



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Irving Lavin

Reviewed work(s): Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture by John Pope-Hennessy

Source: *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (Sep., 1965), pp. 378-383

Published by: College Art Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3048287>

Accessed: 10/09/2008 16:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=caa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Turkestan or Turkey by Kühnel, but it seems more likely that we have here a work of either the Bukhara school, or even more likely of a Persian artist working in India; the treatment of the facial features of the reclining lady are, in fact, highly reminiscent of Abdu'l Samad's work (see R. Ettinghausen, in *Encyclopedia of World Art*, I, 1959, cols. 16-20, pls. 14-17).

In its wealth of information, penetrating analysis of all aspects of the subject, and its well organized form, Dr. Stchoukine's volume is an indispensable guide and handbook for anyone who studies Persian painting. It forms, like his other volumes, the basis for all further research in the field.

ERNST J. GRUBE
Metropolitan Museum of Art

JOHN POPE-HENNESSY, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*, Greenwich, Conn., New York Graphic Society (Phaidon), 1963. 3 vols., unnumbered: Text, 126 pp., 178 figs.; Catalogue, 183 pp.; Plates, 168 pls. \$12.50 each vol.

These three volumes constitute the third and final part of John Pope-Hennessy's monumental *Introduction to Italian Sculpture*. He has performed the astonishing feat of traveling a razor's edge between popularization and scholarship all the way from Nicola Pisano through Bernini. As a result, readers of English now have an accurate and ample guide to the chief treasures of Italian sculpture during the long period of its greatest achievements. Taken as a whole the series admirably fulfills a desideratum the urgency of which can best be gauged from the simple fact that no work of comparable scope has been devoted exclusively to the history of Italian sculpture since Cicognara's three volumes were published in 1813-1818. The serious student will still have to refer to the relevant volumes of Venturi, but mainly for illustrations of minor works by minor artists; it is to Pope-Hennessy that he will turn for up-to-date information and critical analysis of the really significant artists and monuments. Mr. Pope-Hennessy deserves our hearty congratulations and thanks for having brought this considerable undertaking to completion. This final portion is especially welcome because Italian sculpture between Michelangelo and Bernini has remained largely *terra incognita* to all but a few *conoscenti*, interest having lagged far behind contemporary painting and architecture.

The work follows on an ampler scale the pattern of the previous volumes, and of most Phaidon art publications; there is a general introductory text with smallish illustrations, a catalogue, and full-page plates. The reproductions maintain on the whole the very high standard of quality that we have come to expect from Phaidon. But the catalogue above all will make an enduring contribution to the study and appreciation of Italian art. It is a dazzling display of

Pope-Hennessy's talent as a compiler, digester, and expositor of useful information. The careers of the thirty-nine artists included are given summaries that are miracles of condensation, rivaled only by the best articles in Thieme-Becker and often, especially for names coming early in the alphabet, much more valuable. After the artist's biography there follow, by way of commentaries on the plates, accounts of the histories of a selected number of his most important works. These may be short monographs in their own right, bringing together, often for the first time, the important information concerning the monument. Pope-Hennessy even quotes relevant passages from the sources both in Italian and in English translation. In the face of this achievement, to quibble over the selection of artists or works would be an impertinence. One only wishes he had provided more of these little masterpieces.

Unfortunately the same unreserved praise cannot be accorded the text. In part its shortcomings may result inevitably from the way the material is treated, which is typical of many Phaidon books. It might best be described as thematic. Besides the Introduction there are seventeen chapters, of which the first three are devoted to Michelangelo, four near the end to Bernini. The others deal with such various topics as the High Renaissance Statue, the Florentine Fountain, Venetian High Renaissance Sculpture, the High Renaissance Portrait, the Bronze Statuette, the Heritage of Bernini. To be sure, the subjects are chosen aptly, isolating as they do some of the central problems with which sculptors were vitally occupied. And, with seven chapters devoted to different aspects of High Renaissance sculpture, for example, most of the major monuments get discussed under one heading or another. But this approach has two disagreeable consequences. The most important is that, apart from Michelangelo and Bernini, no artist is treated as a whole personality. Discussions of the work of an individual may occur in several different places, and only by exception in connection with what he did before or afterward. So we come away without a feeling for any single artist's development. Theoretically, the catalogue summary might serve this purpose; but as it is a bare enumeration of fact, it does not. The second, concomitant, result of the thematic approach is that no coherent picture of the overall development during the period emerges. In the Introduction Pope-Hennessy deplors the term "Mannerist" because it "imposes a spurious uniformity on a number of widely differing artists and works of art." But he recognizes "a development that leads from the trial relief of Brunelleschi to the final dissolution of Renaissance ideals and Renaissance style in the mature sculptures of Bernini." Yet, save for a few passages—like the splendid one that defines a late sixteenth century tendency anticipating Bernini's interest in movement and transitory states (p. 106)—it is precisely a sense of broad evolution that this treatment fails to convey.

The shortcomings cannot be attributed entirely to the organization, however; indeed, they would be largely vitiated if the chapters as they stand provided a coherent picture of the development in the field to which they are devoted. The monuments in a given category are taken up in chronological order. But in general the discussion consists of a series of isolated observations strung together by often forced and vaguely irrelevant bridge-passages (as when, p. 62, the fact that Michelangelo's tomb in Santa Croce was finished in 1578 leads to Giambologna's Altar of Liberty, begun the year before).

These loosely connected observations about artists and works of art form the real core of the text. They vary greatly, from mere trivia (Lorenzetti's *Jonah* in Santa Maria del Popolo, presumably based on a design by Raphael, "is one of the few sculptures in the world whose true merits transpire more clearly from plaster casts than from the original," p. 44) and petulant cavil (Bandinelli is a special *bête noire*; he is mentioned more frequently than any artist except Michelangelo—an unwitting tribute to the power and importance of his art—but never without a derisive epithet) to brilliant aperçus that rival some of the inspired pages of Friedrich Kriegbaum; those on Giambologna's group-sculpture alone are worth the price of the book.

Moreover, though it is not developed in a systematic fashion there is a certain intellectual frame of reference. The *fons vitae* of Italian sculpture is conceived as its relation to the antique; antiquity is a source of inspiration and a salubrious norm that artists such as Bandinelli and the mature Bernini may flout on peril of excommunication. Closely linked to this view, I suspect, is the rejection of "Mannerism" as a label for sixteenth century style—which seems to have become the fashion of late—and the dismissal of sculpture after Bernini as on the whole not worth consideration. As to the latter opinion, this reviewer offers no comment. As to the former, I would only note that a somewhat analogous thesis has recently been developed by Craig Smyth, who argues that much in sixteenth century painting style is based upon Roman relief sculpture, and who also rejects the term "Mannerism" for the period at large.¹ The conclusion there, however, is based on a radical redefinition of the whole structure of Renaissance art, while here it merely shifts the emphasis from what is new to what is traditional in the sixteenth century.

But perhaps the most consistent aspect of the presentation is Pope-Hennessy's attitude, which, were it not a contradiction in terms, I would call "iconoclastic." He challenges accepted clichés and devours hallowed notions with relish. This too makes for very lively reading, and in many instances it leads to excellent results. A notable example is the treatment of one of the book's chief heroes, Giovanni Bologna, whose *Rape of the Sabines* is often taken as the *locus classicus* of pure formalism in Mannerist art. The

hesitancy over a name for the group, recorded in the sources, shows that to illustrate a specific subject was not the artist's primary intention. Pope-Hennessy argues rightly that the group does nevertheless have a powerful dramatic content, revealing an expressive range that is fundamental to Giambologna's art.

Particularly in the case of Michelangelo, Pope-Hennessy brushes aside the "fruits" of modern scholarship with breathtaking self-assurance. Since these chapters, especially that on the Medici Chapel, are easily the most challenging and original part of the book, I shall devote most of the remaining paragraphs to an examination of some of the principal arguments. His main concern is to help clear the "Nietzschean mist" in which highly abstract, speculative interpreters have shrouded Michelangelo's life and work. He calls the Neoplatonic interpretations of Michelangelo a "rut." On the profundity-laden problem of the "unfinished" in Michelangelo's sculpture he states unequivocally that "by objective standards these sculptures are not complete; they were not regarded by the sculptor as complete; in practically every case they were begun in the conviction that they would be finished; and they should be interpreted in terms of the completed sculptures they imply." While by no means underestimating the anomalies of Michelangelo's personal psychology, his whole approach urges simplicity and sobriety. Where others see arcane allusion he sees straightforward allegory, or no meaning at all. Where others see deliberate elusiveness he sees only vague intentions and indefinite objectives. Whatever the merits of his views on any individual subject this fresh and sometimes irreverent attitude should have a wholesome effect in helping to bring Michelangelo scholarship down to a more earthy level.

I believe there are grounds to suppose that Michelangelo may have been interested in the expressive possibilities of the unfinished; that his contemporaries were is provable from the sources and deducible from, among other things, the flurry of imitations that used to be attributed to the master himself chiefly because they are unfinished (thus it is not altogether true that only his finished sculptures had any influence). Moreover, Michelangelo himself uses as a metaphor the effect of plastic form *in statu nascendi* produced by figure sculpture during execution, in one of his most famous poems (ed. Girardi, 1960, No. 152). But while our emotional response to Michelangelo's unfinished sculptures cannot be quite dismissed as a sentimental anachronism, it is surely a false rationalization of this response to consider them in any sense final works of art, as some have done. The same may be said of the popular notion that Michelangelo attacked the marble "in search" of a more or less undefined image. On the contrary, it can be shown that through drawings, *bozzetti* and models, his manner of working out ideas in advance was virtually without precedent.

In an incisive analysis of the chronology of the Medici tombs Pope-Hennessy reverses the sequence

1. *Mannerism and Maniera*, New York, 1962.

that has become widely accepted. He argues that the tomb of Lorenzo with the allegories of Dawn and Evening must be later than that of Giuliano with Night and Day. And he is willing to accept the implication—which he formulates boldly—that Michelangelo must have moved from a more to a less monumental style, wherein the aggressive, angular forms of the Giuliano figures are replaced by the languid and curved rhythms of the Lorenzo tomb. Part of his reasoning is based on the fact that the undersides of *Night* and *Day*, in contrast to *Dawn* and *Evening*, do not seem to fit neatly on the curved lid of the sarcophagus; he suggests that they must have been intended for a sarcophagus with flat, sloping sides (a variant of Kriegbaum's theory that they were designed for the horizontal lids on the unexecuted Magnifici tombs).

The import of these views must be judged in the larger context of Pope-Hennessy's conception of the meaning of the tombs. As he does not believe Michelangelo was generally very interested in abstruse iconography or symbolism, and dismisses the prevailing Neoplatonic interpretation of the tombs, he also rejects one of the mainstays of that interpretation, the theory that the tombs symbolize the Active (Giuliano) and Contemplative (Lorenzo) Life. The evidence for a development in the tombs makes it possible to argue that the difference in mood between them (actively posed effigy with definite times of day represented by vigorous allegories, vs. pensive effigy with the vaguer times and more languid allegories) was not planned as a meaningful contrast but resulted from the change in the artist's style. He concludes that when work on the earlier statues started "the harmonious conception of the figures as we find it on the Lorenzo tomb did not exist even in embryo in the artist's mind. At that time the Allegories were conceived as four aggressive classicizing figures on angled sarcophagi, the two male figures like Roman River Gods." He also tends, where possible, to play down the contrast between the tombs: the name *Penseroso* for Lorenzo does not appear until much later; the shadow that falls across his face is a mere accident of placement of the statue; the active vs. contemplative dichotomy reverses their roles in life.

This goes too far. Quite apart from the Active vs. Contemplative Life theory, the effect we perceive in this case again is not simply anachronistic, since Vasari already calls Lorenzo "pensoso" and Giuliano "fiero." With the downward cast of the head, the projecting visor on his helmet and the sources of light above, surely Lorenzo's face was meant to have a shadowy veil. The effigies of the Dukes are strongly idealized as portraits anyway, and Michelangelo might have answered Pope-Hennessy's other objection with the same explanation he gave a contemporary for the fact that they are not true likenesses, "in a thousand years nobody would know they had been different."

Much more thought-provoking is the explanation of the differences between the tombs, especially the allegories, as the result of a chronological and stylistic evolution. It should be noted that Pope-Hennessy is not alone in this respect; others, notably Popp and Kriegbaum, had a similar point of view. In fact, there is no absolute proof that the contrast was planned prior to the actual execution. Part of the case against a chronological explanation has already been formulated by Tolnay, on the basis of two drawings, Casa Buonarroti 88A recto and British Museum 27 recto. In the former, an early project for a wall tomb, allegorical figures already clearly recognizable as Night and Day are resting on a sarcophagus with a curved lid; they definitely do not conform to the shape of the lid. In the British Museum drawing, which is perhaps closest of all to the final execution, figures that just as certainly became Dawn and Evening are draped adhesively over a sarcophagus that also has a curved lid. Thus even if the *Night* and *Day* were begun for a straight surface, Michelangelo's final decision to use curved lids must be regarded as a return to an earlier stage in his thinking rather than a progression to something new. And since the British Museum drawing dates from 1521, whereas none of the allegories was begun before 1524 the idea for a harmonious relation between the figures that ultimately became *Dawn* and *Evening* and their lid was certainly more than embryonic before the first allegories were started. Indeed these points, together with the fact that the British Museum drawing may actually be a study for a double tomb (with single sarcophagus) suggest to me a hypothesis almost the converse of Pope-Hennessy's—that it was the idea for a contrast between the two tombs that preexisted, and that what Michelangelo cared not very much about was who was buried where. The basic psychological and emotional difference between two ideals was not the product of a stylistic evolution but the framework within which evolution may have taken place.

Another objection concerns the sizes of the blocks from which the allegories are carved. Pope-Hennessy argues that since the *Day* differs in size (shorter) from the other three, it must be the figure carved from an odd block that Michelangelo had brought from his own studio in the Via Mozza in October of 1524 (thus providing an argument for the early date of the *Day*). But one could at least in theory maintain that the *Dawn* was the Via Mozza figure, since it is longer than the other figures by exactly the same amount as the *Day* is shorter. In fact, the *Day* and the *Evening* are ineligible for consideration as the figure curved from the Via Mozza block. In the *Ricordo* mentioning the transfer of the block Michelangelo gives its dimensions very precisely:² "lungo braccia quattro giuste, grosso uno braccio e ottavo, largo un braccio e dua terzi." The Florentine *braccio* being slightly less than 60cm, this works out to be 240 x 100 x 67.5cm. Thus, as can be seen from

2. G. Milanese, *Le lettere di Michelangelo Buonarroti*, Florence, 1875, p. 597.

the dimensions given immediately below, the block was too shallow for any but the *Night* and *Dawn* (all the figures are substantially higher than they are deep).³

The real significance of the dimensions of the figures, it seems to me, is in the relationships between them. The lengths and depths (after Tolnay) are:

Giuliano Tomb

Day (male) 185 x 82cm

Night (female) 194 x 63cm

Lorenzo Tomb

Evening (male) 195 x 80cm

Dawn (female) 203 x 62cm

The ladies are consistently 10cm longer and 20cm shallower than their male partners; such a pattern can hardly be accidental and the best explanation seems to be an aesthetic one, the difference in size being one of the many devices by which Michelangelo compensated for the normal difference in mass between the male and female bodies. Furthermore, the allegories on the Lorenzo tomb are 10cm longer than their respective counterparts on the Giuliano tomb (the depths remain the same). This too might have had an aesthetic purpose, if Michelangelo was planning to create an emotional contrast—the greater length of the figures on the Lorenzo tomb helping to compensate for their less aggressive poses and physiques. At any rate, the evidence indicates (Tolnay, III, p. 57) that the blocks for all the allegories were quarried at the same time, in the late summer of 1524. The most likely assumption is that the sizes of the figures were already established, which would mean that the difference in scale between the tombs, however one interprets it, was preconceived.

The problem of the chronology of the allegories centers largely about a letter written by Michelangelo in June of 1526, in which he says he had begun six statues, among which were the four allegories. Nine months earlier, October, 1525, he had stated that he had begun four figures, and three months earlier, in March, 1526, it was reported that four (presumably the same ones) were almost finished. It is likely, though not certain, that the two figures begun in the interval were allegories, from which it would follow that he began them in pairs. But in what order? With a single exception the remaining documents are so ambiguous that it was possible for Pope-Hennessy to reach exactly the opposite conclusion from Tolnay. Their arguments have two salient points in common, however; they both assume that Michelangelo began the allegories on one tomb before those on the other, and they both place a restrictive interpretation on the one definite, eyewitness statement that has come down to us concerning the chronology of the allegories. This occurs in a letter of September 29, 1531, from Giovanbattista Mini, an uncle of Michelangelo's pupil An-

tonio Mini, to Baccio Valori: "After much discussion of art [with Michelangelo] I had still not seen the two female figures, but I did so the other day. They are indeed marvelous. I know that you saw the first [la prima], the figure of *Night*, with the moon on its head . . . ; the second [sichonda, i.e., *Dawn*] surpasses it in beauty in every respect, and is a marvelous thing. At present he has been finishing [di presente finiva] one of the old men. . . ." This passage contains the clear implication of a sequence—the two female figures had already been executed (the *Night* first), one male was being finished, and the second male was still awaiting completion. Thus, the other documents showed that the allegories were begun in pairs, and Mini says they were finished in pairs. Admittedly, it is not necessary to conclude that the same pairs are involved, i.e., that Michelangelo completed the figures in basically the same order that he began them. But this would be the reasonable deduction and there is only one thing that stands in its way, the usual conception of the chronology of the allegories as a progression from one tomb to the other. I submit, instead, that Michelangelo worked on them in cross-tomb pairs, first the females, then the males.

This interpretation allows a number of facts to fall into place that have otherwise led to contradictions. It concords with the fact that the *Via Mozza* block of October, 1524, can only have been used for one of the women (the *Night* if one assumes, as Pope-Hennessy does, that the *Via Mozza* block was begun first). The letter mentioned above of March, 1526, from before the second pair was begun, refers to a rumor that one of the four figures Michelangelo was then working on had been broken; according to the present sequence, if the damage was to an allegory, the broken figure must have been a female, and indeed, A. F. Doni in 1552 records that while the *Night* was being moved its original left arm was spoiled and had to be redone by the artist. A woodcut illustration depicting Michelangelo at work published in Sigismondo Fanti's *Triumpho di Fortuna* in January, 1527, but probably made at least six months earlier, i.e., when in the present view the males can only barely have been started, shows the lady *Dawn* already half-emerged from the marble.⁴ Finally, this is the sequence to which the present physical condition of the figures themselves bears witness—for while none of them is wholly finished the men are a major step farther from completion than the women.

If Michelangelo proceeded in cross-tomb pairs, it becomes quite impossible to maintain that the contrast between the tombs was not deliberate. But it is also evident that, at least after mid-1526, Michelangelo in some degree worked on all the figures concurrently. Hence, perhaps the major point to be emphasized is that it is unwise to think of their most

3. Wilde also errs in identifying *Day* with the *Via Mozza* block (*Michelangelo's 'Victory'*, Oxford, 1954, pp. 15f., n. 2).

4. Cf. most recently H.-W. Frey, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Statuenschmuckes der Medici-Kapelle in Florenz," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, XIV, 1951, pp. 44f.

essential features (full or partial displacement of the block; closed or open, angular or fluid pose) as chronological variables. If there is a development it must be defined in subtler terms. And this too lends meaning to the fact that, after all, Michelangelo did make large models for the Medici tomb figures (he was working on them during 1524, as the marble for the allegories was being quarried). It is the first documentable use of large-scale models for marble sculpture since antiquity, and with them Michelangelo laid the foundation for a whole new kind of sculptural planning.⁵

Another of Pope-Hennessy's chronological arguments having to do with the size of the tomb sculptures is an adaptation of a hypothesis of Johannes Wilde that the river gods planned to be placed under the sarcophagi were enlarged in scale in the autumn of 1525. This is based on the proposition that whereas the famous model of a river god now in the Accademia is the same size as the executed allegories, a working sketch in the British Museum (35 recto), presumably for a river god, datable to the autumn of 1525, gives somewhat larger dimensions. But it should not be forgotten that Thode raised weighty objections against regarding the figure represented in this drawing as a river god. Moreover, the relative scale of the allegories and Accademia model is far from clear. Gottschewski, who first published the model, stated that it was substantially larger.⁶

Pope-Hennessy also offers the ingenious but inadmissible theory that the *Virgin* of the Medici Chapel, which is cut from an originally much wider block (among the first to be quarried, early in 1521), was meant for the Julius tomb. The autograph and workshop drawings for the Magnifici tomb to which Pope-Hennessy refers seem to me to show, quite contrary to what he claims, that the Virgin was to look outward to the side and slightly downward, more or less as she does in the executed figure, though in the opposite direction. Her gaze is analogous to that of the *Bruges Madonna* and may be interpreted as turned toward the spectator (rather than the effigy of the Pope), who looks up at her. The unused width of the block seems to me to prove that it was always

intended for the Medici Chapel, since the same drawings show that the original version was to have the Christ child standing between the Virgin's knees.⁷

In addition to substituting chronological for iconographical explanations, Pope-Hennessy debunks the Neoplatonic and philosophical interpretations directly, by showing that they have no warrant in contemporary accounts of the tombs. To compare modern with sixteenth century writers is indeed a sobering experience. And he rightly points out that in the case of Michelangelo we tend to seek meaning for motifs and details that from the hands of a less expressive artist we probably would accept at face value. On the other hand, sometimes it is precisely the contemporary sources that lead us to suspect meaning where otherwise we might see no more than creative fantasy. Pope-Hennessy maintains, for example, that the weird bat's head on the front of Lorenzo's money box means simply nothing; but elsewhere he cites Condivi's report that Michelangelo had intended to include a mouse to symbolize the mordant effects of time. If Michelangelo had actually done the mouse but Condivi had for some reason failed to mention it, Pope-Hennessy would mistakenly also assume that it had no significance.⁸ Again, taking up suggestions made by F. Hartt, he points out some interesting analogies between the tombs and the ceremonies on the Capitoline Hill in 1513, when the Roman patriciate was conferred on Lorenzo and Giuliano. But in adopting the view that the river gods intended for the tombs were, like those that figured in the decorations in Rome, purely locative, representing the rivers Tiber and Arno (rather than, say, the four rivers of Hades), he apparently ignores the fact that there were to be *four* river gods. Either one must include two of the less heroic rivers of Tuscany, or assume that Michelangelo would have repeated the same rivers on both tombs.⁹

Finally, Pope-Hennessy sees confirmation of his basic approach to Michelangelo in the picture of his mental processes that emerges from the letters and from Francisco de Hollanda's Dialogues. These sources suggest to him "that the imagery of the Chapel is likely to have been comparatively simple,

5. We must note two inconsistencies: Catalogue, p. 31, ". . . none of the allegories was begun before the late summer of 1524," whereas *ibid.*, p. 34, "In April of 1524 Michelangelo seems to have started work on the carving of the Allegories"; and *ibid.*, p. 34, "The Evening seems to have been begun in this year or after" (i.e., 1531, the other three having already been started), while on page 21 of the text is a reference to "the latest of them, the Dawn of 1531."

6. A. Gottschewski, "Ein Original-Tonmodell Michelangelos," *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 1, 1906, pp. 58f. Varying dimensions are cited for the model: Tolnay, 180cm; Brinckmann, 120cm; measurements recently taken at my request yielded 141cm as the overall horizontal length. The model given to the Academy by Ammanati in 1583 was said to be four *braccia*, or 240cm.

7. The suggestion that the *Leah* of the Julius tomb was actually begun for the Medici Chapel also seems gratuitous, irrespective of Wilde's early date for the conception of the figure. Vasari reports that the figures of Earth and Heaven,

planned to stand in niches flanking the effigy of Giuliano, were to be nude. Tribolo actually began the *Earth*, which before it was abandoned "già si vedeva scoperta tutta dalla banda dinanzi." However, as Popp suggested, the idea of Leah and Rachel may well have developed from the Earth and Heaven, which had analogous poses; and it is significant that Michelangelo thought of both pairs in terms of a marked psychological contrast. (The contrast would probably have been even stronger in the Medici statues since Heaven was to be smiling, while Earth wept.)

8. See now, E. Panofsky, "The Mouse that Michelangelo Failed to Carve," *Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann*, New York, 1964, pp. 242ff.

9. See F. Hartt, "The meaning of Michelangelo's Medici Chapel," in *Essays in Honor of Georg Swarzenski*, Chicago, 1951, pp. 145ff., and the rebuttal by Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture. Four Lectures on Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini*, New York, 1964, pp. 92f.

intensely apprehended, and based on the principle of direct plastic communication, not on some elaborate intellectual theorem." What I find disquieting here is the omission of the poems as an index to Michelangelo's mental processes. It may be that Pope-Hennessy considers the letters and dialogues especially revealing as direct, unbelabored records of his thought. But the letters deal almost exclusively with practical matters, and were rarely used by Michelangelo as a vehicle for intellectual expression. The authenticity of Hollanda's Dialogues is very seriously in doubt, and in any case the simple-minded elements are precisely what one would hesitate to ascribe to Michelangelo rather than Hollanda himself. On the other hand, the poems, while simple in form and vocabulary, express ideas that are often very complex indeed, and no less difficult to interpret than Michelangelo's creations in the visual arts.¹⁰

In the chapters on Bernini Pope-Hennessy shifts his ground slightly; from urging simplicity on the historian he takes to urging it on the artist. He refers to Bernini the "magician" whose "boisterous egotism" led him to seek grandiose scenographic effects, which are anathema. He praises works such as the Ponte Sant'Angelo angels that speak "with the humble voice of the dedicated marble sculptor," and condemns the design of the Cathedra Petri as being, for all its brilliance and originality, "fatally diffuse." He prefers the more "restrained" and "tranquil" style of the *Lodovica Albertoni* to "the flamboyant idiom of the St. Teresa." Not unexpectedly it is with his portraits that Bernini most consistently earns Pope-Hennessy's sanction, especially with those done from life, since here his dramatic illusionism has a legitimate place and his theatrical tendency is restrained by nature. When he worked from painted models Bernini was apt to exercise a freedom of invention Pope-Hennessy considers not "permissible" in portrait sculpture, as in the bust of Francesco d'Este where the drapery, related to St. Teresa's, creates an "adventitious emotive character." In this context the bust of Louis XIV, which has a similar quality but was done from life, is not mentioned. There are, as always, illuminating passages; for example, he clearly recognizes the coincidence between Bernini's change in style during the 1630's and his new passion for the theater, and he suggests intriguing precedents for the tomb of Urban VIII in the destroyed monument to Gregory XIII by Prospero Antichi. Pope-Hennessy's critical pronouncements, too, are meaningful in the sense that they tend to reflect the range of contrasts, not to say conflicts that are apparent at various levels in Bernini's art and thought, and that are very much in need of explanation.¹¹ It is regrettable that unlike his impatience with recent Michelangelo scholarship, which led to a logical and stimulating—even though not generally acceptable—reap-

praisal of the evidence, his impatience with Bernini leaves the really critical problems practically undisturbed.

The reader will already have discovered what is ultimately the most surprising aspect of this extraordinary book. Matter-of-fact view of content in the work of Michelangelo; evaluation of Italian sculpture largely in terms of its relation to antiquity; distaste for "Mannerism," for Bandinelli, for much of the Baroque—one glimpses, beneath the mantle of heresy, the vestments of inveterate orthodoxy.

IRVING LAVIN
New York University

CARL PAUL BARBIER, *William Gilpin, His Drawings, Teaching, and Theory of The Picturesque*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963. Pp. 196; 16 pls. with 76 ills. 63s.

To an up-to-date connoisseur in late eighteenth century England, equipped with the most current aesthetic terminology, both nature and art could be neatly categorized into examples of The Beautiful, The Sublime, The Picturesque, or some combination of these. An earlier generation would have confined itself to the first two categories, but during the final quarter of the eighteenth century, The Picturesque quite rapidly assumed for Englishmen a position of almost co-equality with the other two terms, at least in the context of landscape scenery and painting. Instrumental in bringing this about—more so, in fact, than any other writer—was William Gilpin, "Apostle of The Picturesque," whose prolific series of "Tours" (all subtitled "Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty"), appearing between 1782 and 1809, enjoyed the widest currency not only among the cultivated gentry but also among most of the landscape painters and topographers of the time. Then, already in the 1810's, this by then all too fashionable fad began arousing critical reactions from some of the romantics, including Wordsworth, who after a brief flirtation, repudiated the creed as too mechanical and artificial. William Combe's popular burlesque on the cult, *Dr. Syntax in Search of the Picturesque* (1812) is symptomatic of the changing taste which dethroned The Picturesque from its recently won status as the third member of the late eighteenth century aesthetic trinity. The term nevertheless survived well into the nineteenth century, though often employed in a variety of ways quite independent of Gilpin. In our time the word has assumed so many meanings and connotations as to become impracticable as a useful aesthetic category (as has, similarly, The Beautiful and The Sublime). In Gilpin's day, however, The Picturesque referred to a comparatively limited set of specific qualities in scenery and art.

The importance of Gilpin's doctrine in the history

10. Cf. the beautiful Foreword by Creighton Gilbert to his *Complete Poems and Selected Letters of Michelangelo*, R. N. Linscott, ed., New York, 1963.

11. See, for example, the writer's comments in the ART

BULLETIN, XXXVIII, 1956, p. 258, and J. Białostocki, "Gian Lorenzo Bernini i jego poglądy estetyczne," *Sztuka i Krytyka*, IX, 1958, pp. 122ff., esp. p. 131 (French résumé pp. 329ff.).