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

IRVING LAVIN

In 1606 the Archconfraternity of the Pietà, proprietor of the Basilica of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini in Rome, determined to erect a hospital 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 wealthy members of the Florentine community in Rome. There were 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 all his worldly goods to the hospital. He was the first person to do so, and in recognition of this signal benefaction the confraternity determined to erect an appropriate inscription and a marble portrait bust in the hospital.

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

1 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 1966. 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 including a signed drawing by Castelli, in ASR, 30 Notai Capitolini, Not. Bart. Dinius, Busta 24, fol. 67-68, 440 ff.; cf. Rufini, 59 ff. Photograph of the drawing: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome, E. 42132).

The inscription reads as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
ANTONIO • COPPOLAE • FLORENTINO
CHIRURGO • INSIGNI
QVI • PRIMVS • OMNIA • SVA • BONA
XENODOCHIO • RELIQVIT
EIVSDEM • XENODOCHII • DEPVSTAT
QVIBVS • MANDATA • TESTAMENTI • EXECVTV
OPTIMO • BENEFACTO • POSVRE
ANNO • M. DC • XIII • MENSE • XVII
VIXIT • ANNIS • LXXII • DE • XXIII • FEBRVARII
M. DC • XII
\end{verbatim}

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:

\begin{verbatim}
D. O. M
ANTONIVS • DE • COPPOIS
CHIRVRGSVS • FLORENTINVS
ANNOS • NATVS • LXXXIII
CASVM • FVTVR [sic] • MORTIS
ANIMO • REVOLVENS
VIVENS
MVMVNTVMV • POSVIT
ANNO • SALVITIS • M. DCV
OBIT • DIE • XXIII • FEBRVARII
M. DC • XII
\end{verbatim}

(Ibid., No. 29).
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. The confraternity again decided to record its appreciation in the form of a portrait bust and accompanying inscription. Both the record of the deliberations of the confraternity 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 repeats the form of the Coppola portrait, was executed during 1629–1630 by Pompeo Ferrucci (Fig. 10).

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. In 1876 the inscriptions were published 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.

In 1937 the hospital was demolished to make way for the present structure. The three busts and the inscription commemorating Coppola were salvaged and deposited in the sub-basement of the church by some farsighted individual, who also took the precaution of writing the subjects’ names on the busts in pencil, making the identifications positive.

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 (caso) 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 Ber-

---

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, tutti li ss. sacramenti et raccoman.* di anima mori et fu sep* a S. Giovanni di fiorentini

(Rome, Archivio del Vicariato, SS. Celso e Giuliano, “Morti dal 1617 al 1624,” fol. 98v), and in that of San Giovanni di Finzi, “Liber III Defunct. ab Anno 1600 ad 1626,” fol. 68v.

Cepparelli was born on March 27, 1557 (Florence, Archivio del duomo, “Maschi dal 1542 al 1561, Lettere A G,” fol. 37v).

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 NATAVITV NOBILITATE
FLORENTIAE GENITO
ILLVSTRI PIEATIS EXEMPLO
ROMAE EXTINTO [sic]
XENOCHYVM NATIONIS
AETERNAE MEMORIAE TVMVLM
REDIDIT
A QVO MAXIMI PATRIMONII
CVMVLM ACCEPIT

---

9 Docs. 24ff. The inscription to Cambi, now lost, bore the date 1627; it is transcribed in Forcella, vii, 24, No. 5. On Ferrucci, V. Martelli, “Contributi alla scultura del Seicento; II. Francesco Mochi a Piacenza; III. Pompeo Ferrucci,” Commentari, 1, 1952, 44ff.

10 “Sono poi nel d’ ospedale dalla parte che risponde sopra il Tevere sopra la Porta, p.q. la quale s’ entra nella Renghia, ha 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).


11 Baldinucci includes in the list of works appended to his biography of Bernini, “Teste fino al num. di 15 luoghi diversi” (Vita, 179). The memorials are mentioned, without indication of authorship, by C. B. Piazza, Εισωθησις στου ιερου ιερουσαλημος; overo delle opere pie di Roma; Rome, 1696, 126; C. L. Morichini, Degli istituti di pubblica carità e d’istruzione primaria in Roma, Rome, 1835, 65; A. Nibby, Roma nell’anno MDCCCLXXVIII, Parte Seconda Moderna, Rome, 1841, 157.

12 ASGF, unnumbered volume concerning the new building; cf. fascicles labeled “Licenza abitabilita” (documents dated November 5, 1937) and “Cerimonie della prima Pietra e della inaugurazione uffiziale del nuovo fabbricato” (May 1938).

13 Over-all heights of the busts: Coppola 67cm; Cepparelli 70cm; Cambi 74cm. 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
nini 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 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.\(^\text{18}\)

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 mentioned in the sources, none are recorded in the documents throughout his long life, and none are preserved.\(^\text{19}\) 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.\(^\text{20}\) 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.\(^\text{21}\) A significant point, also, is that the bust of Antonio Ceparelli, 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 “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. . . . ”\(^\text{22}\)

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 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 poised 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.\(^\text{23}\)

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 character-

\(^\text{18}\) We shall discuss two such occasions below (pp. 236 and 241): 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, a. passim; cf. H. Hibbard and I. Jaffe, “Bernini’s Barcaccia,” BurdM, 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).

\(^\text{19}\) For the bibliography on Pietro see Pope-Hennessy, Catalogue, 122. Significantly enough, the one portrait bust attributed to him in a 17th-century (French) source, that of Cardinal de Sourdis in Bordeaux, is actually the work of Gianlorenzo (see note 100 below).

\(^\text{20}\) Discussed on pp. 228f. below.

\(^\text{21}\) 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.

\(^\text{22}\) Unhappily, I found no trace of the two models.

\(^\text{23}\) 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.

\(^\text{24}\) The development is made sufficiently clear in Grisebach’s Römische Porträtplastik, der Gegenreformation, cf. 19ff.; it should be borne in mind that Grisebach’s survey is confined almost exclusively to portraits made for tombs, and omits papal portraits entirely.

\(^\text{25}\) Ibid., 23–24, 150.


\(^\text{27}\) Cf. Wittkower, 1953, 20–21, who was the first to emphasize the de-
ized, 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). 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. 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 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 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 pray 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 nonvitiating 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). 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 undercetttings 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 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.

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 34 A portrait that must have been made almost simultaneously with that of Coppola is mentioned by Domenico Bernini (p. 20). He reports that before Monsignor Alessandro Ludovisi (later Pope Gregory XV) left Rome to take up the archbishopric of Bologna, he had Gianlorenzo carve his bust. Ludovisi became archbishop of Bologna in March 1612.

35 Baldinucci, 74–75, “La prima opera, che uscisse dal suo scarpello in Roma fu una testa di marmo situata nella chiesa di S. Potenziana [he correctly lists it as in Santa Prassede in his catalogue, p. 176]; avendo egli allora il decimo anno di sua età appena compito. Per la qual cosa . . .’ (continues the account of the meeting with Paul V). Domenico Bernini, 8ff., recounts the meeting with Paul V first, and then continues (p. 10), “Havae gia egli dato principio a lavorare di Scultura, e la sua prima opera fu una Testa di marmo situata nella Chiesa di S. Potenziana, & altre piccole Statue, quali gli permetteva l’età in cui era di dieci anni, e tutte apparivano così maestrevolmente lavorate, che havendone qualcheduna veduta il celebre An­ nibale Caracci, disse, Esser egli arrivato nell’arte in quella piccola età, dove altri poterano gloriarsi di giungere nella vecchiaezza.” In his journal of the artist’s visit to France in 1665, Chantelou reports Bernini himself as relating that the episode with Paul V took place when he was eight years old, and that the work which aroused the Pope’s interest was a head of St. John (evidently a confusion with Giovanni Battista Santoni’s Christian names); cf. Chantelou, 84.

Santoni’s name is often mistakenly given as “Santori.” The cause of the error lies with the consistorial acts, the decrees of the papal consistory which include appointments of bishops and from which

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 17th 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).
the various published episcopal lists are compiled; these, however, are copies made from the original sources, now lost, after the consistorial archive was founded by Urban VIII. In these acts the name is spelled with an r, doubtless a copyist’s error. The correct spelling appears in the inscription of the Santoni monument itself (see below, note 40) and in all the contemporary documents, such as those concerning the elder Santoni’s nunciature in Switzerland, which include letters bearing his own signature (cf. P. M. Krieg, “Das Collegium Helveticum in Mailand nach dem Bericht des Nuntius Giovanni Battista Santoni,” Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte, 25, 1931, 112ff.) and in Cardinal Ottavio Bandini’s original nomination of the younger Santoni to the bishopric of Policastro (BVAS, Acta Miscell., vol. 98, fol. 331).

36 The earlier dating is that of Fraschetti, 11; cf. Wittkower, 1966, 173–74, No. 2 (1615–16). The frame of the Santoni monument is exactly copied in another funeral inscription in Santa Prassede, commemorating a man who died in 1614 (Forcella, ii, 509, No. 1537).

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.

40 See Forcella, ii, 507, No. 1530.

41 K. Eubel, Hierarchia ecclesiastica, Padua, 1913ff., ii, 284.


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.

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.

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 nat[ura]le.” In an inventory begun in 1632 by Niccolò Menghini it 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.52

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 ercole intiero a sedere sopra un Drago, che con una mano l’ha 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[cce]l[encenza] in occasione della Leg[dation]e 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.53 The Cardinal’s legation 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 Eroiletto che sbrana il serpente in età puerile opera del s[igno]r Cavaliere Lorenzo Bernini.”54 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.”55 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.56

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 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 1620.59 The poem is about a bronze dragon that stood in the Borghese garden, and its theme is 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.

50 BVAB–1, fol. 28, “Diverse statue venute di Casa dell’Ecc.” S. 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 alla Leg[atione] di Napoli.” D. Carlo Barberini,” Sept. 22, 1623). The brothers are later reported as having built the Giubbonari palace jointly (cf. Pastor, xxvii, 30). As 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, 1, 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 la Bocca alto p.m. 2 1/2” (BVAB–3, fol. 1).

52 On Menghini, cf. Pollak, 1, 3, 164; n. 131, 49ff. 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 Damasco 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. Piscil, 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 dracken 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, pp. 234f.), which by Pietro Giorgetti (p. 167), the two putti by Gianlorenzo from the Barberini chapel in Sant’Andrea della Valle (see below, pp. 234f.), as by Pietro Bernini (p. 167).

54 Cf. Pastor, xxxiii, 28–29, with bibliography; Bottineau, 250ff.


56 A. Bulifon, Giornale del Viaggio d’Italia dell’ Invitissimo e gloriosissimo Monarca Filippo V. Re delle Spagne e di Napoli, etc., Naples, 1703, 171. Other references to the gift are found in BV, ms 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 Firenze V. . . ., Rome, 1703, ed. P. E. Visconti, Rome, 1856, 81.

57 Bottineau, 250 n. 274, connected the work given by Cardinal Carlo Barberini to Philip V with that described in the Barberini inventory.
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]... .

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 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

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 Sempe 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 1935 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.


Draco aereus in fronte lauret, in viridario
Illustissimi Cardinalis Burghesii
Non sedeo custos, adsto venientibus hospes,
Non magis haec Domino, quam tibi Villa patet.
Hic requiem captare licet, passimque vagari,
Aéris hic haustu liberei frui,
Nec species animû turbet metuenda Draconis,
Non ego, quae flammis Hydra perempta cadat.
Non ego sum Python, feriant quem spicula; lauors
Ecce mihi credid 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:
In quest’ HORTO beato,
Di Gioue à l’alto Augel fatto consorte
Amico aride 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 Rinaldi, L’Arte in Roma del Seicento al Novecento, Bol­logna, 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 Falld, 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 85cm given). Cf. A. Santangelo, “Gian Lorenzo Bernini (attr.): ‘Baccante,’” BdA, 41, 1956, 369–70.
beginning of his career, which must have been made shortly before 1578 (Fig. 23). On the other hand, the physical type of the “Erocoletto,” 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 stiffness 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; 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. Thus, a date about 1614 seems most likely for Gianlorenzo’s Boy with the Dragon.

Two closely related works follow, the St. Lawrence on the Grill in the Contini-Bonacorsi Collection in Florence, and the

---

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, to Cordier’s heirs, on June 15, 1613 (BVAB-7, p. xxxi), another payment of 50 scudi respectively on May 25 and June 1615 (BVAB-9, p. 24). A workman was paid on May 5, 1615, for installing Pietro’s Baptist in the chapel (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.)

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 m.1 che p tanto sia Contentato di Pigliare un Pezzo di Marmo abbozzato da Niccolo cor detto Franciosino p fare un San Gio: Batta et detti Scudi Sessanta di m.1 Sono p a buon conto dell’ ∇ 300 che sia 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.)


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 asceso 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 dell’eccellenza.” (G. P. Bellori, Le vite de'
St. Sebastian in the Thyssen collection in Lugano (Figs. 30–32). 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. Laurence 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. This dating has been universally 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. 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. 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.

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 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.\textsuperscript{74} 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 \textit{St. Sebastian}, is suggested by the block of marble roughed out by Cordier as a \textit{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.\textsuperscript{75} 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.\textsuperscript{76} This corresponds to the presumed date of execution of the \textit{St. Sebastian}, and it seems possible that the block was cut down and adapted by the younger Bernini. The \textit{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.\textsuperscript{77} Such a setting is appropriate to John the Baptist as an allusion to his sojourn in the desert; Pietro Bernini's own \textit{St. John} is seated on a rocky throne, as is the \textit{Baptist} later made by Francesco Mochi, hoping to replace Pietro's figure.\textsuperscript{78} All five of the other statues in the chapel are also more or less seated,\textsuperscript{79} 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.\textsuperscript{80} 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).\textsuperscript{81} 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 1.11m high. Pietro then goes on to state that, having himself already made the terracotta 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 partial payment, he accepts a piece of white statuary marble.\textsuperscript{82} 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 duei petti [putti] del Naturale a sedere con un pannino che li cingie fatti dal Cavalier Bernini.”\textsuperscript{83} 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. 4.”\textsuperscript{84} 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

\textsuperscript{74} On October 27, 1617, Passignano received 100 scudi for “la Tavola di San Bastiano messo nella Cappelletta piccola di San Bastiano annessa alla Cappella grande di Santo Andrea della Valle . . .” (shortly after increased to 160 scudi; BVAB-9, p. xxix).

\textsuperscript{75} We noted that Cordier and his heirs received a total of 100 scudi; the price for the work stipulated in Cordier's contract was 300 scudi. See above, note 65.

\textsuperscript{76} One of the entries of the final payment of June 20, 1615, to Pietro (see note 66 above) shows that Cordier's block had been delivered to him by then: “. . . a m. Pietro Bernini Scultore Scudi quaranta di m* che Insieme un marmo bianco Sbozzato gia dal q. Niccolo Cori et fattolo condurre nella sua Casa di Santa Maria Magg.* et Aprezzato V* Sessanta di m* Sono il re. delle V* Trecento che haver doveva . . . p la Statua di San Gio: Batta che ha fatto p la Cappella di Santo Andrea della Valle . . .” (BVAB-8, p. vi).

\textsuperscript{77} Painted depictions of St. Sebastian seated in isolation appear in the Caravaggio school in the early 17th century: cf. a St. Sebastian in Prague by Carlo Saraceni (T. Gottheimer, “Rediscovery of Old Masters at Prague Castle,” BarkM, 107, 1965, 606, fig. 13; A. Moir, \textit{The Italian Followers of Caravaggio}, Cambridge, Mass., 1967, ii, 135); the \textit{St. Sebastian with an Executioner} in the Museo di Capodimonte, Naples, attributed to Bartolomeo Schidone, who died in December 1615 (Moir, i, 242; ii, fig. 312); and Honthorst's \textit{St. Sebastian} of ca. 1623 in the National Gallery, London (J. R. Judson, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{78} Cf. W. Müller, “Johannes der Taüfer in der Hofkirche zu Dresden,” JPKS, 47, 1926, 112ff. See below, note 85.

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

\textsuperscript{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. \textit{Flora} e \textit{Priapo}, i due Termini già nella Villa Borghese a Roma,” Commentari, 13, 1962, 267ff.; 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
well as documentary, to suppose that they were executed about 1629 by Francesco Mochi (cf. Fig. 35).85

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).86 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.87 The comparison 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);88 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 collection, 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.99 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 imestimable marvel, not only in itself but because Michelangelo made it when 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.”100 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

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 Michelangolo dopo l’aver passato l’età di 70 anni; e ch’egli uomo fatto, e conseguentemente maestro, perché cominciò ad esserlo da giovinotto, vi aveva studiato 10 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. Caval. Passignani che al S. Michelangelo Buonarroti11 restava qui verso il Palazzo d’Aless;12 una statua comincia già da Michelangelo, et che ne Sarebbia fatto fuori. Se si puo haver p’ buon mercato sotto mano col mezo del med’ Passig:13” la piglierete pche il fig.14 del Bernino che fa g’ riusc.14 la pietonerebbe.” (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 Guidicciioni,” 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 much-debated Palestrina Pietà, which was in fact owned by the Barberini, though Michelangelo’s authorship of the work is not thereby guaranteed.

94 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.

95 Among the possible sources for the St. Sebastian, incidentally, should be considered the Louvre Pietà by Annibale Carracci, as
by Michelangelo, and that he might be parted from it. If it can
be obtained cheaply through Passignano, I would take it be¬
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 fac¬
tory he enjoyed with Maffeo Barberini. It also reveals the hitherto un¬
known fact that there was in Rome, owned by Michelangelo’s
grandnephew, 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 reason¬
able to associate this project for finishing one of Michelan¬
gelo’s works with the study of the earlier artist Bernini said he
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 re¬
ceive 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 mono¬
mental drama of the groups made in the early 1620’s.

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). 94 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 pri¬
vate collection. They first appear there in an inventory entry of
December 4, 1628, with yellow marble bases added (indicating
they had originally been placed in oval or circular niches). 95
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. 96

In the bust of Camilla everything has become sharp and
clear. The surfaces are smoothly polished; contours and in¬
cisions 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, con¬
trast 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. 97 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. 98

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. 99 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 posed body 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 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 Sourdies 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. 100 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. 101 The bust must have been made shortly before his departure, i.e., early in 1621. Cardinal de Sourdies had come to Rome early in the spring of 1621, and he left to return to France by July 1622; 102 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 the 1620's, 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 Niccolò 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 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 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

---

107 Cf. Cessi, Alessandro Vittoria architetto e scultore (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—Giorlamo Rainaldi, who shortly afterward also seems to have designed the Sforandra tomb in Santa Cecilia, in which the same formula is repeated (Brüns, 313–14, fig. 235; for the correct date, cf. Martinelli, “Contributi alla scultura del seicento: IV. Pietro Bernini i figli,” Commentarii, 4, 1953, 148 n. 22).
made substantially earlier.\textsuperscript{109} Documents from the archive of the Confraternity of the Resurrection, which was the proprietor of San Giacomo, provide evidence for a precise date.\textsuperscript{110} The minutes of the meetings of the confraternity record that in September 1622, Montoya petitioned for permission to found a chapel.\textsuperscript{111} 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.\textsuperscript{112} 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.\textsuperscript{113} The bust was therefore most probably made at the end of 1622.\textsuperscript{114}

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 sharpness of focus adds to the quality of inner tension and vitality the figure conveys. 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.\textsuperscript{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 hanging from the chest project forward, apronlike, and suggest an empty space behind. There Bernini introduces the bow that falls startlingly over the pedestal.\textsuperscript{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 that of Montoya (Fig. 52).\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{110} A history of the confraternity and its benefactors is given by Fernández Alonso (279ff.; 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.

\textsuperscript{111} September 16, 1622: "Lei. yo el secretario un memorial, que decia como Mons.' Pedro de Foix Montoia quiere fundar estar esta Iglesia una Capellanía anidiendo un Capellan mas y cometerien. a los 55.' Bernardo de Cegama, y D. Botinet y D. Pedro de Alarcon p.* que con los 55.' Adm.' traten. del modo de esta fundacion con e diho mons.'" (AIEE–1191, fol. 91).

\textsuperscript{112} December 28, 1622: "Quese conclua en el negocio de la Capellanía 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 queen materia de comenc;ar a fabricar en tosta manera.

\textsuperscript{113} January 29, 1623:

\textsuperscript{114} Bernini seems to have borrowed this motif from the bust of Martino Gambara, in the Montoya collection that Montoya left the bust in the artist's studio for a long time (Chantelou, 102–03).

\textsuperscript{115} In a marginal note added to the manuscript of Fioravante Martelli's "Roma ornata," 63, the architecture of the tomb is attributed to Orazio (not Niccolò) Torriani; 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 benefactors, Bernardo Botinet, who died in October 1632, and are listed in an inventory of 1680 (AIEE, Busta 1333, "Inventà de la yglesia y Sacristi que Sirvio hast el Año de 1680," foll. 133ff.; "cosas diferentes de Sacristia," cf. fol. 134v: "Mas dos Estatuas de Marmol blanco del Bernino, con sus pidestales de jaspe, son dos testas que representan la una la anima en gloria, y la otra anima en pena & las quales vienen con lo que dejó el D." Botinete a la Iglesia"). On Botinet cf. Fernández Alonso, 322–23.

\textsuperscript{116} "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.

\textsuperscript{117} I hereby emphatically retract the doubt I once expressed whether the bust is completely autograph (review of Wittkower, in AB, 38, 1956, 259).
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22. Pietro Bernini, Bacchic group. Whereabouts unknown (from Galerie Sangiorgi . . . 1910, 26)
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41. Flight from Troy (detail). Rome, Galleria Borghese (photo: GFN)

42. Flight from Troy (detail). Rome, Galleria Borghese (photo: GFN)


47. Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Cardinal Dolfin*. Venice, San Michele all'Isola (photo: Böhm, Venice)
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52. Bust of Monsignor Francesco Barberini. Washington, National Gallery

56. Attrib. to Nicolò Cordier, *Bust of a member of the Aldobrandini family*. Rome, Santa Maria sopra Minerva (photo: GFN)


The drapery arrangement of 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). 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). 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). 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). The 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). The resemblance includes not only details of costume and composition, 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 physiognomical structure of the head and the handling of features such as the eyelids and cheeks. The choice of this asymmetrical prototype is significant, and in interpreting it Bernini brought into play and made explicit the innovations that had been hinted at in the busts of Montoya and Francesco Barberini. 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 mantelletta. 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. 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 underlying the arms of Coppola and Vignevano; though here it appears through the armpit and does not interrupt the wide-flaring, bow-shaped lower silhouette, 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 forward, the left back.

The drapery arrangement and the suggestion of movement make it possible 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 in-
introduced an element of movement in their busts, apart from the
turn of the head, by showing one arm forward and the
other back. 125 This, too, is a device that Bernini subsequently
adopted, though in radically altered form. 126 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 shift­
ing 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
planes. Perhaps for the first time in the history of the sculp­
tured 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 127) conveys
the vaguely tragic impression of a great reservoir of human
energy that is past maturity. 128

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
father and another assistant. 129 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. 130

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. 131 Docu­
ments in the Jesuit archive now make the situation clear, and
show that the portrait has a most remarkable history. In his
testimonial 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 ju­
rist 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. 132 A diary of
the church subsequently records that on August 3, 1623, the new
sepulchre was begun; 133 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 con­
ception 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. 134 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

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 “ardito moto del vivo,” and Bandinelli of “il
moto suo . . . che distende uno braccio alcu[n]chando la mano da
pacificare e . . .” (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 il­
usionistic purpose of alluding to the lower extremities of the arms.
Bernini’s deep response to Florentine 16th-century sculpture in
the early 1620’s is evident from the relationships, often noted, be­
tween his Neptune and Triton from the Villa Montalto and Stoldo
Lorenzi’s Neptune fountain in the Boboli garden; between the Rape
of Prosperine and Giambologna’s Rape of the Sabines (though in
fact Bernini’s direct source seems to have been a small bronze Rape
of Prosperine by Pietro da Bargia in the Bargello); and between the
Apollo and Daphne and Battista Lorenzi’s Alpheus and Arethusa,
now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. Cf. B. H. Wiles, The
Fountains of the Florentine Sculptors and Their Followers from
Donatello to Bernini, Cambridge, Mass., 1933, 102; P. Remington,
Alpheus and Arethusa: A Marble Group by Battista Lorenzi,” BMMA,
25, 1940, 61ff.; L. Lavin, “Bozzetti and Models: Notes on
Sculptural Procedure from the Early Renaissance through Bernini,”
Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn 1964,

127 “Item: voglio che il Corpo mio morendo a Roma di questo male . . .”
(ASGF, Busta 606, Testament of Cepparelli, April 12, 1622, Not. B.
Doni, 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
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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. 135 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. 136 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 by the bust of Cardinal Pio da Carpi in Santa Trinità dei Monti (Fig. 5); Bellarmino’s head and glance are inclined toward the worshipper 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). 137 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. 138 Traditions that had served mainly to record the aspect of what was dead are fused in order to re-create 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 1624, 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, 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.

New York University

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 Fulgigli, 347ff. Cf. also ARSI-i, 2, 3.
133 August 3, 1623: “Si comincio la sepoltura del Card. Bellarmino” (ARS-I-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 foderi di piombo et posato a seppellire . . .” (ARS-I-2; cf. Fulgigli, 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, 1957ff, i, cols. 160ff.
137 By Giovanni da Valsolpo. 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 (L. Lavin, Bernini and the Crossing of Saint Peter’s, Monograph of the College Art Association of America, in press).
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. 1v):

   Si paghi p il cassò di cera fatto p la testa del d' m. Ant.° Coppola \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) quattro et che Piero Paulo Cavalc.\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) sia con il s' Fran.° Tichic p far fare al bernino scultore la testa de Marno del detto m. Ant.° Coppola da mettersi nel'spedale.

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 marno 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.° Tichic, che veda di far pagar meno che si puo.

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

   E deve Dare addi 4 di Agosto \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) quattro di m.° Pag.\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) à Pietro Bernini scultore e p suo ordine à s° tichic porto franc.° Scachi cont. p Interia Valuta della testa di Marno della Detta B. M. p tenere nel spedale ____________________________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

4. August 10, 1612 (ibid.):

   E Addi 10 di Agosto \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) Cinquanta di m.° Pag.\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) à Pietro Bernini scultore e p suo ordine à s° tichic porto franc.° Scachi cont. p Interia Valuta della testa di Marno della Detta B. M. p tenere nel spedale ____________________________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

5. September 3, 1612 (AGSF–205, before middle of volume):

   Adi 3 di Sett.° 1612. in Roma. M. Gio: Franc.° Giannozzi Camarlingo del Nro Hospitalte Pagherete à m. Cosimo Dandini Pittore \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) cinque di m.° p l'intiera valuta del ritratto del Nro M. Ant.° Coppola che con sua ric.° saranno ben pag.\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) e Poneteli al conto solito Dio vi guardi \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) cinque di m.°

   And.° Pasquali Dep.\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

   Ascanio sordonati Dep.°

   Io Cosimo dandini sopd.° ho ricevuto

   li detti cinque scudi di 14 di set 1612 Cosimo dandini Mano pp°

6. September 14, 1612 (AGSF–430, p. 49 right):

   E Addi 14 detto \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) cinque di m.° Pag.\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) à Cosimo dandini Pittore p cont. p Valuta del Ritratto fatto della detta B. M. ______________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

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

   Misura del epitaffio fatto nel spedale di sà Gio: dela natione fioretina da m° Simone Castelli long p' 4\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) alto p' 4\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) fa p' 22\(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) aguiu 4 il p° monta ______________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

   P aver intagliato liter.° n° 225 a b 4 luna mòta ______________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

   Somma in tut.° scudi dicisette b quaranta ______________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

   Filippo Breccioli mú pp

   Ha hauto abò còto da me Seb.° Guidi p 1 . . . fatta all'ospitale delle . . . di 1615 ______________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

[verso]

M. franc.° Rochi mr.° Camarl.° pagharete a m. Simone Castelli Scarpellino sedici b 80 m.° se li fanno pag.° p pagmt.° p l'epitaffio e altro conforme il retroscritto Conto che con sua ric° vi si farano . . . Adi 16 di 9bre 1615

   Cam° del Palagio deput.°

   Arcagelo Cavalcati dep.°

   [ illegible signature ] . . . proved.°

   io simone castello o ructo scudi sedici e baiochi otòta quali . . .

   soldi del retroscritto io simone castelo mano proprieta questo di 12 dicembre 1615

6b. December 1, 1615 (AGSF–651, fol. 19):

   fu fatto mäd.° di pag.° à m. Simone Castelli scarpell.° \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) sedici b otant° p pagmt° p l'epitaffio et altro conforme il conto sotto il q° fatoli il md° ______________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

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

**Four Cherubs for the Barberini Chapel**

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

   Sig.' Ruberto Primo Piaccia a V.S. pag." a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore Scudi Settanta cinque m.° Sono p a buon conto di quattro putti di Marno che mi deve fare p Serv." della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle ____________________________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

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

   Pietro Bernino Scultore deve dare Addi 5 di Febb° \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) Settantacinque m.° Pag.° a m. Pietro Bernino a buon conto della fattura di quattro putti di Marno bianco che mi fa p Serv." della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle ____________________________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

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

   E addi 5 di Febb° \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\) Settentaquindici m.° Pag.° a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore p a buon conto di quattro putti che fa di Marno p Serv." della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle ____________________________ \(\text{\scriptsize \(\ddagger\)}\)

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

   Havendo io Pietro Bernino Scultore et Statuario habitante In Roma, convenuto et pattuito con L'Ill.° Sig.' Card.' Barberino, di farli quattro putti di mio marno popio Bianco nuovo, che devono andare, sopra li frontespitii delle pte laterali della Sua Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle, li quali quattro putti devono essere di altezza di palmi cinque l'uno Inc.° Et a questo fine, essendo da me di già stato fatto li Modelli di Terra di detti quattro putti, Nudi con alcuni Suolazzi di panni, etc. Di qui, è che io Pietro Bernino, Sud.° pometto di fare et fornire di mia mano et di mano di Gio: Lorenzo mio fig.° p tutto Giuogio Milleseicento-dicinove li detti quattro putti, et mi obligo che sieno lustrati et finiti con ogni diligentia, et pche io et Contrafacendo, à quanto di Sopra et agiudicandosi da periti non ess.° l'opera conforme alla Sud.' posse, volgob essere Tenuto ad ogni danno et Interesse, che S. S. III.° ne potessi patire, à ne havesi patito, et di piu mi obligo ancora di far Condurre li sud.' quattro putti di Marno a mie popie Spese nella Sud.' Sua Cappella di Sant Andrea della valle, et assi-
stere a quelli artefici che li Collocheranno Sopra li frontespiti delle pte laterali della Sud.\* Cappella, accio venghino, à posare agiustam. et bene. Et p pezzo de sud.\* quattro putti ho ric.\* da S. S. Ill.\*m.\* un pezzo di Marmo bianco Statuario di dua Carrettate Incirca, et di piu mi doverra dare Scudi Centosettantacinque di m.\* di g.\* dieci p \(\Psi\) a Conio della quali questo giorno, ne ho ric.\* da S. S. Ill.\*m.\* un Mandato diretto al Sig.\* Ruberto Primo di Scudi Settanta cinque m.\* et il restante che sono Scudi Cento m.\* mi doveranno essere da S. S. Ill.\*m.\* liberam. et Senza eccettione alcuna pagati ogni volta che io li dia finiti et pletionati li Sud.\* quattro putti di Marmo et p osservazione di quanto di sopra, è detto, mi obbligio In forma Camere etc. questi di 7 di febbraio 1618-In Roma Io pietro bernini Affermo prometto mi obbligo e giuro di osservare quanto di sopra si contiene et in fede del vero o di mia propria mano sottoscritto la presente q.\*e di e anno suddetto Io pietro bernini mano propria.

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

Nota che si è fatto una scrittura con Pietro Bernino Scultore, che faccia quattro putti di Marmo Bianco Novo del Suo priio p metterli in su li frontespiti delle pte laterali della Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle alti palpini Cinque quali li deve dare finiti p tutto Giugno 1619 et li deve dar Cond\* a Sua spese Ind\* Cappella, et p pezzo si e Convenuto darli un pezzo di Marmo Bianco di dua Carrettate Inc\* et di pui Scudi Cento Settantacinque m.\* a Conio de quali si le e consegna un Mand\* di \(\sqrt{75}\) —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 margine] Roma—Fatti detti putti et Collocati in la Cappella dove andavano.

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

A Pietro Bernini Scultore Scudi ventinove m.\* buoni a Spese che Si fanno in fabricare et ornare una Cappella In Sant Andrea della Valle. Sono p la meta di \(\sqrt{58}\) 58 m.\* che costà un pezzo di Marmo bianco di quattro Carrettate Inc.\* che fu Compo da m. Gio; Bellucci fattore della fabbrica di San Pietro fino sotto di 11 di Agosto 1611 del q.\* Marmo della Meta ne fu fatto la Statua di Mons.\* Fr.\* Barberini da m. Cristofano Statti Braccianese et l’altra meta fu cond.\* a Casa dell. Ill.\*m.\* Sig.\* Card.\* Barberino, il quale Si e poi Consegn.\* al Sud.\* m. Pietro a Conio di quattro putti di Marmo Bianco che mi deve fare p Serv.\* della Sud.\* Cappella --------------- \(\sqrt{29}\)

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

E addi d.\* [February 21, 1618] \(\sqrt{58}\) 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 quattro carrettate Inc.\* che fu Compo da m. Giuseppe fattore della fabbrica di San Pietro \(\sqrt{58}\) 58 m.\* fino Sotto li 11 di Ag.\* 1611 --- \(\sqrt{29}\)

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

E addi 21 d.\* [February] \(\sqrt{58}\) ventinove m.\* che tanto Si valuta un pezzo di Marmo Bianco Statuario di dua Carrettate Inc.\* circa consegnaetli [i.e. Pietro Bernini] qui In Casa che lo fece ptare a Casa Sua --------------- \(\sqrt{29}\)


Sig.\* Ruberto Primo Piacca a V. S. pag.\* a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore Scudi Cinquantatrenta m.\* Sono p a buon conto delli quattro putti di Marmo bianco che mi fa p Serv.\* della mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle --------------- \(\sqrt{50}\)

11b. May 28, 1618 (BVAB-9, p. 104):

E addi 28 Magio \(\sqrt{58}\) Cinquanta m.\* pag.\* con Mandato diretto al s.\* Ruberto Primo --------------- \(\sqrt{50}\)

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

E addi d.\* [May 28] \(\sqrt{58}\) 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 --------------- \(\sqrt{50}\)

12a. July 7, 1618 (BVAB-8, p. lii):

Sig.\* Provisori del Sacro Monte di Pietr piacera alla Sig.\* v.\* Pag.\* a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore Statuario Scudi Cinquantatrenta m.\* Sono p resto del pezzo con lui Convenuto di quattro Putti di Marmo bianco che mi ha fatto et fattoli Condurre a Sue Spese conforme a che era obligato nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle quali Sono Stati Collocati Sopra li Fronte Spiti delle pte laterali della detta Cappella --------------- \(\sqrt{50}\)

12b. July 7, 1618 (BVAB-9, p. 104):

Addi 7 di Lug.\* \(\sqrt{58}\) Cinquanta m.\* pag.\* con mand.\* diretto al Sacro Monte di Pietr p re.\* della Sud.\* quattro putti di Marmo bianco, che ha fatti et condurre nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle, quali sono Stati Collocati Sopra li Fronte Spiti delle pte laterali della detta Cappella --------------- \(\sqrt{50}\)

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

E addi 7 d.\* [July] \(\sqrt{58}\) Cinquanta m.\* pag.\* a m. Pietro Bernino Scultore p re.\* del pezzo di quattro putti di Marmo bianco che ha fatto p Serv.\* della mia Cappella di Santo Andrea della Valle --------------- \(\sqrt{50}\)

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

E \(\sqrt{58}\) Dugentoquattro m.\* buoni a m. Pietro bernino Scultore Sono p pezzo delle quattro putti di Marmo bianco che sono Sopra le pte laterali della Sud.\* Cappella che posano Sopra li Fronte Spiti di esse pte --------------- \(\sqrt{204}\)

(Summary of previous payments.)

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

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 Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle Sopra li Fronte Spiti delle pte laterali --------------- \(\sqrt{204}\)

(Summary of previous payments.)

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

Addi 19 di Ottobre \(\sqrt{58}\) 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 --------------- \(\sqrt{1}90\)

14. December 22, 1618 (ibid.):

Addi 22 Xbre \(\sqrt{58}\) Uno b 77\% m.\* pag.\* con mand.\* diretto al Sacro Monte di Pietr a m’ro Antonio Lucatelli ferraro p otto Sphagne di ferro, che ha date p tenere li quattro putti di Marmo messi Sopra le pte laterali --------------- \(\sqrt{1}77\%\)

15. December 31, 1618 (ibid.):

E addi 31 d.\* [December] \(\sqrt{58}\) Sei m.\* buoni a m’ro Bat’ta Scala Muratore Sono p hav.\* messo In opera li Sud.\* quattro putti di Marmo bianco --------------- \(\sqrt{6}\)

16. April 26, 1619: See Doc. 17a, below.
**Busts of Camilla Barbadori and Antonio Barberini**

17a. April 26, 1619 (BVAB-11, p. 5):

Sig. M. Provisori del Sacro Monte di Pieta piacere alle Sig. M. v'è 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. M. 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 e Sono ancora p rs. di tutti li lavori che mi possi hav. fatto Insieme con Suo padre fino a q. giorno

\[\n\text{\n\$750\n}\]

17b. April 26, 1619 (BVAB-12, p. xxxvi):

E addi 26 d. [April] \[\text{\n\$780\n}\] pag. a Gio: Lorenzo Bernino Scultore p una Testa della B. M. della Sig. M. Camilla mia Madre che mi ha fatto __________________________

\[\n\text{\n\$750\n}\]

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

Una Testa di Marmo Bianco della B. M. della Sig. M. Camilla mia madre In mano a Gio: Lorenzo bernino deve fare Addi 26 di Aprile \[\text{\n\$750\n}\] 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. le la deve far Condurre a Sue spese nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle p Collocarla nel luogo che li Sara destinato __________________________

\[\n\text{\n\$750\n}\]

18a. February 22, 1620 (BVAB-11, p. 14):

Sig. M. Provisori del Sacro Monte di Pieta piacere alle Sig. M. v'è Pag. a m. Gio: Lor. M. bernino Scultore Scudi Cinquanta m. Sono p pezzo d'una Testa di Marmo bianco che mi ha fatto della B. M. del 5° Ant. M. mio P'è q. le la deve far Condurre a Sue Spese nella mia Cappella di Sant Andrea della Valle et Collocarla nel luogo che li Sara destinato __________________________

\[\n\text{\n\$750\n}\]

18b. February 22, 1620 (BVAB-12, p. 40):

E addi 22 di Febaro \[\text{\n\$750\n}\] pag. con mand. diretto come Sopa al Sud. P' è una Testa di Marmo bianco della B. M. del s. Ant. M. mio P' è q. le la deve far condurre come Sopa __________________________

\[\n\text{\n\$750\n}\]

18c. February 22, 1620 (ibid., p. 111):

E addi d. [February 22] \[\text{\n\$750\n}\] pag. a Gio: Lor. M. bernino Scultore p la Testa di Marmo bianco della B. M. del s. Ant. M. mio P' è q. le che mi ha fatto __________________________

\[\n\text{\n\$750\n}\]

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 cò inscrizione 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 facessi quanto p. —

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

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

\[\text{\n\$76\n}\]

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

Mag. M. Santi Vannini nò Camarlengho à piacere pagare à m.

Pompeo Caccini pittore scudi sei mt. quali sono p prezzo del ritratto del s. Ant. Cepparelli bo: me: che cò una riceuta saranno ben pagati dal m° spedale li 21 di Giugno 1622 \[\text{\n\$76\n}\]

Horatio Falconiere Sup.

joorlando Cosini di put.

Io Jaco Caccini ho receu.

li sopra detti danari p il

Sud. Pompeo mio padre

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

Al s. Cav. M. Gialorenzo bernini p a bon conto della statua che deve fare del s. Ant. Cepparelli in marmo fu fatto m. ° __________________\n
\[\text{\n\$25\n}\]

22b. August 7, 1622 (ASGF-205, middle of volume):

Mag. M. Santi Vannini nò Camarlengho à piacere al S. Cav. M. Gialorenzo bernini scudi ventincinque mt. quali sono a bon conto della testa di marmo che deve fare del ritratto del S. Ant. Cepparelli che con una riceuta saranno ben pagati Dal Nr Cong. li 7 di Agt° 1622 \n
\[\text{\n\$725\n}\]

Hor Salco n sup.°

Fran.° Scacchi Dep°

Domenico Migliari De Putato


[verso]

Io pietro bernini scultore ricieuto li detti scudi ventincinque° 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 addi 24 di ’bre \[\text{\n\$750\n}\] venticinque di m° pag. con mand. a m. Pietro scultore p la testa fatta di Marmo __________________________

\[\text{\n\$25\n}\]

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

Al d.° [Sebastianio 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 ______ \n
\[\text{\n\$45\n}\]

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

Mag. M. Lorenzo Cavotti nr.° Cam.° à piacere pagare a m Seb° Guidi nr Prov° scudi quaranta cinque tali fatt° pagare da Ticci al s. Cav° bernini p la statua di marmo fatta a 5° 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 \n
\[\text{\n\$45\n}\] p resto

Piero Landi, deput.°

Io Seb.° Guidi ho

r° quanto sopra Seb.° Guidi Prov.°

23c. December 23, 1623 (ASGF-430, p. 118):

E addi detto [December 23, 1623] \[\text{\n\$750\n}\] p resto della statua fatta di d.° Cepparello __________________________

\[\text{\n\$45\n}\]

**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 Marnero fatta p Mettere nel n° sped.° p Memoria del q. Pietro
Cambi Beneffattore, che con Riceuta ne darete deb. a d. Redita dal d’luogo il di 2 di Genaro 1629 in Roma ▽12 m.  
Antonio Resti dept.

io pompeo ferrucci oriceuto 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 buon conto della testa di Marmaho 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 ▽15 m.  

Ant. Resti 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 Marmaro che fa del q. Pietro Cambi p 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 ▽10 m.  

Ant. Resti Dept

Lorenzo Cavotti Deputato

io pompeo ferrucci o ricieuto li sopradetti iscudi dieci a buon conto del ritratto questo di d 14 di dicembre 1629

io pompeo ferrucci mano pp

Carlo Aldobrandi scr.

27. March 7, 1630 (ibid., near beginning of volume):
M. Santi Vannini fornaro no Camarl. pag. al m. Pompeo ferucci scultore ▽ dieci di m. quali seli fanno pag. p resto della testa di Marmaro fatta del q. Pietro Cambi messa nel no sped. che cò Riceuta ne darete debito alla detta Redita dal d. Spd. il di 7 di Marzo 1630 In Roma ▽10 m.  

Fran.” Scacchi Dept

io pompeo ferrucci o riceueto li sopradetti iscudi dieci di mone p resto come sopra questo di 10 daprile 1630 io pompeo ferrucci mano pp

Carlo Aldobrandi scr.

28. May 8, 1630 (ibid., near beginning of volume):
M. Santi Vannini no fornaro no Camarl. pag. a m. Simone Castelli scarpellino ▽ Cinque di mo. quali seli fanno pagare p una pietra di Marmo longa p. 3½ larga p 17/12 grossa ½ cò l’te intagilate 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 ▽5 m.  

Fran.” Scacchi dept

Felice Sellori deputato

Io Simone Castelo orecuto li sopra scritti scudi cinque per sado di detta pietra chome di sopra li deti dinari pagare to Francesco osano lano che sarano bene pagati secondo a 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 falegname ▽ dua b 60 quali sono p jo. del pn’to Conto delle basse Inpernature di ferro et altro fatte p Mantenini. delle due teste di Creta fatte di Mano del Bernino, ch 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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1. Arm. 155. "... Inventarij ... della Guardarobba dell’Ill.” S.‘ CARDINALE FRANCESCO BARBERINI ... cominciato alli 10. Decembre 1626. e finito alli 15 Gennaio 1627. da Federigo Soleti com- putista.” (Entries continued to be made in this volume through 1631.)

ADDENDA

Doc. 3bis August 4, 1612 (ASGF-369, Part 2, p. 19):

Pegati ai sig’ francesco schachi schudi quattro p francesco ticci quali sono p il Casso di gesso della testa del sig.’ antonio Coppola

Doc. 22d. September 24, 1622 (ibid., facing p. 63):


Ricoboni, A., Roma nell’arte. La scultura nell’epoca moderno dal quattro­ cento ad oggi, Rome, 1942.


Siren, O., Nicodemus Tessin d.y:s Studieresor, Stockholm, 1914.
