have been left out of account or mentioned but incidentally. I refer especially to the series of monumental sculptures commissioned by Scipione Borghese at the end of the second and the beginning of the third decade, the chronology of which has been established by Faldi, and to the papal portraits (Paul V and Gregory XV), concerning which I have nothing to add to the fundamental investigations of Martinelli and Wittkower. Thus, although the works we have discussed offer a spectacle of creativity,

---

137 By Giovanni da Valsoldo. Albani had died in 1591; the date of the monument, situated on the north face of the easternmost pier on the south side of the nave, is unknown. Cf. Bruhns, 290.

138 In a sense, the Bellarmino portrait is a prelude to the crossing of St. Peter’s (on which Bernini began working in June 1624), where the whole space is conceived as the site of a dramatic action taking place at the altar, to which the sculptured figures respond (I. Lavin, *Bernini and the Crossing of Saints Peter’s*, New York, 1968.)
probably without parallel in the history of art, by a youth between roughly
his tenth and twenty-fifth year, it should be borne in mind that we have
dealt with only a fragment of what he actually achieved.

Appendix of Documents

(Multiple versions of the same document have been listed alphabetically under the
same number.)

Bust of Antonio Coppola

1. March 8, 1612 (AGSF–651, fol. Iv):

   Si paghi p il cassio di cera fatto p la testa del d’ m. Ant.” Coppola ∇ quattro
et che Piero Paulo Caval′ sia con il s’ Fran.” Ticci p far fare al bernino scul-
tore la testa di Marmo del detto m. Ant.” Coppola da mettersi nel’pedale.

2. July 16, 1612 (ibid., fol. 2v):

   Fu fatto un mandato di pagare a Bernini scultore di pagare quello
che deve havere p la testa di marmo di m. Ant.” Coppola e fu fatto il mandato
in bianco, e fu dato ordine al s’ Andrea Pasquali che sia con il S’ Franc.” Ticci,
che veda di far pagar meno che si puo.

3. August 4, 1612 (ASGF–430, p. 49 right):

   E deve Dare addi 4 di Agosto ∇ quattro di m.” pag. à franc” Scachi p tant.
pag.” p Il s.” Ticci à Cesare Rugg.” p sua mercede p Havere fatto Il Capo
di gesso della testa del detto q” Ant Coppola _________________ ∇ 4

4a. August 10, 1612 (ibid.):

   E Addi 10 di Agosto ∇ Cinquanta di m.” Pag.” à Pietro Bernini scultore e p
suo ordine à s.” ticci porto franc.” Scachi cont. p Interà Valuta della testa di
Marmo della Detta B. M. p tenere nel spedale _________________ ∇ 50

4b. August 10, 1612 (ASGF, Busta 369, ‘Entrata et Uscita 1606 1624,’
Part 2, p. 19):
5a. September 3, 1612 (ASG F-205, before middle of volume):


And.° Pasquali Dep."  
Ascanio sordonati Dep."
Io Cosimo dandini sopd.° ho ricevuto
li detti cinque scudi di 14 di set 1612 Cosimo dandini Mano pp°

5b. September 14, 1612 (ASGF–430, p. 49 right):

E Addi 14 detto \textit{V} cinque di m° pag° à Cosimo dandini Pittore p cont. p Valuta del Ritratto fatto della detta B. M. \textit{V}5

6a. November 16, 1615 (ASGF–205, toward middle of volume):

Misura dl epitafio fatto nel spedale di sà Gio: dela natione fiorètina da m° Simone Castelli long p° 4'/4, alto p° 4'/4; fa p' 21'/4, agiuli 4 il p° monta

\begin{align*}
\text{Paver intagliato liter n.°} & 225 \text{ a b 4 luna mòta} & \text{\textit{V}8–40} \\
\text{Somma in tutt.° scudi dicisette b quaranta} & \text{\textit{V}17–40} \\
\text{Filippo Breccioli mù pp} & \text{Ha hauto abò cóto da me Seb.” Guidi p 1 . . . fatta all’hospitale delle} & \text{\textit{V}8–80} \\
\text{[verso]} & \text{. . . di 1615} & \text{. . .}}
\end{align*}

\[\text{M. franc.° Rochi nr.° Camarl.° pagharetè a m. Simone Castelli Scarpellino sedici b 80 m. se li fanno pag.° p pagm° p l’epitaffio e altro conforme il retscritto Conto che con sua ric° vi si farano . . . Adi 16 di 9bre 1615 Cam° del Palagio deput.”} \\
\text{Arcagelo Cavalcanti dep.”} \\
\text{[illegible signature] . . . proved.”} \\
\text{io simone castello o rictu scudi sedici e baiochi otòta quali . . . saldi del retscritto io simone castelo mano propria questo di 12 dicembre 1615} \]
6b. December 1, 1615 (ASGF–651, fol. 19):

fu fatto mad. di pag. a m. Simone Castelli scarpell. V sedici b otant p pagm. p l’epitaffio et altro conforme il conto sotto il q. fattoli il md. V16–80

7. May 10, 1634: see Doc. 29 below.

Four Cherubs for the Barberini Chapel

8a. February 5, 1618 (BVAB–8, p. XLII):

Sig. Ruberto Primo Piaccia a V.S. pag. a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore Scudi Settantacinque m. Sono a buon conto di quattro putti di Marmo che mi deve fare p Serv. della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle V75

8b. February 5, 1618 (BVAB–9, p. 104):

Pietro Bernino Scultore deve dare Addi 5 di Febbro Settantacinque m. pag. con mand. diretto al Sig. Ruberto Primo p a buon conto della fattura di quattro putti di Marmo bianco che fa p Serv. della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle V75

8c. February 5, 1618 (ibid., p. CI):

E addi 5 di Febbro Settentacinque m. pag. a Pietro Bernino Scultore p a buon conto di quattro putti che fa di Marmo p Serv. della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle V75

9a. February 7, 1618 (BVAB–5, No. 80):

Studiera nel farli di Marmo, pometto di pfezionarli in ogni miglior forma, et à lavoro rivisto da periti da Elegiersi da d." III."mo Sig.' Card.' et Contrafacendo, à quanto di Sopra et agiudicandosi da periti non ess. l'opera conforme alla Sud.' pomessa, volgo essere Tenuto ad ogni danno et Interesse, che S. S.III."mo ne potessi patire, o ne havessi patito, et di piu mi obligeancora di far Condurre li sud.' quattro putti di Marmo a mie popie Spese nella Sud.' Sua Cappella di Sant Andrea della valle, et assistere a quelli artifici che li Collocheranno Sopra li frontespitij delle p te laterali della Sud.' Cappella, accio venghino, à posare agiustam. et bene. Et p pezzo de sud.' quattro putti ho ric." da S. S. Ill."mo un pezzo di Marmo bianco Statuario di dua Carrettate Incirca, et di piu mi doverra dare Scudi Centosettacinque di m.ta di g. 4 diecì p V." a Conto della quals visto giorno, ne ho ric." da S. S. Ill."mo un Mandato diretto al Sig.' Ruberto Primo di Scudi Settantacinque m." et il restante che sono scudi Cento m." mi doveranno essere da S. S. Ill."mo liberam." et Senza eccettione alcuna pagati ogni volta che io li dia finiti et pfezionati li Sud.' quattro putti di Marmo et p osservazione di quanto di sopra, è detto, mi oblige In forma Camere etc. questi di 7 di febbraio 1618 — In Roma Io pietro bernini Affermo prometto mi oblige et giuro di osservare quanto di sopra si contiene et in fede del vero o di mia propria mano sottoscritto la presente qst" di e anno suddetto lo pietro bernini mano propria.

9b. February 7, 1618 (BVAB–10, fol. 2):

Nota che si è fatto una scrittìa con Pietro Bernino Scultore, che faccia quattro putti di Marmo Bianco Novo del Suo pprio p metterli in su li frontespitij delle p te laterali della Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle alti palmi Cinque quali li deve dare finiti p tutto Giugno 1619 et li deve dar Condi a Sue spese Inda Cappella, et p pezzo si e Convenuto darli un pezzo di Marmo Bianco di dua Carrettate Inc.a et di pui Scudi Cento Settantacinque m." a Conto de quali s li e consegnato un Mando di 75 — diretto al Sig.' Ruberto Primo et li altri Scudi Cento Se li doveranno pag' come dia finiti li Sud' quattro putti di Marmo bianco. [In margin] Roma — Fatti detti putti et Collocati nella Capella dove andavano.

10a. February 21, 1618 (BVAB–8, p. 43):

A Pietro Bernini Scultore Scudi ventinove m.ta buoni a Spese che Si fanno in fabricare et ornare una Cappella In Sant Andrea della Valle. Sono p la meta di 58 m.ta che costo un pezzo di Marmo bianco di quattro Carrettate Inc.a che fu Compo da m. Gio: Bellucci fattore della fabrica di San Pietro fino sotto di il 11 Agosto 1611 del qal Marmo della Meta ne fu fatto la Statua di Mons." Fran." Barberini da m. Cristofano Stati Braccianese et l'altra meta fu cond." a Casa dell' Ill."mo Sig.' Card.' Barberino, il quale Si e poi Consegl' al
Sud. m. Pietro a Conto di quattro putti di Marmo Bianco che mi deve fare p Serv. della Sud. Cappella _______________________________ ▽29

10b. February 21, 1618 (BVAB-9, p. CIII):

E addi d. [February 21, 1618] V° Ventinove m.° che tanto si Valuta un pezzo di Marmo bianco Statuario che si e Consegna a Pietro Bernino Scultore et e la meta di un pezzo di Marmo Grande di quat-tro carettate In circa che fu compo da Gio. Bellini fattore della fabbrica di San Pietro p V° 58 m.° fino Sotto li 11 di Ag.° 1611 ________________________________ ▽29

10c. February 21, 1618 (ibid., p. 104):

E addi 21 d’ [February] V° Ventinove m.° che tanto Si valuta un pezzo di Marmo bianco Statuario di dua Carrettate In Circa consegnati [ie. Pietro Bernini] qui In Casa che lo fece ptare a Casa Sua _______ ▽29

11a. May 28, 1618 (BVAB–8, P. L):

Sig. Ruberto Primo Piaccia a V. S. pag.° a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore Scudi Cinquanta m.ta Sono p a buon conto delli quattro putti di Marmo bianco che mi fa p Serv.° della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle __________ ▽50

11b. May 28, 1618 (BVAB–9, p. 104):

E addi 28 Magio V° Cinquanta m° pag.° con Mandato diretto al s.° Ruberto Primo __________________________________________________________________________________________ ▽50

11c. May 28, 1618 (ibid., p. CVX):

E addi d.° [May 28] V° Cinquanta m.° pag.° a Pietro Bernino Scultore p a buon conto di quattro putti di Marmo bianco che mi fa p Serv.° della mia Cappella di Sant’ Andrea della Valle __________________________ ▽50


Sig.° Provisori del Sacro Monte di Pieta piacera alle Sig.° v’rePag.° a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore Statuario Scudi Cinquanta m° Sono p resto del pezzo con lui Convenuto di quattro Putti di Marmo bianco che mi ha fatto et fat-toli Condurre a Sue Spese conforme a che era obligato nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle quali Sono Stati Collocati Sopa li Fronte Spitiij delle p te laterali della detta Cappella ____________________________________ ▽50
12b. July 7, 1618 (BVAB–9, p. 104):

Addi 7 di Lug. Cinq. m. pag. con mand. diretto al Sacro Monte di Pietà p re. delli Sud. quattro putti di Marmo bianco, che ha fatti et fatti condurre nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle, quali sono Stati Collocati Sopra li Fronte Spitij delle pte laterali della detta Cappella _______ \$50

12c. July 7, 1618 (ibid., p. CXXV):

E addi 7 d. [July] Cinq. m. pag. a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore p re. del pezzo di quattro putti di Marmo che ha fatto p Serv. della mia Cappella di Santo Andrea della Valle ________________________ \$50

12d. (July 7, 1618) (ibid., p. 103):

E Dugentoquattro m. buoni a m. Pietro bernino Scultore Sono p pezzo del quattro putti di Marmo bianco che sono Sopra le pte laterali della Sud. Cappella che posano Sopra li Fronte Spitij di esse pte ________________________ \$204

(Summary of previous payments.)

12e. (July 7, 1618) (ibid., p. CIII):

Pietro Bernino di contro deve Hav. Scudi Dugentoquattro m. Sono p pezzo di quattro putti di Marmo Bianco che ha fatti et Collocati nella mia Capella di Sant’ Andrea della Valle Sopra li Fronte Spitij delle pte lateral _____ \$204

(Summary of previous payments)

13. October 19, 1618 (ibid., p. 103):

Addi 19 di Ottobre Uno b 90 m. buoni a m. Fausto Poli m’ro di Casa pag. alli che hanno messo li perni et spanghe che tengono li Sud. 4 putti ________________________ \$1.90

14. December 22, 1618 (ibid.):

Addi 22 Xbre Uno b 77\(\frac{1}{2}\) m. pag. con mand. diretto al Sacro Monte di Pietà a m’ro Antonio Lucatelli ferraro p otto Spanghe di ferro, che ha date p tenere li quattro putti di Marmo messi Sopra le pte lateral _____ \$1.77\(\frac{1}{2}\):

15. December 31, 1618 (ibid.):

E addi 31 d. [December] Sei M. buoni a m’ro Bar’ta Scala
16. April 26, 1619: See Doc. 17a, below.

*Busts of Camilla Barbadori and Antonio Barberini*

17a. April 26, 1619 (BVAB–II, p. 5):

Sig.ri Provisori del Sacro Monte di Pieta piacerà alle Sig.ri v’re Pag. a m’ Gio: Lorenzo Bernino Scultore Scudi Cinquanta m. sono p una Testa di Marmo bianco che mi ha fatto della B. M. della Sig. Camilla mia Madre. quale la deve far Condurre a Sue Spese nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle p Collocarla nel Luogo che li Sara destinato et sono ancora p rs° di tutti li lavori che mi possi hav. fatto Insieme con Suo padre fino a q.° giorno

17b. April 26, 1619 (BVAB–12, p. XXXVII):

E addi 26 di [April] sdi Cinquanta m. pag. a Gio: Lorenzo Bernino Scultore p una Testa della B. M. della Sig. Camilla mia Madre che mi ha fatto

17c. (April 26, 1619) (*ibid.*, p. 40):

Una Testa di Marmo Bianco della B. M. della Sig. Camilla mia madre In mano a Gio: Lorenzo Bernino deve dare Addi 26 di Aprile sdi Cinquanta M. pag. con mand. diretto al Sacro Monte di Pieta al Sud. Gio: Lorenzo Bernino Scultore Sono p pezzo di detta Testa di Marmo che mi ha fatto, q’è la deve far Condurre a Sue spese nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle p Collocarla nel luogo che li Sara destinato


Sig.ri Provisori del Sacro Monte di Pieta piacerà alle Sig.ri v’re Pag. a m’ Gio: Lor. Bernino Scultore Scudi Cinquanta m. sono p pezzo d’una Testa di Marmo Bianco che mi ha fatto della B. M. del S’ Ant mio P’re q’è la deve far condurre a Sue Spese nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle et Collocarla nel Luogo che li Sara destinato
18b. February 22, 1620 (BVAB–12, p. 40):

E addi 22 di Febraro £50 m." pag." con mand." diretto come Sopa al Sud." p una Testa di Marmo bianco della B. M. del s.' Ant." Mio P're quale deve far condurre come Sopa ______________________________________ £50

18c. February 22, 1620 (ibid., p. LIII):

E addi d' [February 22] £50 Cinquanta M." pag." a Gio: Lor." Bernino Scultore p la Testa di Marmo bianco della B. M. del S.' Anti mio P're che mi ha fatto __________________________________________________________ £50

19. March 31, 1629: Payment for yellow marble bases; see note 95, above.

Bust of Antonio Cepparelli

20. April 23, 1622 (ASGF–651, fol. 57 right):

E più si faccia fare una statua di marmo có inscrittione a detto s. Ant. e mettere nello spedale come quella del Coppola, e fu detto al s. Girolamo Ticci che ne parlassi al Bernino scultore — che si facesqui quanto p.a —

21a. June 21, 1622 (ibid., fol. 58 right):

A Popeo Caccini pittore p il ritratto del s. Ant. Cepparelli bo: me: ____ £6

21b. June 21, 1622 (ASGF-205, middle of volume):

Mag." m. Santi Vannini nõ Camarlengo à piacere pagare à m. Pompeo Caccini pittore scudi sei mt." quali sono p prezzo del ritratto del s. Ant." Cepparelli bo: me: che có una riceuta saranno ben pagati dal nr spedale li 21 di Giugno 1622 £6

Horatio Falconiere Sup."
joorlando Cosini di put." Io Jaco Caccini ho riceu." li sopra detti danari p il
Sud." Pompeo mio padre

22a. August 7, 1622 (ASGF–651, fol. 60 left):

Al s. Cav." Giãlorenzo bernini p a bon conto della statua che deve fare del s. Ant." Cepperelli in marmo fu fatto m." ___________________________ £25
22b. August 7, 1622 (ASGF–205, middle of volume):

Mag.“ m. Santi Vannini nr Camarlengo à piacere al S. Cav.“ Gio: lorenzo bernini scudi venticinque mta. quali sono a bon conto della testa di marmo che deve fare del ritratto del S. Ant.“ Cepperelli che con una riceuta saranno ben pagati Dal Nr Cong.e li 7 di Agto 1622 ____________________

Hor Salco n sup.
Fran.“ Scacchi Dep“
Domenico Migliari De Putato
Seb.“ Guidi p.“

[verso]
Io pietro bernini scultore ricieuto li detti scudi venticinq.e contanti oggi li 13 d’agosto in fede o scritto la precedente di mano pp

Io pietro bernini mano propria

22c. September 24, 1622 (ASGF–430, p. CX):

E adi 24 di 7bre V venticinque di mta pag.ti con mando a m. Pietro schultore p la testa fatta di Marmo ____________________________________

23a. December 23, 1623 (ASGF–651, fol. 64 right):

Al do [Sebastiano Guidi] scudi quaranta cinque fattili pagare da Ticci al Cav.“ bernini p la statua di marmo fatta del s. Ant.“ Cepparelli benefattore e messo nello spedale — sono p resto _________________________________

23b. December 23, 1623 (ASGF–205, toward middle of volume):

Mag.“ Lorenzo Cavotti nr. Cam.“ à piacere pagare a m Seb“ Guidi nr Prov“ scudi quaranta cinque tali fattì pagare da Ticci al s. Cav“ Bernini p la statua di marmo fatta a S. Ant. Cepparelli e posto nel nostro spedale p memoria del beneficio havuto da lui che con rict.“ saranno ben pagati Dal Nr Cong.’ li 23 di Xbre 1623

V45 p resto
Piero Landi, deput.“
Io Seb.“ Guidi ho
ri“ quanto sopra Seb.“ Guidi Prov.“


E adi detto [December 23, 1623] V quarantacinque m postpone della statua fatta di d.“ Ceparello _________________________________ V45
Bust of Pietro Cambi


M. Santi Vannini no Camarl. pag. al m. Pomp. ferucci scudi dodici di m. quali seli fanno pag. a buon conto della testa di Marmero fatta p Mettere nel n. sped. p Memoria del q. Pietro Cambi Benefattore, che con Riceuta ne darete deb. a d. Redita dal d luogo il di 2 di Genaro 1629 in Roma V12 m.

Antonio Resti dept.

io pompeo ferrucci oriceuti li sopradetti iscudi dodici questo di detto
io pompeo mano pp

Carlo Aldobrandi scr.

25. July 17, 1629 (ibid., near beginning of volume):

M. Santi Vannini fornaro nro Camarl. pag. al m. Pompeo ferrucci scultore scudi Quindici m. seli fanno pag. a buonc. della testadi marmere che fa p la Memoria del q. pietro Cambi B. M. p mettere nell’no sped. In Conformita dello Stabilim. fatto dalla Cgn’e il di del pass. che con riceuta ne darete debito alla sua Redita, dal d. luogo il di 17 di Luglio 1629 in Roma V15 M=

Ant. Rest Dept
Lorenzo Cavotti Deputato
io pompeo ferrucci o ricieuto li sopradetti iscudi quidici questo di detto
io pompeo ferrucci mano pp

Carlo Aldobrandi scr.

26. December 1, 1629 (ibid., near beginning of volume):

M. Santi Vannini fornaro no Camarl pag. al m. Pompeo ferucci scudi dieci di m. quali sel fano pag. a buon conto della testa di Marmero che fa del q. Pietro Cambi mettere nel no sped. che con riceut. ne darete debito al Conto della sua Redita, dal d. Sped Il di p di Xbre 1629 In Roma V10 M=

Ant. Rest dept
lorenzo Cavotti Deputato
Io pompeo ferruci oricieuto li sopradetti iscudi dieci a buo conto de ritratto questo di di 14 di dicembre 1629
Io pompeo ferruci mano pp

Carlo Aldobrandi scr.
27. March 7, 1630 (ibid., near beginning of volume):

M. Santi Vannini fornaro no Camarl. pag. all m° Pompeo ferucci scultore V dieci di m° quali seli fanno pag. p resto della testa di Marmero fatta del q. Pietro Cambi messa nel no sped.° che cò Ri-ceuta ne darete debito alla detta Redita dal d sped.° il di 7 di Marzo 1630 In Roma

\[\n\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(V10 \text{m}° \quad \text{Fran.™ Scacchi Dep}®\)}}\)\)}}\]

io pompeo ferruci o ricieuto li sopradetti scudi dieci di mone p resto come sopra questo di lo daprile 1630 io pompeo ferrucci mano p p°

Carlo Aldobrandi scriv.

28. May 8, 1630 (ibid., near beginning of volume):

M. Santi Vannini no fornaro no Camarl pag.° à m° Simone Castelli scarpellino V Cinque di mo.° quali seli fanno pagare p una pietra di Marmo longa p.° 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) larga p° 1\(\frac{1}{12}\) grossa 1\(\frac{1}{3}\) cò lt’è intagliate Messa nel n’ro spedale sotto la testa di Marmo del q. Pietro Cambi così dac° con il S. Sebbastiano Guidi che cò riceuta ne darete deb.° a spesa di d.° Eredita di d Cambi, dal nro sped.° il di 8 di Maggio 1630 In Roma

\[\n\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(V5 \text{M}° \quad \text{Fran.™ Scacchi dept}®\)}}\)\)}}\]

Felice Sellori deputato

Io Simone Castelo orecuto li sopra scriti scudi cinque per sado di deta pietra chome di sopra li deti dinari pagarete a francesco osalano che sarano bene pagati se co altra receputa questo di 17 Maggio 1630

io simone castelo mane propria

Carlo Aldobrandi scr.

Models of Busts by Bernini

29. May 10, 1634 (ibid., slip numbered 1648 for year 1634):

M. Santi Vannini fornaro nro Camarl. pag.° a Alessandro Bracci falegniane V dua b 60 quali sono p p° del pn’te Conto delle basse Inpernature di ferro et altro fatte p Mantennim.° delle due teste di Creta fatte di Mano del Bernino, che si tengono sotto lo spedale, che con ricevuta ne darete deb.° a spesa straord., dal d.° lugo il x Maggio 1634
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Pagati al sig’ francesco schachi schudi quattro p francesco ticci quali sono p il Casso di gesso della testa del sig.’ antonio Coppola __ ∇74
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Doc. 23d. December 23, 1623 (ibid., p. 68):
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