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Abstract

The notion of a sculptural type of drawing is often summarily included in critical literature. These references tend to be brief and regularly contradict one another. Furthermore, drawings made by Tuscan sculptors of the sixteenth century are often neglected altogether. This thesis investigates the notion of a sculptural type of drawing and attempts to understand more clearly the appearance and purpose of drawings made by sixteenth-century sculptors working in central Italy. In order to understand this notion, the history of drawings for sculpture and the literature related to them should be examined. Individual artists from whom a number of drawings survive must be studied separately before being related to one another as a group. This investigation utilizes several methodologies: the early history of drawings for sculpture is recreated from information contained in contemporary written documents and contracts; the literature related to the characterization of inherently sculptural qualities is reevaluated against the surviving visual material; the attributions made to lesser-known sixteenth-century sculptors are scrutinized; and, finally, the drawings executed by sculptors are placed in the broader context of sixteenth-century draughtsmanship. This investigation reveals that some drawings exhibit a functional approach that explores the challenges of preparing a three-dimensional work of art. Such an approach is, however, not unique to sculptors, whose drawings employ an approach that cannot be separated from those by painters. These similarities are significant because they reveal several misunderstandings concerning graphic characteristics often understood to be inherently sculptural, and a history of incorrect attributions based on these assumptions.
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Chapter 1

Sculptors’ Drawings in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries

Written sources of the fifteenth and sixteenth century

Fifteenth-century theoretical writings on the preparatory responsibilities of the sculptor are often polemical. In his Della statua, Leon Battista Alberti implies that drawing for painting requires a different set of skills than drawing for sculpture. Alberti begins to describe the process by which an artist separates a surface into outlines, but cuts his discussion short because he considers such abilities in drawing to be the domain of the painter and not the sculptor. Significantly, Alberti makes no mention of drawing techniques that are the province of sculptors rather than painters. This suggests that Alberti believed that the painter-draughtsman requires a wider range of graphic knowledge and ability than the sculptor-draughtsman. This agrees with Alberti’s statement in Della pittura that painting is master of all the arts and that painting is much more difficult than sculpture. Conversely, Ghiberti saw drawing as the basis and theory of both painters and sculptors, both of whom “must be proficient in perspective, and above all, be a most perfect draughtsman, for drawing (el disegno) is the basis and theory (fondamenta e teorica) of both these arts.” Ghiberti’s assertion of the fundamental importance of drawing to sculptors was reiterated at the turn of the century by Pomponius Gauricus, who in his De Sculptura related that “Donatello declared drawing so essential to sculpture that he always told his pupils: the art of sculpture could be taught in one word. Draw. And that in truth is the summit...

1 Leon Battista Alberti, Della architettura, Della pittura e Della statua, ed. Cosimo Bartoli (Roma: Dedalo, 2009), 301.
2 Ibid. 301. “metterò sempre inanzi l’ingegno del pittore, perch’egli pratica in cosa molto più difficile.”
Leonardo, roughly contemporaneous with Gauricus, sided with Alberti, writing that the sculptor has only to focus on outlining his figure, while a painter must accomplish this while considering light, shade, colour and perspective—all of which are provided to the sculptor by nature.\textsuperscript{5}

The writings of the sixteenth century present a somewhat more unified description of the sculptor’s creative process. In 1568 Giorgio Vasari added a section to the technical introduction in his 	extit{Lives} that explained the use of drawing in the three arts of 	extit{disegno}. Here, Vasari stated that several sculptors do not have much practice in drawing and, accordingly, do not draw on paper, but instead practise the art of 	extit{disegno} through modelling in wax and clay.\textsuperscript{6} The author confirmed this statement in his 	extit{Life of Andrea da Fiesole}: “it is almost a marvel to see the manner in which some sculptors, without in any way knowing how to draw on paper, nevertheless bring their works to a fine and praiseworthy completion with their chisel.”\textsuperscript{7} According to Vasari, when sculptors wish to make a figure in marble, they usually make a small model for it in clay, wax or plaster\textsuperscript{8} from which a full scale model will be produced to be used for mechanical transfer to the block.\textsuperscript{9} He claimed that sculptors may make use of drawings but, like Alberti and Leonardo, implied that sculptors create such graphic works with a narrower range of skills than painters.\textsuperscript{10}

Furthermore, Vasari’s comment that “although Jacopo [della Quercia] was only a sculptor, \textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
\item \cite{vasari1966} Giorgio Vasari, 	extit{Le vite de’più eccellenti pittori scultori e architetti: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568}, ed. Rosanna Bettarini, and Paola Barocchi, vol. 1 (Firenze: Sansoni, 1966-1987), 87. “E perché alcuni scultori talvolta non hanno molta pratica nelle linee e ne’ dintorni, onde non possono disegnare in carta, eglino in quel cambio con bella proporzioni e misura facendo con terra o cera uomini, animali et altre cose di rilievo, fanno il medesimo che fa colui il quale perfettamente disegna in carta o in su altri piani.”
\item \cite{vasari1971} Vasari, 	extit{Vite}, vol.1, 87.
\item \cite{vasari1912} Ibid., 90.
\item \cite{vasari1915} Vasari, 	extit{Lives},112. It also seems, from a comment made in the 	extit{Life} of Ghiberti (Vasari, 	extit{Lives}, vol. 2, 144), that the drawings of sculptors may not have been on paper, as Vasari considered small reliefs in wax or stucco as the drawing exercises of sculptors.
\end{itemize}
nevertheless he drew passing well,”\textsuperscript{11} implies the author felt that skill in drawing was an exceptional characteristic for sculptors. In an apparent contradiction, however, the \textit{Lives} are filled with Vasari’s praise of sculptors’ drawings, many of which he had collected.\textsuperscript{12}

In Benvenuto Cellini’s \textit{Due trattati}, published in the same year as the second edition of the \textit{Lives}, the sculptor agreed with Vasari that before creating a statue, one begins by creating a small-scale model.\textsuperscript{13} This, he argued, is necessary, because unlike painting which has one principal view, the sculptor must be concerned with eight views, and, therefore, must constantly work the model, adjusting the figure in order to ensure each view is satisfactory.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Modern critical literature}

To an even greater extent, the secondary studies of sculptors’ drawings present a multitude of characterizations as regards the drawings of sculptors during the sixteenth century. The first attempt to define a distinct category of drawings unique to sculptors was Erwin Gradmann’s 1943 \textit{Bildhauer-Zeichnungen}. In his monographic study, Gradmann surveyed many examples of drawings executed by sculptors, choosing examples from the entire surviving history of such works. For his discussion of Renaissance sculptors, Gradmann unsurprisingly focussed much of his attention on Michelangelo, who he established as the prototypical sculptor-draughtsman and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Vasari, \textit{Lives}, vol. 2, 96.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} According to Vasari, the contemporaries of Jacopo della Quercia and the sculptors who followed immediately in his wake continued to create drawings. Vasari describes many of the sculptors of his second age as being skilled draughtsmen, among them della Quercia himself, Niccolò di Pietro Lamberti, Luca della Robia, Donatello, Desiderio da Settignano, and Andrea del Verrocchio. In addition to these sculptors whom Vasari praises for their drawing, he mentions others of the same age who drew including Antonio Rosselino, Mino da Fiesole, Benedetto da Maiano, although no mention is made of the quality of their output. In fact, the only sculptor of the fifteenth century mentioned by Vasari as being a poor draughtsman is Dello Delli who was, at least, “well among the first who began to show judgment in revealing the muscles in nude bodies” (Vasari, \textit{Lives}, vol. 2, 110). Similarly, Vasari praises the draughtsmanship of later fifteenth and early sixteenth century sculptors Pietro Torrigiano, Andrea Sansovino, Benedetto da Roverezano, Giovanni Francesco Rustici, Raffaello da Montelupo, Baccio Bandinelli and Michelangelo, while mentioning, without a critical judgment, drawings by Tribolo, Pierino da Vinci, and Jacopo Sansovino.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Benvenuto Cellini, \textit{Due trattati: uno intorno alle otto principali arti dell'oreficeria : l'altro in materia dell'arte della scultura, dove si veggono infiniti segreti nel lavorar le figure di marmo, & nel gettarle in bronzo} (Modena: Edizione Aldine, 1983), 46.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 60.
\end{itemize}
whose graphic concerns typified a method of drawing that defined the category. He described this graphic treatment as being paradoxically unsculptural: the sculptor focuses on outlining the contour of a figure, pays little attention to internal modelling, and utilizes a geometric shorthand when delineating figures in the interest of speed.\textsuperscript{15} The “sculptor’s drawing,” as a type, should thus resemble the outline of a motif with little or no attention given to modelling the internal musculature of a figure. Such an outline is akin to the practice of drawing directly on the block of marble, which serves as a general guide for the chisel when the sculptor begins to carve.\textsuperscript{16} This generalization, which has been adopted by many subsequent scholars, rightly considers the fact that as preparation for sculpture, either carved or modeled, the sculptor’s drawing necessarily maintains an indirect connection with the final work, as the drawing must be transformed, once again, into a three-dimensional object. Conversely, the drawings of painters can be transferred and incorporated directly into the final picture, notably through the practice of directly transferring a cartoon onto the surface to be painted.

In 1948, Harald Keller published his brief article “Bildhauerzeichnung,” which was much narrower in its focus than Gradmann’s study. Although Keller surveyed drawings by sculptors within a relatively wide geographical range, he concentrated mostly on German and Italian examples and constrained his investigation to artists from the late Middle Ages through the Baroque period.\textsuperscript{17} Keller’s article consists mostly of convenient lists of known drawings by sculptors, but the author also adds general conclusions concerning the definition of a unique category. The author recognized a greater plurality of types than Gradmann, but concluded that, generally, there exist two types of sculptor’s drawings. The first type aligns closely with

\textsuperscript{15} Erwin Gradmann, \textit{Bildhauer-Zeichnungen} (Switzerland: Holbein-Verlag, 1943), 14-16.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 12.
Gradmann’s definition and is characterized by clear outlines and precise detailing of drapery folds, while rejecting chiaroscuro effects.\textsuperscript{18} Keller described a second, polar opposite type that is more common. These drawings are characterized by a rejection of traditional linear and spatial values, resulting in more abstract studies, which Keller characterized as being more painterly than the preparatory studies of painters.\textsuperscript{19}

Subsequent mentions of a type of drawing displaying particularly sculptural traits have been, for the most part, quite brief. For example, in 1968 Degenhart and Schmidt briefly traced the development of sculptural drawing, citing similarities between drawings attributed to Donatello, early studies by Michelangelo and drawings by Baccio Bandinelli.\textsuperscript{20} On the other hand, in his fundamental catalogue of Michelangelo’s drawings in the British Museum, Johannes Wilde adopted a different approach to categorizing the drawings of sculptors, stating, “Sculptor’s as opposed to painter’s drawings which can be incorporated directly into a picture, are of form and have only indirect connection with the proposed sculpture. The sculptor draws the same form from different angles, not always quite in the intended attitude; and he is particularly concerned with the effect of the muscles on the surface modelling.”\textsuperscript{21}

In the middle 1970s, Ulrich Middeldorf, citing Gradmann’s work, rejected the notion of a definable type, parenthetically writing, “In a long study of sculptors’ drawings the author has convinced himself that there is no such thing as a typical ‘sculptor’s’ drawing. Quite the contrary; if a drawing looks particularly close to sculpture, it is likely not to be by a sculptor. Sculptors drew exactly like painters or architects.”\textsuperscript{22} Although Middeldorf’s argument was clear,

\textsuperscript{18} Keller, “Bildhauerzeichnung,” 626.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Johannes Wilde, *Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Michelangelo and His Studio* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1953), 84.
it did contain vestiges of previous German scholarship, in that it retained the notion that particularly plastic drawings were more often the product of painters.

A similar flexibility underpinned a 1979 essay by Catherine Monbeig Goguel, which became the first survey of sixteenth-century Central Italian drawings by sculptors as a group. In her survey, Monbeig Goguel stated, “Drawings by sculptors display easily identifiable traits, although it is rarely possible to distinguish individual styles.” These identifiable traits can be separated into three main characterizations. The first is the dismissal of the format of the sheet as regards the positioning of figure studies and compositions. According to Monbeig Goguel, these drawings are characterized by a lack of proportion between figural studies and the margins of the page. Furthermore, because the blank space of the sheet was not of any intrinsic value to the draughtsman, the principal unity of these drawings is entirely contained within the group being studied. Secondly, Monbeig Goguel asserted that almost all of these drawings derived from the models of Leonardo and Michelangelo, whose figure types were copied and used interchangeably amongst sculptors. Finally, she argued that these drawings were typified by a similar crosshatching technique, often in pen and ink, in which the figure is defined primarily in terms of highlighted volume and mass. Importantly, Monbeig Goguel also noted that the drawings of sculptors were rarely executed with the care seen in the modelli of painters, and that generally one may believe Vasari’s statement that many sculptors of his day could not draw on paper. In the end, however, Monbeig Goguel was careful to state, “it would be incorrect to describe sculptors’ draughtsmanship as distinct from that of other artists.”

---

23 Catherine Mobeig Goguel, Maestri toscani del Cinquecento: Michelangelo, Sansovino, Bandinelli, Jacone, Montorsoli, Salviati, Vasari, Dosio, Pierino da Vinci, Giambologna, etc (Firenze: Istituto Alinari, 1976), 12
24 Monbeig Goguel, Maestri Toscani, 12-14.
25 Ibid., 24.
More recently, the notion of categorizing drawings of the Early Modern Era as sculptural has been dismissed outright. Martha Dunkelman, for example, stated that there does not exist any evidence that would allow for a list of special characteristics that apply particularly to sculptors. Moreover, Dunkelman argues that examples of crosshatching – the technique often connected with sculptors – can be found in the drawings of painters throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.26 Similarly, Bruce Boucher briefly concluded, “It is sometimes said that sculptors drew differently from painters as if their drawings constituted a separate genre. Like most generalizations, this is an exaggeration that hardly bears scrutiny.”27

Nevertheless, in 1983 Charles de Tolnay generalized, “If the drawing is executed for a statue, it has no background and the contours are drawn with more precision.”28 More recently, Paul Joannides employed a contradictory method of analysis – owing much to Wilde’s point of view – when tentatively attributing a drawing to Bartolommeo Ammanati, because, as he put it, “the powerful three-dimensionality of the modeling suggests a sculptor.”29 Clearly, the drawings of sculptors have been described in a variety of ways, and have been at times generally defined by many different characteristics, ranging from quick studies focussed on contour to highly modelled drawings that are concerned with the sculptural presence of form.

In order to better understand the apparent confusion of the written sources, both primary and secondary, one must examine the surviving documents as well as the visual evidence. Unfortunately, the surviving evidence, especially for the late fourteenth and early fifteenth

27 Bruce Boucher, “Sister Arts: The Relationship of Drawing to Sculpture: 1520-1620,” in Drawings Related to Sculpture: 1520-1620, ed. Katrin Bellinger (Gräfelfing: Peradruck Matthias KG, 1992), unpaginated. Curiously, Boucher then went on to say, “Often drawings by sculptors focus more on outline, contours, or the effects of light. In particular, the application of washes to suggest how light should fall on figures in relief could sometimes produce a more painterly effect than that found in any painter’s drawing.”
centuries, is very limited, and for that material problems of attribution abound. However, an examination of the extant material, though limited, helps reveal the changing preparatory responsibilities of the Italian sculptor, and the increasing multi-disciplinary training they received, which, increasingly, included drawing.

The fourteenth century

Lorenzo Ghiberti claimed in his *Commentarii* to have seen drawings by Giotto’s hand for the reliefs on the Campanile of Florence Cathedral.\(^{30}\) In the second edition (1568) of his *Lives*, Giorgio Vasari cited this passage and related that Giotto had created the “*modello*” for part of the sculpted reliefs of the Campanile.\(^{31}\) Vasari’s description of the designs for the Campanile—which no longer survive—is somewhat ambiguous, as Vasari, at times, used the term *modello* to designate either a drawing or a model made of clay or wax.\(^{32}\) In any event, his addition of the information into the 1568 edition of his *Life of Giotto*, along with his citation of Ghiberti’s direct reference to drawings, agrees with contractual information of the fourteenth century that describes painters providing the designs for major Tuscan sculptural projects.

An important painter who was commissioned to create drawings for several major sculptural projects in Florence was Agnolo Gaddi. In June of 1383, Gaddi received payment for drawings for the figures of *Faith* and *Hope*, two of the seven Virtues located on the base of Loggia dei Lanzi, which were eventually carved by Jacopo di Piero Guidi.\(^{33}\) Gaddi was also later commissioned to design *Prudence* and *Justice*, eventually carved by Giovanni d’Ambrogio.\(^{34}\)

---


\(^{31}\) Vasari, *Vite*, vol. 2, 115.


\(^{34}\) Paolini, *Loggia de’ Lanzi*, 16.
involved with creating drawings for the Florence Cathedral toward the end of the decade. Between 1387 and 1390, Piero di Giovanni Tedesco sculpted four figures depicting various apostles and saints. In this instance, a document dated 5 September 1387 makes clear that the four statues were to be executed after the drawings of three painters: Lorenzo di Bicci, Spinello Aretino, and again, Agnolo Gaddi. Lorenzo and Agnolo were each responsible for a single drawing while Spinello Aretino was responsible for two, all specifically created for Piero. Similarly, Piero received another commission to carve two Church Doctors for the Duomo’s façade between 1396 and 1401, when he was joined by Niccolò di Piero Lamberti who was commissioned to produce the other two. A document dated October 21 1395 shows that in this case all four marble statues were to be based upon the drawings of Agnolo Gaddi.

From this evidence it can be observed that Agnolo Gaddi became somewhat specialized in creating drawings for sculptors. It is perhaps ironic, then, that Vasari, who owned drawings by Gaddi, criticized him for his weak skills in drawing and praised Niccolò di Piero Lamberti—whose drawings he also owned—for being an excellent draughtsman. It is also clear, however, that this preparatory process was not an exceptional instance involving a single artist, but a common practice involving multiple painters and sculptors. It is also worth noting that the documents for these two important Florentine projects do not reveal any instances in which sculptors were charged with creating their own drawings.

The practice of painters creating drawings for sculptors was not unique to Florence. Documentary evidence for San Petronio in Bologna reveals that in 1393 the painter Jacopo di Paolo was responsible for drawing six figures on parchment for Master Paolo of Venice to

---

follow when making marble sculptures for the church.\textsuperscript{37} Several similar examples are also found in the written records from Milan Cathedral, where again the repeated mention of drawings refer to designs by painters executed for sculptors.\textsuperscript{38}

The types of drawings mentioned in these contracts seem to have functioned as legal documents which visually represented the responsibilities of the sculptor, and, as such, were often deposited with a notary or signed by the artist, as if they were a written document.\textsuperscript{39} In fact, the drawings seem to have been measures of adequate work, meeting the contractual requirement, and were often accompanied by caveats stating the project was to follow a drawing, and, if possible, improve upon it.\textsuperscript{40} These drawings could eventually be used as a measure of whether the contractual obligations of the artist were fulfilled, and suggest that they served less an artistic and more a legal function. For example, in the late fourteenth century, sculptor Niccolo d’Arezzo was warned by the patron to observe more closely the drawing executed for him by Giovanni d’Ambrogio for the framework of the Porta della Mandorla.\textsuperscript{41} This legal function does not, however, exclude the possibility that other preparatory studies may have been created by either the painter or sculptor, only that such evidence has not survived. Furthermore, the written sources do not make clear whether painters were employed to design the sculptural programme or to simply represent another’s design graphically for the patron.\textsuperscript{42}

Despite the apparent consistency of preparatory process presented in these fourteenth-century examples, there are nevertheless instances which indicate that Trecento sculptors may

\textsuperscript{38} Ugo Nebbia, \textit{La scultura del Duomo di Milano} (Milano, 1910), 45-47 and 59-66.
\textsuperscript{39} Glasser, \textit{Contracts}, 115.
\textsuperscript{41} Harald Keller, “Bildhauerzeichnung,” 627.
\textsuperscript{42} Eisler, \textit{Sculptors’ Drawings}, unpaginated.
have created their own drawings. For instance, Francesco del Tonghio and his son Giacomo were awarded the commission for a wooden choir-stall for Siena Cathedral in 1377 that required them to provide their own drawing. In a similar instance, Nino Pisano’s contract for the tomb of Archbishop Scarletti in Pisa, written immediately after the archbishop’s death in 1362, states that the appearance of the work will follow a picture (pictura) by the sculptor himself. Although it is generally understood that the latter contract refers to a painting or drawing created by the sculptor, Richard Krautheimer cautions that it instead may refer to a painting or drawing given by Nino to the committee that may not have been in his own hand. Although the first interpretation seems more likely, such an example at least serves as a reminder of the limited information with which we are able to reconstruct the working methods of the fourteenth century, while both examples serve as a caution against assuming general trends from limited information.

**The early Quattrocento**

The amount of surviving material concerning sculptors’ drawings increases somewhat in the fifteenth century and it represents an apparent moment of transition in the preparatory responsibilities of the Italian sculptor. The earliest evidence of this change exists in the well-documented work of Jacopo della Quercia, which also represents the first instance of surviving written documents and visual evidence connected to one another.

In December of 1408, the Comune of Siena commissioned Jacopo della Quercia to remake the old fountain on the Piazza del Campo. The following year, the project was expanded

---

44 Herald Keller, “Bildhauerzeichnung,” 627. “prout sicut et et eo modo et forma ut quadam pictura by eundem magistrum Ninum data dictis fideicommissariis by omnia continetur.”
and the budget increased. A document dated 22 January 1409, which authorized the commission, makes reference to a drawing deposited with the notary of the Concistoro. The terms of the contract were also recorded on January 22, the details of which survive in a copy made in 1412. The contract stated that Jacopo would also be required to make or have made a drawing of the fountain in the sala del Consiglio. It is likely, and widely agreed, that this drawing would have been large in scale and executed on a wall to serve as a demonstration for the patrons. In a much later discussion renewing the contract for the Fonte Gaia, reference is made to an initial drawing executed in the room in the Palazzo Pubblico that overlooks the Campo and a new drawing by the hand of Jacopo that appears, from the description, to have been executed on vellum. This information has led many to believe that two extant drawings on vellum for the Fonte Gaia are designs by Jacopo’s hand.

In 1927, Jenő Lányi published a fragment of a drawing in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Fig. 1.1) that he attributed to della Quercia, arguing that it represented the new design of 1409. When, in 1952, Richard Krautheimer published what appeared to be another part of the same piece of vellum in the Metropolitan Museum (Fig. 1.2), he attributed the drawing to della Quercia or a close copy after him and agreed with Lányi that the sheet showed the 1409 design for the Fonte. Krautheimer also argued that the two fragments must have originally been part of a single drawing which was now missing only the middle section that joined them. This

47 Beck, Jacopo della Quercia, 347, doc. 25.
50 Ibid., 373, doc. 63. “primi disegini facti in Palatio magnificorum dominorum Priorium in sala dicti Palatti tendenti versus Campsum fori.”
51 Ibid. “novum designum factum manu dicti magistri Iacobo.”
52 Ibid. “quod designatum est in quadam carta pecudina.”
argument is, however, somewhat problematic as the two fragments are noticeably different. In the New York drawing, wash has been used to create the appearance of plasticity in the architecture but this is not found in the London fragment. Furthermore, the frieze drawn part way down the inner wall of the drawing in the Metropolitan is completely absent from the London drawing, as are the feet of the Virtues. Hannelore Glasser and James Beck have since argued that the discrepancy between the level of finish of the two fragments can be explained as a common practice for the sculptor and cited the contract for the portal of San Petronio, revealing that the details of the drawing were only included on a portion of the drawing.55

Even if we accept this argument to explain the differences between the two fragments, the drawing style featured on both sheets has produced a further problem for critics evaluating their authenticity. Indeed, Krautheimer cited “the rarity of original fifteenth-century drawings; the alleged differences between the style of the drawing and Jacopo's sculptural style; and the hesitant and at times awkward lines of the drawing, which appear to contrast with the freedom and impetuosity of the artist's personality,”56 as factors which made a possible attribution to della Quercia troublesome. In order to reconcile these issues, scholars have attributed the fragments to a copyist or assistant,57 or quoted Vasari’s statement that della Quercia’s drawings “appear to be rather by the hand of an illuminator than of a sculptor.”58 Attributing the Fonte fragments to della Quercia is difficult, ultimately because there does not exist any other comparative graphic

55 Glasser, Contracts, 128. Beck, Jacopo della Quercia, 70 and 404, doc. 117. “che tutte le cose Iacomo appare... deve far che nel disegno la Colonna, la qual non è disegnata, delle sette historie, s’intenda esser come l’altra.” Beck also proposed that the higher level of finish on the left side of the drawing could suggest that della Quercia was left handed; however, the right-handed hatching (i.e. strokes travelling from upper right to lower left) on both fragments would argue against this.


material attributed to his hand. However, for the same reason, the possibility that the fragments are autograph cannot be ruled out by visual analysis alone. Moreover, the case for an attribution to della Quercia is strengthened when one considers the function of the sheet.

That the drawing(s) in question performed a legal function is suggested by the fact that a drawing was deposited with the notary of the Concistoro and because the contract originally recorded in 1409 states that Jacopo was obliged to follow the drawing without diminishing the design, but instead to improve further upon it.\textsuperscript{59} The drawing, therefore, would seem to represent the accepted design of the \textit{Fonte} and would have been kept in order to measure the success of the sculpted version. For this reason, the drawing, although likely executed by a sculptor, was not executed for that sculptor’s artistic benefit, but rather for the patron’s. This explanation supports the possibility that certain details were added to provide the patron with a visual idea of the design, but would not have been required throughout. Moreover, one would not expect to find “freedom and impetuosity” in this type of patronal presentation. For these reasons, it does not seem that an attribution to della Quercia can be completely ruled out. More importantly for current purposes, the legal function of the drawing indicates that, because it was created for the patron and not the artist, one would not expect to find graphic techniques or concerns that are unique to either a painter or a sculptor. Instead of representing the first true preparatory drawing by a sculptor, the drawn fragments for the \textit{Fonte} could represent the planned arrangement and iconography of the design as was necessary for city officials of Siena.

The case of Jacopo della Quercia’s drawing for the \textit{Fonte Gaia} is an important one, because it is the first instance in which the surviving visual material can be linked with its

\textsuperscript{59} Beck, \textit{Jacopo della Quercia}, 347. Doc. 26. “che nel disegno soprascritto chiaramente si dimostrano, non diminuendo alcuno lavoro, ma piútosto ehiiorare e acresciare.” Although Jacopo’s sheets no longer survive, a later drawing by Baldassare Peruzzi, made in 1522 for the projected façade of San Petronio, records a new drawing made by Jacopo for a version of the portal.
corresponding contract, and because in the contract there is insistence that the sculptor create a
drawing himself. This occurrence was, however, not unique in della Quercia’s career. In 1425,
Jacopo was commissioned to create the main portal for the basilica of San Petronio in Bologna.
The original contract for the commission, dated 28 March 1425, names della Quercia as the artist
responsible for the manufacturing of the portal and calls for a drawing made and signed by
Jacopo’s hand in pen on paper (carte di papiro). In an interesting reversal of Trecento
tradition, documents from the same year record a series of payments to the painter Giovanni da
Modena for his part in the drawing of the portal, which seems to have been limited to rendering
Jacopo’s drawing to scale on a provisional wall in the basilica.

Lorenzo Ghiberti, a contemporary of della Quercia’s, was also part of the transition from
the Trecento tradition of executing sculpture after drawings created by painters. As noted above,
Ghiberti expounded the importance of draughtsmanship in his Commentarii. Given his
enthusiasm for drawing, it seems to follow that Ghiberti himself would have made drawings in
preparation for his works. There exist, however, only two surviving drawings which have been
somewhat convincingly attributed to Ghiberti: the Flagellation in the Albertina (Fig. 1.3) and the
St. Stephen in the Louvre (Fig. 1.4). Like the fragments for the Fonte gaia, Ghiberti’s drawings
have come under much criticism concerning their attribution. The Paris drawing is connected
with the later of the two projects, the bronze St. Stephen for Orsanmichele of the late 1420s. The
drawing, whether by Ghiberti or a member of his workshop, seems, because of its meticulous

61 Ibid., 126.
finish and variation from the final work, to be an initial presentation for the Arte della Lana, and, accordingly, follows the contractual tradition of the time.

The Flagellation, however, represents quite another type of drawing. If one leaves open a possible attribution to Ghiberti, which I do not believe can be ruled out, the sketchy Vienna drawing represents the first true preparatory sculptor’s drawing. In the sketches, Ghiberti, or possibly a member of his workshop, worked out through successive revisions, the poses of Christ’s persecutors. As Krautheimer pointed out, it is clear that the top three figures represent the executioner to the right of Christ, and that the artist has reached a solution with the middle figure nearly identical to the relief. The sketches appear to have been made quite quickly, and once the solution was reached in the centre figure, the artist retraced the pose with heavy pen strokes. The speed with which the draughtsman apparently worked out the poses and the freedom of the handling contrast markedly with the above mentioned presentation drawings for patrons. The figures do not adhere to the space implied by the lightly drawn architecture in the top row and one certainly does not gain a sense of the overall composition for the drawing. Instead, the sheet holds the solutions at some stage of the preparatory process for Ghiberti and would have been of use only to the sculptors executing the relief. That the drawing represents some stage of design before the modelling of the relief and that it was not created to be seen outside the workshop confirm that, attribution issues aside, the sheet constitutes the earliest surviving evidence of another departure in the responsibilities of the Italian sculptor.
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64 Luciano Bellosi, “A proposito del disegno dell’Albertina (dal Ghiberti a Masolino),” in Lorenzo Ghiberti nel suo tempo, vol. 1 (Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1980), 135-146. Bellosi argues the tremulous pen strokes lack the boldness and quality of the relief. Instead, the author posits that the sketches and the architectural space are pictorial in nature and resemble the sinopie of Masolino, to whom Bellosi attributes the sheet.
65 Krautheimer and Krautheimer-Hess, Lorenzo Ghiberti, 129.
A note on models

The early fifteenth century also witnessed a rise in popularity of small-scale three-dimensional models for sculptural projects. The survival rate of such models is extremely low, and those that do are often of uncertain origins. The limited extant evidence suggests that these models functioned similarly to contemporary contract drawings for sculpture -- although, like the drawings from the period, their numbers are too few to conclusively confirm their function in general. For example, Donatello and Michelozzo deposited a model for the Prato pulpit in the church’s sacristy and it was held by the patron during the carving.\(^{66}\) Similarly in 1446, Luca della Robbia’s small-scale model for the Ascension relief in Florence’s Duomo was consigned to the possession of the Opera until the work was finished to the standards of the design, if not exceeding them.\(^{67}\) And in 1464, Agostino di Duccio undertook a commission for a giant prophet for the same Duomo, the contract for which stated that the artist make a small-scale model\(^{68}\) to be kept in the Audience Hall of the Opera del Duomo while carving was underway.\(^{69}\) These documents seem to indicate that, like the contractual drawings that predated them, the models were principally created for the benefit of the patron, not the artist.

Of these early examples of models, there is one for which some visual evidence remains: the record of commission for Luca della Robbia’s marble relief of the Crucifixion of St. Peter for Florence’s Duomo (Fig. 1.5) which remains in an unfinished state. According to the commission, dated 12 April 1439, della Robbia was to carve this relief after a wooden model.\(^{70}\) As Irving

---


\(^{67}\) Poggi, *Il Duomo*, vol.1, doc. 441. “*designum factum in quadam modello parvo, qui stare debet in opera usque ad perfectionem dicti laborerii, et melius, si melius fieri potest.*”

\(^{68}\) Ibid. “*in modo e in perfetione, che riponda al modello fatto per detto Aghostino di cera, el quale ene nell’udienza di detti operai quanto all’aparenza, ma sia di misura di br. Nove.*” The carving of the giant figure of a prophet was never completed and the commission was turned over to Michelangelo who used the block to carve his David.


\(^{70}\) Glasser, *Contracts*, 118.
Lavin has argued, the relatively uniform level of carving throughout the unfinished relief and the lack of pointing marks indicate that the marble was carved directly and not produced by pointing off from the model. Lavin thus inferred that the model did not function as a step in the creative process but was rather a visual representation of the design for the patron. Although this is a somewhat precarious inference, as mechanical transfer and artistic benefit are not mutually exclusive, Lavin’s argument does raise an important advantage of models over drawings. A sculpture based on drawings must of necessity be directly carved, whereas models can be used as a means of transference. This, furthermore, points out a fundamental difference between the drawings of painters, which can be directly incorporated into the final design, and those of sculptors, which maintain indirect an relationship with the final work.

It is also interesting that in della Robbia’s other altar for the cathedral, that of St. Paul, the sculptor was to realize the relief after a wax model by Donatello. This model too was consigned to the Opera del Duomo, and held as a measure of della Robbia’s compliance with the contract. The model for the St. Paul relief suggests a further parallel with contemporary contract drawings for sculpture, which were, as was seen above, often executed by other artists. The consignment of the model created by another artist helps to strengthen Lavin’s suggestion that, like the other examples of models of the early to mid-Quattrocento, della Robbia’s preparatory process was not dependent upon the creation of models that instead seem to have performed a legal function.
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71 Irving Lavin, “Bozetti and Modelli: Notes on Sculptural Procedure from the Renaissance through Bernini,” in Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes. Akten des 21. internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn, (Berlin, 1967), 97. Pointing-off is a mechanical process for transferring the composition of a model to another, typically larger, copy. It is achieved by measuring the depth of relief of specific points in the model and then reproducing proportionally equivalent depths on parallel points of the copy.

72 Glasser, Contracts, 118. “secundum modellum eis dandum, quod factum fuit de cera per Donatum Nicholai Betti Bardi, quod est in dicta opera.”
As the century progressed, the practice of supplying models for the patron continued, as can be seen with Benedetto da Maiano’s highly finished model for the pulpit in S. Croce of around 1475, and Verrocchio’s somewhat rougher terracotta model for the Forteguerri monument. However, as Lavin has argued, it was not until Michelangelo that we find surviving evidence of a true sculptural sketch representing a step in the creative process.

Training

An important connection among the early Renaissance sculptors who moved away from the Trecento tradition of creating sculpture after drawings by painters was their training as goldsmiths. Ghiberti was the adoptive son of a goldsmith, in whose shop he trained before eventually matriculating into the goldsmith’s guild. Less is known of della Quercia’s early training but his father too was a goldsmith, and it is assumed that Jacopo trained in his father’s shop as a boy, as was typical during the fourteenth century. This is significant because the fine details and linear minutiae required of metalworkers demanded skills in draughtsmanship. Indeed, Vasari would state that one could not be considered a good goldsmith if one could not draw well and work well in relief. Moreover, Vasari, when discussing Botticelli’s early training, stated that goldsmiths enjoyed a close relationship and constant interchange with painters. This foundation in drawing required by a goldsmith’s training not only allowed artists like Botticelli and Ghirlandaio to develop careers in painting, but also created greater opportunities for such fifteenth-century sculptors (in addition to Ghiberti and Jacopo della
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75 Krautheimer and Krautheimer-Hess, Lorenzo Ghiberti, 4.
76 Beck, Jacopo della Quercia, 11.
78 Ibid., vol. 3, 247.

Significantly, the skills and training of the goldsmith are different from those of craftsmen recorded in the fourteenth-century Florentine documents. The majority of the Trecento artists mentioned in these documents were stonecutters or architects who specialized in working with stone. Such specialization in a single craft is quite different from the multi-disciplinary approach of fifteenth-century artists, in whose writings the arts were unified through their collective dependence on disegno, not only as a preparatory step but also as a basis of all the arts. This transition may not only help explain the emergence of sculptors preparing their own drawings, but it may also help explain the polemical nature of the written sources. The fifteenth century represents a time in which changes in attitude and training caused sculptors to break with tradition and create their own drawings, just as the requirement of three-dimensional models was becoming increasingly popular. Given the state of flux in the discipline at the time, it is not hard to understand the opposing accounts of various authors. This transition, furthermore, helps us recognize an environment in which traditions were being discarded, creating an atmosphere which would be less conducive to the creation of a generic type of ‘sculptor’s drawing’.

**Leonardo and the Quattrocento legacy**

The writings of Leonardo on sculpture are particularly interesting in their relation to his writings on drawing. On the one hand, Leonardo privileged painting above sculpture in the introduction of his *Trattato della pittura*, which caused him to downplay the difficulties of
sculpture, and thus the difficulties of drawing for sculptural projects. For example, Leonardo wrote,

The sculptor says that he cannot make a figure without at the same time making an infinite number of drawings owing to the infinite number of outlines which are continuous quantities. We answer that this infinite number can be reduced to two half-figures, one of the back view and the other of the front. If these two halves are well proportioned they will together make up the figure in the round, and if all their parts are in the proper relief they will of themselves and without further work correspond to the infinite number of outlines which the sculptor says he must draw.  

This statement does not seem to have been simply a part of Leonardo’s argument, as is shown most clearly when the artist followed his own advice. A recently discovered sheet, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (Fig. 1.6), displays what Carmen Bambach Cappel has convincingly argued to be a preparatory sketch for an unexecuted sculpture of Hercules that was first suggested to have been a project by Carlo Pedretti. On this sheet, Leonardo drew a Hercules holding a club, which he then held up to the light in order to trace the contours on the opposite side of the sheet (Fig. 1.7), creating the corresponding back view, and quite literally reducing the three-dimensional form to his “two half-figures.” This practice was also in keeping with the tradition of Antonio Pollaiuolo, whose obsession with creating diametrically opposite profile views permeates his work in various media.  

On the other hand, Leonardo’s writings and drawings demonstrate the artist’s greater appreciation for what Rudolph Wittkower called sculpture’s “multi-faciality.” In his Trattato, Leonardo made a concession, similar to Cellini’s argument, in which he stated that, “the sculptor
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82 Bambach, Leonardo, 542.
83 See, for example, Pollaiuolo’s painted Martyrdom of St. Sebastian at the National Gallery, London; the engraved Battle of Nude Men, or the drawn Nude Man Seen from Three Angles at the Louvre.
in bringing his work to completion has to make each figure in the round with many contours so that it will look graceful from all viewpoints. These contours cannot be realized accurately without turning the form to see its profiles.”  85 Again, Leonardo’s argument seems to have emerged from the Quattrocento sculptural tradition. Leonardo’s early training took him to Verrocchio’s workshop in whose sculpture there exists what Andrew Butterfield describes as an “unprecedented concern for the incorporation of multiple viewpoints.”  86 Leonardo’s preoccupation with expressing this multi-faciality graphically can be seen in a number of sheets for his unrealized equestrian monuments, in which he drew horses, not in strict profile, but from multiple viewpoints approaching a continuous three-dimensional view on a two dimensional surface.  87 These drawings function as a preparatory step in which the artist visualized the form in two-dimensions and planned the multiple views that the intended sculpture would have. Nowhere is this more clear than on two sheets, the first at Windsor Castle (Fig. 1.8) and the second at the Szépművészeti Museum (Fig. 1.9), on which Leonardo studied the legs of horses from various angles, the black chalk study of four views of a leg truly anticipating Michelangelo’s studies for the right arm of night in the Ashmolean.

It should be noted, however, that a three-dimensional approach to form is also evident in drawings by Leonardo that are demonstrably not associated with sculptural projects, and that a tendency to draw figures from multiple points of view permeates Leonardo’s anatomical studies. The most conspicuous example of this practice can be found on two sheets at Windsor Castle (Figs. 1.10 and 1.11) on which Leonardo drew eight views of the musculature of a man’s right shoulder in an attempt to describe the three-dimensional form on a two-dimensional surface.

Fig. 1.1. Jacopo della Quercia, design for the *Fonte Gaia*, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 1.2. Jacopo della Quercia, design for the *Fonte Gaia*, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Fig. 1.3. Lorenzo Ghiberti, studies for the *Flagellation*, Vienna, Albertina.
Fig. 1.4. Lorenzo Ghiberti (workshop of?), design for *St. Stephen*, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 1.5. Luca della Robbia, *Crucifixion of St. Peter*, Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello.
Fig. 1.6. Leonardo da Vinci, studies for a Hercules seen from the front, a male nude and the movements of water, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Fig. 1.7. study for a Hercules seen from the back (verso of Fig. 1.6), New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Fig. 1.8. Leonardo da Vinci, studies of a horse’s leg, Windsor, Royal Library.
Fig. 1.9. Leonardo da Vinci, studies of a horse’s leg, Budapest, Szépművészeti Museum of Fine Arts.
Fig. 1.10. Leonardo da Vinci, anatomical studies, Windsor, Royal Library.

Fig. 1.11. Leonardo da Vinci, anatomical studies, Windsor, Royal Library.
Chapter 2
Michelangelo’s Drawings for Sculpture

The analysis of Michelangelo’s graphic work is fundamental to the way that many scholars view drawings executed by sculptors. Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture have been defined – more than those of any other fifteenth or sixteenth-century sculptor – by a wide range of graphic characteristics. Specifically, there have been three general types that correspond to the modern literature summarized in Chapter 1: the pen-and-ink crosshatched study, the contour drawing devoid of internal modelling and the study of form from various viewpoints. This chapter will examine these often conflicting characteristics and test the hypotheses of the literature in order to understand whether the factors influencing the appearance of the studies were inherently sculptural. Additionally, Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture will be measured against those for painting, so that differences may be identified. Finally, the chapter will attempt to emphasize the problem of inferring too much from a body of evidence that is the product of substantial destruction and loss. This investigation will focus on the artist’s work up until his permanent departure for Rome in 1534, a period containing the majority of Michelangelo’s studies for sculpture and those works that most influenced his Tuscan followers.

Michelangelo’s early drawings

As Martha Dunkelman pointed out, there exists a cliché in recent literature that the cross-hatching that characterizes Michelangelo’s early pen-and-ink drawings is comparable with his carving technique – specifically, the network of claw marks left by the chisel in his unfinished sculptural projects.\(^8\) As a consequence, the reader might infer that the early studies are inherently sculptural. Dunkelman quite correctly reminds us, however, that Michelangelo began
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8. For a convenient list of references to this technical parallel see Dunkelman “Earliest,” 126-127 as note 14.
using pen-and-ink crosshatching in the late 1480s while training as a painter in the workshop of Domenico Ghirlandaio -- in whose graphic work, crosshatching played an essential role. Accordingly, Michelangelo’s technique was most likely based on his master’s example and, as Vasari related, on the example of Northern European prints.\textsuperscript{89} Importantly, Vasari and Condivi both wrote that Michelangelo did not begin to learn the art of sculpture until he entered Lorenzo de’ Medici’s Giardino di San Marco a year or two later.\textsuperscript{90} This last observation underlines the anachronistic view of seeing “claw marks” in graphic works that predate the artist’s first-hand experience with the chisel. Here an important distinction should also be made between the stylistic concerns of the artist and his graphic technique. Michelangelo’s early drawings – and indeed most of his graphic work – betray an obsession with describing the sculptural presence of the human form, particularly the form of the nude male. However, the technique of his early pen-and-ink drawings must be understood not as an \textit{a priori} sculptural working method, but as a consequence of his early training and pictorial sources.

Michelangelo’s pen-and-ink drawings of the 1490s are also noteworthy because his early approach was quite different from his subsequent drawings of the early sixteenth century. In his early drawings – his copy after Giotto in the Louvre (Fig. 2.1), his study after Masaccio in Munich (Fig. 2.2), the possible study after Masaccio in the Albertina (Fig. 2.3), and the so-called \textit{Philosopher} in the British Museum (Fig. 2.4) -- Michelangelo densely modeled his figures, using regular parallel and cross-hatching made up of mostly straight strokes. The meticulousness with which the young Michelangelo drew the figures in this group resulted in figures that approach what Vasari referred to as \textit{disegni finiti}. Though not all the figures on these sheets are completely

finished, they all possess the regular hatchings executed with the network of parallel and croseshatched strokes that Michelangelo evidently learned in the workshop of Domenico Ghirlandaio (Fig. 2.5). Although it is highly unlikely that these are the first drawings Michelangelo made, they are generally considered his earliest surviving studies on paper. These drawings constitute the consistent approach of Michelangelo’s early drawing technique, which does not, in the extant material, include any rough drawings that embody the first sketches of ideas, often known as pensieri or concetti. Such scarcity could be explained by the artist’s well-known auto-destruction of his drawings, or by a lack of interest by early collectors as a consequence of the unpolished appearance of such studies.

The early sixteenth century

Around the turn of the century, Michelangelo evidently adopted a more expressive approach to drawing in pen-and-ink that included the first extant appearance of sketchy pensieri in the artist’s graphic output. For Gradmann and the subsequent scholars employing his basic argument, it is the roughness and economy of the pensiero that essentially conform to the criteria of the so-called “sculptor’s drawing.”

The perceived difference between Michelangelo’s graphic handling for different media can first be noted in two important sheets that feature studies both for sculpture and painting. On these sheets, Michelangelo’s habit of developing many projects at once, and his custom of using paper until the entire surface was filled, provide us with the opportunity to scrutinize the artist’s preparatory methods for painting and sculpture from about the same period, side by side on the same sheet. The earliest of the pair is a sheet in the Uffizi (Fig. 2.6) from around 1503-1504, which contains six small studies for the Bruges Madonna and Child, a sketch of an Apostle for Florence Cathedral, and a study of a figure in the Battle of Cascina. The small studies for the
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91 Gradmann, Bildhauer-Zeichnungen, 14-16.
Bruges Madonna were first executed in lead-point and were then, if incompletely for those figures along the left side, drawn over in ink. The sketches for the Madonna and Child as well as the study for the Apostle are predominantly concerned with outlining the figure, and they do not feature the internal modelling found in the black-chalk study of a male figure for the Battle of Cascina in the center of the sheet. This contrast between Michelangelo’s graphic handling for works in two and three-dimensions is even more pronounced on a closely related sheet in the British Museum (Fig. 2.7). Here, there is a further black-chalk study of a group of male nudes for the Battle of Cascina and another pen-and-ink (over lead-point) study for the Bruges Madonna, disposed at a right angle on the right side of the sheet.

On these examples, Michelangelo appears to have concerned himself predominantly with contour in the studies for sculpture and with the description of mass in the studies for painting. It may thus seem natural to offer these sheets as evidence of Michelangelo’s division in graphic treatment of studies for works in different media, and, by extension, of the character of drawings produced by a sculptor as opposed to those produced by a painter -- as was the influential argument of Erwin Gradmann. However, the difference of the intended media is not the only factor explaining the appearance the drawings. The influences under which Michelangelo was then working and the function of the drawings also help to explain their appearance.

As Michael Hirst has argued, the appearance of the sketches in the Uffizi for the Bruges Madonna is comparable to Leonardo’s small pen-and-ink pensieri studies (Academia, Venice) for his Battle of Anghiari (Fig. 2.8). This observation is significant, because, as has been mentioned, no drawings of this kind exist by Michelangelo before his contact with Leonardo during their simultaneous commissions for the Sala del Gran Consiglio in the Palazzo Vecchio.
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92 Gradmann, Bildhauerzeichnungen, 16.
Conversely, Leonardo had exploited this sketchier type of drawing previously, as evidenced by his study at Windsor for the *Last Supper* (Fig. 2.9). In addition to his influence on Michelangelo’s pen-and-ink technique, Leonardo seems to have been the source of Michelangelo’s sketchy use of chalk. Following his pen-and-ink for the *Last Supper*, Leonardo used red or black chalk to further develop his composition (Fig. 2.10). Michelangelo may have seen Leonardo’s similar use of pen-and-ink and red and black chalk in drawings for the *Battle of Anghiari*. And it was evidently at this time that Michelangelo began exploiting the possibilities of the chalk medium. His simultaneous adoption of a new medium and a new drawing technique — both of which were already components of Leonardo’s working method — reveal the impact that the older artist’s draughtsmanship had on the younger’s. This influence suggests that the likely source of Michelangelo’s early sixteenth-century *pensieri* was Leonardo, most likely his drawings for the *Battle of Anghiari*. Thus, the appearance of the loosely outlined *pensieri* sketches, said to have been motivated by their function as preparations for sculpture, is more likely due to a new type of drawing in the artist’s graphic language. Michelangelo would continue to employ drawings of this type throughout his career, and from 1504 onward he would use sketchy preliminary drawings for painting.

The immediate influence of Leonardo on Michelangelo’s draughtsmanship can be seen further on a sheet in the British Museum (Fig. 2.11) that features a sketchy battle scene and two studies for an apostle seen from the same view and in the same pose as in the Uffizi sheet. The study for the battle scene specifically has been connected with Leonardo’s drawing style and the
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95 Francis Ames-Lewis, *Drawing in Early Renaissance Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 172-173. Hirst, *Michelangelo*, 66, Hirst argues that Leonardo was an important example for Michelangelo’s adoption of black chalk. However, we do not possess any parallel in Leonardo’s *oeuvre* for the drawings for the bathers in Haarlem. He contends that the smaller scale drawings that Signorelli was making in the same period are closer in appearance.
content of his *Battle of Anghiari* cartoon.\(^9^6\) Fig. 2.11 is a very loose, first design that is generally connected with the *Battle of Cascina* (although it is not entirely agreed upon as to where it fits specifically). Again, the sketchy style of the drawing is unlike Michelangelo’s graphic approach of the 1490s and is most likely founded on knowledge of Leonardo’s drawings. Following a logical progression, Michelangelo then developed this group further. On two sheets at Oxford, the artist seems to have isolated a group of cavalrmen for additional exploration. The first sheet (Fig. 2.12) features a small sketch of the group beneath studies for a horse. Although smaller, this study is slightly more worked up than the Fig. 2.11, and features a small number of hatched strokes. The second sheet at Oxford (Figure 2.13) very much shows the influence of Leonardo’s drawings for the *Battle of Anghiari*, as the hatchings are so dense that the ink has bled into areas of solid black. Though this sheet is still rough in its finish, some description of form is indicated that in its use of loose parallel hatching is not wholly unlike the study for an apostle on the Uffizi sheet (Fig.2.6).

Similarly, the differences in Fig. 2.6 between the graphic treatment of the Cascina bather and the pen-and-ink *pensieri* for the *Bruges Madonna and Child* may be explained by their different stages in the evolution of their respective projects, and the source of their motifs, rather than their connection to the final media of the commissions. The small sketches for the *Bruges Madonna* are the first known variations on the disposition of the group. These sketches, measuring between four and six centimeters, document Michelangelo’s initial imaginative explorations on paper of the positions of the two figures, and the attitudes of the child differ significantly in the studies. The middle sketch, drawn at a right angle at the side of the sheet,

shows the child turning around to face his mother, as does the study in the center of the sheet, drawn in the same direction as the Cascina bather. This motif was explored further in larger size and with increased, if still relatively restrained, hatching on a sheet in the Albertina (Fig. 2.14) and another in the Louvre (Fig. 2.15).  

Alternatively, in the self-confident economy of Fig. 2.7 (London, British Museum), Michelangelo explored the design of the uppermost of the three perpendicular drawings on the Uffizi sheet, where Christ stands in front of the Virgin. This design, which is quite similar to the one eventually executed in marble, was still under transformation on the London sheet. This is shown by the lead-point underdrawing that shows Christ’s arm extending over the Virgin’s lap under her right arm. Thus, it can be observed that Michelangelo was still attempting to fix the attitudes of the figures, which, like the Uffizi pensieri for the same group, functioned differently from the studies for painting on the same sheet.

The Cascina bather, drawn with black chalk on the Uffizi sheet (Fig. 2.6), appears again in the London drawing as the rightmost figure in black chalk on the recto (Fig. 2.7), and again, slightly altered, as the black-chalk study in the center of the verso. Significantly, this repeated design for the bather is based on an existing model that was, as Johannes Wilde first noted, the Dioscuri of Monte Cavallo (the colossal Horse Tamers of the Quirinal).  

As Wilde pointed out, the figure is also found in the finished cartoon, although seen in profile and holding a spear at the extreme right of the Holkham Hall grisaille (Fig. 2.16). The antique model not only informed the general disposition of the figure, but also displayed the effects of muscles on the surface modelling. The black chalk drawings of the bather thus constitute a different type of drawing: the
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97 Hirst, Michelangelo, 33. As Hirst has observed, it cannot be ruled out that these studies were intended for yet another two projects also dateable to the same period: the two marble Madonna tondi undertaken between 1503 and 1505.  
98 Wilde, British Museum, 12.  
99 Ibid.
general attitude of the figure had already been fixed and some basic effects of underlying musculature were visible on a three-dimensional model. As the evolution of the bather and the accompanying group progressed, Michelangelo redrew the figure, increasing the modelling of its form. Another more finished version of the London group, now in the Louvre (Fig. 2.17), demonstrates the evolution over several studies of this figure, featuring successively greater modelling.

One can find further evidence against the generalisation concerning Michelangelo’s early pen-and-ink studies for sculpture on the verso of the London sheet (Fig. 2.18). The front and back views of a putto are connected with a series of studies of children for the Taddei Tondo of the same period. On another drawing in London (Fig. 2.19), Michelangelo drew pen-and-ink sketches for Christ and the infant St. John, several of which have been modelled – like the studies in Fig. 2.18 -- by means of parallel and cross-hatching to indicate the surface plasticity of their underlying muscles. These drawings, unlike the pensieri for the Bruges group, almost certainly did not come directly from the artist’s imagination. In this way, the London putti are similar to the studies of the bather. The greater modelling in both can be attributed to the physical appearance of Michelangelo’s source material. Not surprisingly, these studies result in drawings, regardless of the final intended media, whose surfaces are more highly described than those of exploratory compositional sketches taken from the imagination.

The variations in function and approach among the surviving pen-and-ink drawings for sculpture demonstrate, for the first time in Michelangelo’s surviving sheets, an evolution in designs from rough sketches to more elaborately modelled studies. However, the emerging preparatory process found in such early pen studies as those for the Bruges Madonna was not unique to sculptural projects. The surviving sheets from a sketchbook at Oxford (Corpus 166-
171, Fig. 2.20) for the Sistine Ceiling agree in practice and appearance with the earlier studies for the *Bruges Madonna*. The Oxford sheets relate to the second painting campaign for the Sistine Ceiling (c. 1511-12) and represent a large group of individual *pensieri*. The figures are the same size as the early sketches for the *Bruges Madonna* (between 3cm and 6cm). Many of these studies were drawn over a black-chalk sketch, following a similar process as the mixed-media studies of Fig. 2.6 that were underdrawn in lead-point. Although some of the larger figures seem to have been executed from life, many of the smaller sketches share another characteristic with the Bruges study: the initial figural sketches would have come directly from Michelangelo’s imagination. ¹⁰⁰ This observation again illustrates the functional similarity of the young Michelangelo’s initial drawings for sculpture and those for painting. It is perhaps the variety of graphic treatments that Michelangelo quickly evolved that caused Bernard Berenson to reject these sheets, noting that “these sketches are positively not by Michelangelo.”¹⁰¹ As Paul Joannides has recently argued, this rejection seems to have been a misjudgement about the function of the sketches, which are not developed studies but rough *primi pensieri*.¹⁰² By this time, the custom of making initial rough sketches of individual figures seems to have become a part of Michelangelo’s process for both painting and sculpture.

Michelangelo’s early pen-and-ink drawings expose the inherent problem of strict generalizations that differentiate the graphic function of a small amount of surviving material by an artist whose graphic approach was apparently evolving quickly. Certainly, it cannot be claimed that Michelangelo’s drawings always functioned in one way for sculptural projects and another way for painted projects. Nevertheless, it does not follow from an examination of all the

¹⁰¹ Berenson, *Florentine Painters*, 234.
existing evidence that the inverse is true. It can be observed, especially from the 1520s onward (a period from which more drawings for sculpture survive), that Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture often exhibit a distinct functional approach informed by the reality of executing a design in three-dimensions. The traditional argument for a division between “sculptors’ drawings” and the drawings of painters has relied on identifying an interest in defining contour rather than in modelling mass. It is interesting that, for a number of reasons, Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture, and indeed his sculpture itself, became more focussed on the latter than the former.

The mature projects for sculpture: a focus on form

In 1519 Michelangelo returned to Florence from the quarries of Carrara and Pietrasanta where he had been selecting marble for the execution of a new version of the tomb of Pope Julius II. He had also, the previous year, officially accepted the papal commission for the façade of San Lorenzo, Florence. Despite his involvement in both these projects, it was the Risen Christ for Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome that became Michelangelo’s first completed work upon returning to Florence. The one surviving sheet (Fig. 2.21) connected with the Roman Christ may be for the first attempt, which was abandoned after a disfiguring black vein appeared across the statue’s face. This assumption is based on the evidence that, as Howard Hibbard pointed out, the drawing “deals with problems of form and surface that would have been worked out before the second statue was begun.”

103 However, as Frederick Hartt observed, such an assumption is problematic, because we do not have any evidence of what the first version of the statue looked like.104 Indeed, if the recent proposal by Irene Baldriga provides any indication of the general

attitude of that figure, the drawing in question would certainly belong to the second version of the statue.  

The drawing of the *Risen Christ*, formerly in the Brinsley Ford collection in London, functioned as a study of how the forms of the underlying musculature of the torso would be modelled. The pen marks of the abdomen are formed in a dense network of cross-hatched strokes that curve according to the surface structure of the muscles. As such, the graphic approach resembles, although studied from a closer viewpoint, the abdomen of the study of a nude male in the Louvre (Fig. 2.22) probably intended for the aborted *Entombment* now in the National Gallery, London (c. 1500). The similarities between the two drawings are also noteworthy because, as Hirst explained, the altarpiece and the drawings for it likely date from about 1500, during a period after the completion of the marble *Pieta*.  

The stylistic connection between the two drawings strengthens Hirst’s argument that the study for the *Risen Christ* provides the only means by which we can attempt to visualize the appearance of studies for the *Bacchus* or the *Pietà*, as no drawings exist for Michelangelo’s Roman sculptural commissions of 1496 through 1501.  

This retrospective visualization emphasizes the role of chance survival in our understanding of Michelangelo’s drawings for his major sculptural commissions and the problems associated with putting too fine a point on the role of technique or medium in what, at first glance, may appear to be an exceptional case.

This drawing also raises an interesting question that is unique to studies for sculpture: the intended viewpoint of the statue. The *Risen Christ* was intended for a niche, and, because of its location, the figure would possess a single principal view. In such cases, it may seem obvious
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107 Ibid.
that the sculptor would draw the figure from the principal view that would eventually be framed by the niche. In the case of the drawing for the *Risen Christ*, this assumption has led to the identification of the incorrect positioning of the statue. As Hirst showed, the statue is incorrectly set-up on its pedestal, which has the effect of flattening the figure and nullifying Michelangelo’s desire to convey movement.\textsuperscript{108} This argument follows a similar logic displayed by Wilde concerning the London drawing for the *Bruges Madonna*, already discussed in relation to identifying categories of drawings based on functions within the artist’s working methods. According to Wilde, the study for the *Madonna and Child*, also intended for a niche, shows one of the main views of the group that would have been seen from the central nave. Although changed from the drawing, the correct view of the group would see the Virgin with her left side turned, similar to the manner in which her right side is rotated in the drawing.\textsuperscript{109} Like the *Risen Christ*, the improper installation of the Bruges group on its base counteracts the intended effect of the Child’s movement as well as the Virgin’s gaze.\textsuperscript{110}

Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture from the 1520s onward are marked by the characteristics first associated by Wilde with sculptural drawings, namely investigations from several viewpoints and a focus on the representation of solid form. This can first be observed in the artist’s preparations for the *Dying Slave*, now in the Louvre (c.1512-14). On a sheet in Haarlem (Fig. 2. 23), Michelangelo drew several studies for the right arm of the *Dying Slave* that

\textsuperscript{108} Hirst, *Michelangelo*, 68.
\textsuperscript{110} The issue of intended principal viewpoints is also related to earlier drawings. For example, Wilde maintained that the studies for the Duomo *Apostle* in Figs. 2.6 and 2.11 represent the intended principal view of the statue (Wilde, *British Museum*, 6). A. E. Popp and Michael Hirst, on the other hand, argued the sketches represent a subsidiary view (Wilde, *British Museum*, 6 and Hirst, *Michelangelo*, 3). Wilde and Hirst were again, uncharacteristically, at odds as to the function of the red chalk study at the École des Beaux-Arts for a *Slave* on the tomb of Pope Julius II (Hirst, *Michelangelo*, plate 30). In this case, Wilde believed the study to represent the intended principal view of an initial design for the *Youthful Slave* (Johannes Wilde, *Michelangelo’s ‘Victory’* (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), 15). Conversely, Hirst argued that the study demonstrated the care Michelangelo paid to secondary views of his sculpture (Hirst, *Michelangelo*, 3).
are revealing for several reasons. The top four studies, which were drawn with the sheet turned upside down, demonstrate Michelangelo’s concern for studying the model’s form from slightly different viewpoints, capturing the angles of the wrist and forearm that would eventually fluidly transition into one another on the marble statue. In the studies at the bottom, with the sheet turned around the other way, Michelangelo studied, again from different viewpoints, the relationship between the forearm and bicep. These studies, along with the carefully modelled study of the figure’s hand, reveal Michelangelo’s effort to record the anatomical implications of the bent arm and its effects on the surface of the figure. Here, Michelangelo’s interest is made clear by the accompanying pen-and-ink écorché studies of arms, themselves shown from different angles. The artist’s preoccupation with anatomical accuracy was such that he has sometimes placed an arrow marking a particular muscle, a practice that can be seen in other anatomical studies by the artist.\footnote{Carel van Tuyl van Serooskerken, \textit{The Italian Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries in the Teyler Museum} (Ghent: Snoeck-Ducaju, 2000), 109.} Importantly – like the other graphic characteristics noted above – Michelangelo also employed this method in drawings for paintings, such as the well-known study at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for the \textit{Libyan Sibyl} (Fig. 2.24).

Michelangelo’s concern for the modeling of muscles became more pronounced in a series of studies now divided among London, Oxford and Haarlem for the tombs of the Medici in the New Sacristy. In these studies, Michelangelo’s interest in the effect of the underlying musculature on a form’s surface is evident in his analyses of anatomical details. In Michelangelo’s surviving drawings for painted figures, we do not find the same diversity of concentrated studies so divorced from the figure to which they belong. Instead, the majority of anatomical details for paintings were heads and hands, which would accompany a compositional draft of the figure usually on a separate, but in some cases the same, sheet. However, the
drawings for the allegories of Day and Night on the tomb of Giuliano de’ Medici reveal a graphic approach that is more symptomatic of his preparations for carving.

These drawings represent a late stage in the evolution of the figures and would have been preceded by initial sketches and compositional drafts. The general attitude of the figures had been already established, although their specific poses seem not to have been finalized, and the drawings still differ from the carved statues. In a drawing at Oxford (Fig. 2.25), Michelangelo began exploring the anatomical implications of a reclining torso and its relationship with the figure’s legs. However, this drawing does not yet contain the degree of torsion that characterizes the realized statue. In another study from the same collection (Fig. 2.26), Michelangelo came closer to the contorted pose of the marble figure by experimenting with a more upright, curved back and the motif of the raised left leg that crosses over the right. Although the pose of Day still seems to have been in the process of being determined, the degree of modelling found in the back and abdomen of the torso suggests that in this study the artist was concerned with studying the effects of the pose on the figure’s surface structures. Although the investigation of anatomy was likely Michelangelo’s main focus, the markings to the right of the figure may be evidence that he was simultaneously considering the confines of the size of the block from which the figure was to be carved. As first observed by Wilde, the block for the figure of Day was not the one originally quarried for the tomb. A ricordo dated 27 October 1524 states that Michelangelo had taken to San Lorenzo a block of marble from his studio in via Mozza that was to be used for a figure upon the tomb (serve per una figura di quelle che vanno in su cassoni delle
sepulture). Wilde further noted that the measurements for the block correspond with the allegory of Day, while the other figures were carved from larger blocks.

On the reverse of the sheet at Oxford (Fig. 2.27), Michelangelo made more focussed studies of anatomy for the figure of Night. These studies examine the right arm of Night from four separate viewpoints in preparation for carving the figure in the round. Three of the studies are modelled with chalk and reveal Michelangelo’s interest in understanding the effects of the crooked arm on the underlying musculature. The practice of understanding in two-dimensions a three-dimensional object seems to have preoccupied the artist at this time, as can be seen in four contemporary sheets of drawings after an antique Venus, two in the British Museum (Figs. 2.28 and 2.29) and two at Casa Buonarroti (Figs. 2.30 and 2.31). Of the two in the British Museum, Wilde noted that their technique agrees with Michelangelo’s graphic style of the 1520’s. Wilde further posited that such drawings may well have been used at the time Michelangelo was making a full-size clay model for Dawn and served him as a female model from which he could study surface modelling.

As he had done with the Oxford studies for Night’s arm, Michelangelo made drawings of anatomical details from multiple viewpoints for the figure of Day. On a sheet at Haarlem (Fig. 2.32), Michelangelo drew, and redrew from multiple viewpoints, highly modeled studies of Day’s left knee that was, like Night’s right arm, eventually carved in the round. To an even greater extent, these studies show Michelangelo exploiting a tonal range of the chalk to model the effects of the underlying anatomy on the skin’s surface. There exist only the faintest suggestions of contour that dissolve quickly around the rest of the leg. This dissipation
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114 Wilde, British Museum, 80.
emphasizes the extent to which the artist was concerned only with the modelling of specific anatomical details that are, in the drawings, unrelated to the figure as a whole. It is especially telling of the artist’s preoccupation with fully understanding his figures for three-dimensional sculpture that in the most worked-up studies for *Night* and *Day* Michelangelo studied views which a visitor to the New Sacristy cannot see.\(^{115}\)

On two additional sheets in Haarlem (Fig. 2.33 and 2.34), Michelangelo made studies for the left arm, back, and shoulder of *Day*. Again, his focus was to understand the modelling of form. Like the studies for the figure’s knee, the subtlety with which the effects of light on the form’s surface were studied suggests that Michelangelo was working from a live model. These drawings would have directly preceded or been contemporary with the execution of the model for the figure, which itself would have been made before Michelangelo began work on the marble block in the fall of 1524. By that time, the general attitude of the figures had been worked out, and Michelangelo was exploring in great detail the effects of the unusual stress the muscles came under in the contorted poses. Although the viewpoints are slightly different in these two drawings, Michelangelo’s preoccupation with the secondary view of *Day*’s back shoulder can be explained by the fact that, as Hirst noted, the view is the one seen from the altar.\(^{116}\)

The artifice of the pose of *Day* and the focus of the unusual effects that such poses exert on the surface of the form are also visible in the *Victory* for the tomb of Pope Julius II, likely executed between 1527 and 1530. Unlike the *Slaves*, the *Victory* was intended to have several engaging views, and, as John Shearman has argued, signalled the birth of the *serpentinata* as a compositional type.\(^{117}\) Michelangelo’s drawings for the group thus feature studies from multiple viewpoints. On a sheet in Haarlem (Fig. 2.35), Michelangelo made a study for the *Victory* in

---


\(^{116}\) Hirst, *Michelangelo*, 63.

which, as was typical for the artist, the modelling is most pronounced on the torso. In preparation for carving, the artist redrew the figure’s left thigh from a viewpoint turned to approximately forty-five degrees to the left, showing the thigh as it runs back on an angle. Similarly, on a sheet in the Casa Buonarroti (Fig. 2.36) and another in the British Museum (Fig. 2.37), convincingly demonstrated as preparatory studies for the *Victory* by Wilde, Michelangelo examined the neck of the figure from various viewpoints.\(^{118}\) On the Casa Buonarroti sheet Michelangelo explored both the appearance of the turned head from four separate views, and the effects that the position of the head, turned back over the shoulder, would have on the folding muscles and skin of the neck.\(^{119}\)

The *Victory* figure’s tight arm is not depicted on the Haarlem sheet. However, in a quickly outlined drawing (Fig. 2.38) that is functionally earlier and is drawn on the verso of a study in which the design of the Medici tombs was still being finalized, the *Victory* figure is shown with its right arm in the position of the marble statue. Therefore, the general pose of the figure predates the Haarlem study. It is possible that Michelangelo omitted this detail because he was familiar with it from his work on the figure of *Night* and had already studied the motif through the drawing at Oxford and potentially in three-dimensions through a three-dimensional model.\(^{120}\)

\(^{118}\) Wilde, *British Museum*, 62. The connection is substantiated to some degree by the poem fragment on the recto referencing “la vectoria” (p(er)o... ama(n)do m afaticho/ch(e) la vectoria fia qua(n)ti e l nemicho’; ‘agli occhi alla virtu al tuo valore; ...ch altro piacer no(n) an(n)o/ ove si viva ... ove mort io defu(n)to / e dì me te so fatto appu(n)to apu(n)to).

\(^{119}\) Charles de Tolnay, *Corpus dei disegni di Michelangelo*, vol. 3 (Novara: Istituto geografico de Agostini, 1975-1980), no. 326. De Tolnay’s argument that the study was intended for the *Apollo* or *David* in the Bargello is unconvincing when one considers that the sheet in question would be investigating the mirror image of the statue, with the head turned in the opposite direction.

\(^{120}\) Hartt, *Michelangelo*, 210. It is less convincing that, as argued by Hartt and Richard Betts, the Oxford studies correspond more closely with the arm of the *Victory*. According to this argument, the Oxford sheet would have been contemporary with the Haarlem study and used by Michelangelo to finish the figure of *Night* after 1530. Such a suggestion is, however, symptomatic of the difficulty of dating the study as well as the intersection of ideas between the New Sacristy and the tomb of Julius II.
Stylistically, the Haarlem study for the *Victory* differs from the studies for *Day*. In the preparatory studies for *Day*, for example, or the study of the back and shoulder at Oxford and for the knee at Haarlem, Michelangelo used a soft black chalk to draw closely spaced lines that were then smudged. As a result, the transitions from dark to light are harmonious and anticipate the effects of polished marble.\(^{121}\) The drawing for the *Victory*, on the other hand, features shorter strokes that do not merge with one another, resulting in less harmonious transitions that lack the surface lustre of stone. Moreover, the Haarlem study for the *Victory* does not possess the deemphasized contours of the drawings for *Day*, which result in a greater sense of volume as the form of the figure is created by the structure of the muscles and not imposed by an outline.\(^{122}\)

Another drawing in the British Museum connected with the *Victory* (Fig. 2.39) shows the figure in profile and features a graphic approach closer to the studies for *Day*. In the London study, softer lines have been smudged to form unified areas of shadow. The drawing is also dissimilar to the Haarlem study for the *Victory*, in that its forms emerge organically instead of appearing contained by a hard contour. Functionally too, the London drawing seems closer to the studies for *Day*, and its survival suggests that it would have been accompanied by other studies of subsidiary views of the torso. The style of the London sheet and the statue itself suggest that the work was carried out between 1527 and 1530, as they both reveal the influence of the tombs in the Medici Chapel at San Lorenzo. Despite this, it seems that Michelangelo had fixed the general pose of the figure in the early 1520s. Therefore, the differences between the Harlem and

\(^{121}\) Achim Gnaan, *Michelangelo: Drawings of a Genius* (Vienna: Albertina, 2010), 211. The line work of the Haarlem study and its containment within a strict contour have recently caused Gnaan to compare the drawing with the study for the *Risen Christ* of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Such a comparison could, coupled with early sketch for the figure whose recto can be dated to circa 1519-21, present the possibility that the Haarlem study for the *Victory* belongs to the early 1520s.

\(^{122}\) Ibid., 107.
London studies are indicative of the formal concerns that had become more dominant in his final years in Florence.

It is important to note that these concerns continue in the artist’s drawings for the *Last Judgement*. Although Michelangelo’s mature drawings for sculpture display his clearest and most detailed studies for the anatomical effects of specific poses, his studies for the *Last Judgement* betray a pinnacle in his painted works of his lifelong obsession with the sculptural presence of form. Significantly, a sheet in the British Museum (Figure 2.40) for the *Last Judgment* features studies of the same figure from two separate points of view, proving that – although this practice is much more common to Michelangelo’s preparations for sculpture – it was a part of his graphic language that extended into his drawings for painting.

Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture present several characteristics that prevent a uniform description of their appearance and function. Of the characteristics that have often been used to describe his studies as sculptural, only the modelling of form from various angles can be said to be inherently sculptural. More importantly, these characteristics are also found in Michelangelo’s drawings for painting and cannot be said to be unique to any particular medium. The artist’s graphic approach also evolved over the course of his long career, and a growing interest in the expression of mass can be seen in his surviving figural drawings. This can be observed in his drawings for sculpture connected with long-running commissions such as the tomb of Pope Julius II and those in the Medici Chapel at San Lorenzo. Accordingly, the function of Michelangelo’s drawings must be determined in the context of the project to which they belong. Such an analysis begins to reveal that the artist did have graphic tendencies that were more frequently employed in – although not unique to -- his preparatory drawings for sculpture, including a tradition of understanding subsidiary views of his figures and, later, an interest in
describing the plasticity of human anatomy. This basic understanding of Michelangelo’s graphic approach to sculpture is essential, considering his influence on other Florentine sculptors of the sixteenth century and the critical understanding of drawings for sculpture they produced.
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Chapter 3

The Drawings of Baccio Bandinelli

This chapter will focus mostly on a functional analysis of Baccio Bandinelli’s drawings. Unlike Michelangelo, little has been written that compares Bandinelli’s drawings for different media or that explains how his drawings relate to sculpture. Instead, much of the discussion involves difficult questions of attribution. The pioneering work concerning Bandinelli’s drawings and the definition of a secure corpus was done by Roger Ward, and it is upon his research that this chapter hopes to build. A general understanding of Bandinelli’s draughtsmanship will also be essential to understanding the critical attributions made to other sculptors of the sixteenth century that are discussed in Chapter 4.

Baccio Bandinelli’s personality, political views, and sculpted projects, as is well-known, were harshly criticized during his lifetime – a trend that generally continues to this day. Despite this, the artist has been largely admired for his skill as a draughtsman. As early as 1549, Anton Francesco Doni referred to Bandinelli as a “miraculous draughtsman,” and by 1591 Francesco Bocchi named Bandinelli as the greatest draughtsman who had ever lived. Closer to the artist’s own lifetime, Vasari described Baccio as “an envious and malicious person,” who was “very rough with his tongue, [which] robbed him of the goodwill of other persons, obscured his talents, and brought it about that his works were regarded with ill will and a prejudiced eye,

and therefore could never please anyone."\(^{126}\) Although Vasari’s tepid critical judgement of Bandinelli’s sculptured oeuvre includes some redeemable qualifications, it was the sculptor’s drawings “to which it is evident that he gave his attention more than to any other thing, was of such a kind and such excellence that it atones for his every natural defect and makes him known as a rare master of our art.”\(^{127}\) Vasari went as far as to say of the drawings by Bandinelli that he had collected for his libro that it was “impossible to improve upon them.”\(^{128}\) This opinion was also expressed in the seventeenth century by Filippo Baldinucci who ranked Bandinelli’s draughtsmanship second only to Michelangelo’s.\(^{129}\)

In his will to his sons, the aged Bandinelli himself appeared to recognize the fundamental importance of the drawings to his reputation as an artist, stating that, “all my efforts were in draughtsmanship, in which according to the judgment of Michelangelo, as well as princes and nobles, I prevailed. Their Excellencies have a great many of my drawings, others have been sent to Germany and to France as well as distributed throughout Italy, some of which I know have been sold for as much as two hundred scudi.”\(^{130}\)

Based on contemporary mentions of his draughtsmanship and the number of surviving sheets, Bandinelli emerges as the only sculptor of the sixteenth century, other than Michelangelo, for whom drawing played such an important role.\(^{131}\) Although, as Roger Ward has pointed out, comparisons to Michelangelo must be tempered, as Bandinelli does not seem to have shared the

\(^{126}\) Vasari, Lives, vol. 7, 103.
\(^{127}\) Ibid., 99.
\(^{128}\) Ibid.
\(^{129}\) Brian Tovey, Andrea Gáldy and Hilary Hunt, eds., The Pouncey Index of Baldinucci’s Notizie (Firenze: Centro Di, 2005), 40. “disegnatore maraviglioso quanto altri mai forse, toltono il gran Michelangelo...il migliore di quanti a quell tempo (toltono Michelangelo) maneggiavano scarpello”.
\(^{130}\) Barkan, Unearthing, 307.
\(^{131}\) Roger Barry Ward, “Baccio Bandinelli as a Draughtsman” (PhD diss., Courtauld Institute of Art (University of London, 1982), 62. Ward gives 428 sheets to Bandinelli. For Michelangelo, Hirst agrees, more or less, with Toknay’s total of about 785 autograph rectos and versos (Hirst, Michelangelo, 16-17).
older artist’s habit of destroying his own drawings. Numerical comparisons of Bandinelli’s graphic output are furthermore misleading because of the way in which he used the individual sheets that have survived. Bandinelli rarely used both sides of a sheet and typically, unlike Michelangelo, devoted an entire page to a single idea. The purpose of this practice was explained by the artist himself in a letter to Luca Martini in 1552:

But it is necessary, if I wish to produce variation among the invenzioni, that I place all the designs in front of my own eyes, so that each of them illuminates the others helping me to see the truth of the errors in each, because I see by comparisons, and in this manner I will vary and improve my work so that it will please his excellency, since drawings are made for no other reason than to compare them in comparison to each other.133

This practice was important to a key aspect of Bandinelli’s draughtsmanship: his reuse and repetition of figural motives. Ward referred to the clearest example of such drawings as Baccio’s “exemplum-like” studies, which the author saw as a revival of sorts of the pattern books created during the Trecento and, to a lesser extent, the Quattrocento.134 Among the drawings that conform to the technical definition of exempla; that is, created without a specific project in mind, Ward cites a group of widely dispersed drawings, similar in execution and type, which he believes once formed parts of a sketchbook dating from the late 1540s (Fig. 3.1).135 The general poses of these figural studies reappear, in composition but not in specific details, throughout several decades of Bandinelli’s work in different media -- graphic, painted and sculpted.136
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132 Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 45.
133 Barkan, Unearthing, 305.
135 For the sketchbook see Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” cats. 115, 183, 237, 239, and 240.
136 Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” Cat. 115 is related to the figure of Cain in the drawing of God Cursing Cain for the Death of Abel in the Louvre Cat.69, (see also Françoise Viatte et al. Baccio Bandinelli: dessins, sculpture, peinture. Paris: Éditions des Musées nationaux, 2011), 185-86, cat. 69; Cat. 183 is related to similar, if reversed, central Son of Bandinelli’s late relief of the Drunkenness of Noah in the Bargello; Cat. 239 is related to the figure of Adam in Bandinelli and Andrea del Minga’s painting of the Expulsion from Paradise and reappears in a similar drawing in the Louvre (Cat. 337, Viatte, Bandinelli, 187, cat. 71); Cat. 240 was used for the rightmost Son in the highly finished drawing of the Drunkenness of Noah in the British Museum.
However, Bandinelli did not constrain his reuse of drawn figural inventions to non-specific *exempla*; figural types originally created for a specific project were also repurposed over several decades. An instructive example of Bandinelli’s reuse of drawings over a long period of time has been published by Ward in connection with several drawings that owe their origin to the female attendant holding a dish at the extreme right of Andrea del Sarto’s fresco of the *Birth of the Virgin* at Santissima Annunziata.

In Coburg, there survives a pen-and-ink sketch (Fig. 3.2) of two women for Bandinelli’s *Birth of the Virgin* relief at Loreto. On the verso of this sheet (although covered by a backing), there is a similar sketch of a woman holding a dish inspired by del Sarto’s attendant.¹³⁷ In the British Museum (Fig. 3.3) there exists a life study in red chalk of a *garzone* for the woman raising the curtain on the recto, which was connected by Popham with the Loreto relief and the Coburg drawing.¹³⁸ An equivalent life study in chalk of the figure holding a dish after a *garzone* is found at Düsseldorf (Fig. 3.4), and a further study of the head exists in a private collection in Florence (Fig. 3.5). On stylistic grounds, and based on their connection with the Loreto relief, these studies can all be convincingly dated to 1518. Although the figure holding a dish was not used in the Loreto relief, it reappeared two decades later in an anonymous print designed by Bandinelli and published by Antonio Salamanca in 1540 (Fig. 3.6), and once more, seven years later, in a compositional drawing of *Abraham’s Meeting with the Three Angels* that is connected with the choir *recinto* for the Duomo at Florence (Fig. 3.7). In this case Ward was able to trace Bandinelli’s reuse of a figural motif across the better part of the sculptor’s career and demonstrate its interchangeable application in graphic and sculpted media.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 14 as note 37.
A similar case obtains for the figural type Bandinelli first employed for the figure of St. Lawrence in the composition engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi in 1525 (Fig. 3.8), for which a drawing is preserved in the Louvre (Fig. 3.9). The same figure was reversed and adapted for Bandinelli’s drawing, now in the Louvre (Fig. 3.10), of St. Michael Triumphant Over Sin that has been associated with Bandinelli’s plan for an unexecuted bronze destined for Castel St. Angelo in 1530/31; an engraving of the Battle Between Reason and Love published by Salamanca in 1545 (Fig. 3.11); and as Adam in a drawing (Louvre) of the Fall of Man connected with the recinto reliefs of 1547 (Fig. 3.12). Interestingly, the figure was later (re-) reversed in a red chalk study in Cologne (3.13) for the nude youth drinking from a jug who appears in the well-known drawing of the Drunkenness of Noah in the British Museum (Fig. 3.14), which is also among the ten drawings originally recognized by Jacob Bean to be designs for the choir recinto of the late 1540s for Florence Cathedral. Finally, the figural motif can be found, adjusted, in a black chalk study in the Uffizi (Fig. 3.15) for a painting of Moses Carving the Tablets of the Law (Fig. 3.16), a work from the final months of the artist’s life. Similar, albeit often less overarching, adaptations of figural motifs can be traced through Bandinelli’s graphic oeuvre, as, for example, his use of a Bather from Michelangelo’s Cascina cartoon described by Leonard Barkan.

As Charles Avery has noted, the subject matter of a given sculptural work mattered much less to Bandinelli than did the superficial appearance of the figure’s pose. This observation holds for the artist’s drawing and the repetition of stock poses, and, according to Ward, “his art became somewhat hackneyed as he grew older: the proportion of fresh invenzioni decreases and

139 See Viatte, Bandinelli, 133-34, cat. 28 and Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 362, cat. 320.
141 Barkan, Unearthing, 317-319.
compositions tend to degenerate into machine-like compilations of familiar figures.” In other words, Bandinelli’s work progressively moved towards the derogatory definition of maniera as put forth by Lodovico Dolce, in which he decried the monotony of repeated figures. The examples of recurrent use of ideas combined with Bandinelli’s claimed need to compare his graphic inventions against one another help to explain the consistent appearance of large, singularly dedicated motives on the artist’s extant sheets, as well as underscore his need to conserve his drawings. As noted, this process stands in opposition to Michelangelo’s, whose practice of creating new formal inventions for each project kept the older artist from referring to his earlier graphic work or, indeed, from conserving it.

Bandinelli’s working method was, in many ways, quite different from Michelangelo’s. As has been observed above, Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture are not characterized by their technical divergence from his drawings for painting, but rather by the unique functional concerns they display -- namely the focus on modelling the surface effects of anatomical details and the description of form from multiple angles. These functional concerns are not, however, to be found in Bandinelli’s drawings. In contrast to Michelangelo’s, and indeed to Leonardo’s drawings for sculpture, sheets by Bandinelli that can be connected to a work in three-dimensions are characterized by an insistent two-dimensionality.

Bandinelli’s tendency towards a flattened pictorial effect can best be observed in his graphic work executed in pen-and-ink, the medium of two thirds of his surviving drawings. This preference for the pen separates Bandinelli from Michelangelo, who rarely used pen-and-
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143 Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 134.
145 Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 74.
ink for figural studies after 1510, and to a greater extent from the painters with whom he was associated: del Sarto, Rosso and Pontormo.\footnote{Roger Ward, “Observations on the Red Chalk Figure Studies of Baccio Bandinelli: Two Examples at Melbourne,” \textit{Art Bulletin of Victoria} 23 (1982): 19.}

Bandinelli’s distinctive pen style appears early in his surviving drawings. In one of the artist’s earliest surviving pen drawings (Fig. 3.17), inspired by Donatello’s marble \textit{Entombment} relief at St. Peter’s,\footnote{Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 360-61, cat. 318.} the regularity of stroke that will come to define his best-known pen drawings is already observable. The contour lines are clear and purposeful, and the hatching is, save for the looser foliage and shadow beneath the shroud, regular in its spacing and length. These hachures are summarily employed and sharply juxtaposed against the white of the paper. This technique seems to have had its origins in the limited extant sheets by Rustici, Bandinelli’s teacher, and is a defining characteristic of Bandinelli’s closest students, notably Giovanni Bandini.\footnote{Gert Jan van der Sman, “Giovan Francesco Rustici as a Draftsman,” \textit{Master Drawings} 50 (2012): 21-32. Ulrich Middeldorf, “Drawings by Giovanni dell’ Opera,” \textit{The Art Quarterly} 2 (1939): 386-393.} The early technique of the Paris sheet would prove to be significant to the artist because, unlike Michelangelo, Bandinelli did not significantly reform his graphic approach over the course of his career. Like his retention of figural motifs, Bandinelli held on to and reused drawing techniques once they had been acquired.

Nevertheless, Bandinelli did display different approaches to drawings in pen-and-ink according to a sheet’s function.\footnote{Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 79ff.} For example, Bandinelli’s pen could be loose and calligraphic, as is shown in a \textit{pensiero} sketch (St. Petersburg), for the \textit{Birth of the Virgin} relief (Fig. 3.18). In some compositional sketches, such as those in Florence (Fig. 3.19), St. Petersburg and Oxford (Fig. 3.20) of the \textit{Birth of the Virgin},\footnote{Ibid., 274, cat. 176.} and a design of the \textit{Death of the Virgin} in the Uffizi (Fig. 3.21), Bandinelli mostly abandoned hatching and modeled his figures in clear and economic
outlines. On the other hand, such linearity could be supplanted by compositional designs of great control and finish, such as in the drawings for the late *recinto* reliefs (Fig. 3.14). A well-known type of Bandinelli’s pen-and-ink drawing emerged in the early 1520s, which combines a bold calligraphic style of contour line that abstracts the figure’s body into basic units with regular, if little, parallel hatching (Fig. 3.22). This type of quick figure study became a formula to which Bandinelli stuck so closely throughout the rest of his career that, once the technique had been developed, drawings of this kind are, as Ward put it, “thereafter virtually undatable.”\(^{151}\)

As a large number of sheets suggest, Bandinelli also utilized a more restrained manner of drawing in which a denser network of very uniform parallel and crossed hachures describes the play of light upon a figure’s surface. This approach is best demonstrated in the sketchbook of “exempla-like” studies and drawings created with a similar technique, such as the study of two men in the Louvre (Fig. 3.23). This approach was, nevertheless, not only reserved for such highly finished figure studies but also shares much the same characteristics as the compositional draughts connected with Bandinelli’s late work for Florence Cathedral.

This brief, general summary of some of Bandinelli’s pen techniques is intended to highlight some of the more conspicuously different drawings. What is important for the current discussion is the approach to form uniting the various techniques. As has been noted, Bandinelli’s most distinctive characteristic as a draughtsman was the regularity of his hatching, which avoided Leonardo’s technical development of curved strokes describing three-dimensional volume.\(^{152}\) The result of the pitch-straight strokes to describe volume is a flattening of plastic, organic form. Bandinelli used these hachures generally to describe the effects of light, but as a result of the uniform thickness and spacing of the stroke, they do not describe modulations in

\(^{151}\) Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 172.
tone. Instead, his graphic oeuvre is marked by abrupt shifts from the extreme light of the paper to unvarying areas of shadow, which likewise flatten the form. Importantly, Bandinelli’s hachures are all carefully kept within clear contour lines – often incised with a stylus -- which enclose the figure, emphasizing its two-dimensional nature.

The same approach to form also pervades Bandinelli’s chalk studies. As Ward observed:

For Bandinelli red chalk was principally a fine medium, like the pen, and not a broad one. Precision was its essence, and by means of very dense hatching or cross-hatching it was used to create a chiaroscuro pattern that shades rather than models the surface of a form, meaning that the conveyed sense of three-dimensionality or volumetric form is an imperfect one. A corollary to Bandinelli’s particular method of internal shading was the compulsion to silhouette the isolated, naked form and solidify its emphatic contour, for the shading is fastidiously kept within the precisely drawn outlines. Furthermore, Bandinelli’s less finished chalk studies are marked by the same tendency to contrast dense hatching and areas left in reserve, creating the same hard, inorganic appearance as his pen drawings.

Bandinelli’s approach to form was not only a product of his unified and straight hatching, but also of his models. Unlike his contemporaries, notably Michelangelo or Sarto, the majority of Bandinelli’s studies were not after a live model. Bandinelli’s habitual reference to his own graphic reserve rather than to nature helps to explain the two-dimensional characteristic of his drawings, which were intended for multiple graphic reproductions before being transposed to any given number of projects. The practice also seems to have actuated a pictorial mode of drawing which often involved flattening a pose into an antique relief-like profile. An interesting example of this phenomenon is found in a series of drawings derived, as Michael Hirst first noted, from Michelangelo’s Victory group. Despite the three-dimensional inspiration, which
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154 Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 125. Ward has shown that the majority of Bandinelli’s studies that can be associated with his creative process take the form of pensieri, compositional draughts, or fully finished modelli drawings.
Bandinelli most closely copied (in reverse) on a sheet in the Uffizi (Fig. 3.24), the motif has been adapted into a very clear and readable profile. Typical of the artist’s working method, the pose was re-adapted in a study for the leftmost son in the *Drunkenness of Noah* in London (Fig. 3.25), the son in the completed compositional drawing in Florence (Fig. 3.26), and adapted once more as Eve in Bandinelli’s late *Creation of Eve* painting (Fig. 3.27).

Bandinelli’s technique was the same for painting as it was for sculpture, meaning that, like Michelangelo, his approach was not informed by the final media, but by fundamental concerns about form. As demonstrated by the above examples, drawings executed in the same technique were applied to graphic, painted and sculpted media; yet, often the drawings in question cannot safely be said to be true preparatory studies for any specific work. Bandinelli’s careful preservation of his drawings not only explains the recurrence of poses, but the purposes for which he drew – to develop a figural or compositional motif and not to investigate a natural form – and helps explain the unique look of his graphic output, which remained consistent throughout studies for all media. Simply put, Bandinelli’s graphic approach was primarily characterized by the Florentine instinct to enclose form within contours, but avoided the Tuscan impulse towards sculptural presence of form and life drawing, known as *ritrarre del naturale*, so popular during the sixteenth century.

How then, did Bandinelli transfer such two-dimensional studies on paper to three-dimensional sculpture? First, it should be noted that Bandinelli’s drawings for sculpture in the round are rare in number, and his studies for sculpture, for the most part, are preparations for reliefs. For example, we have no surviving drawings for Bandinelli’s *St. Peter* for the Duomo, the stucco *Hercules* for Leo X’s triumphal entry into Florence, his *Orpheus* for the Medici, the stucco *Giants* in the Villa Madama, the small bronze *Hercules* of the 1530s and the bronze
Cleopatra of 1544; his Bacchus, Cleopatra, Adam and Eve, and Apollo of the late 1540s; the Dead Christ Held by an Angel in the crypt of Santa Croce, his God the Father of the early 1550s, or the Nicodemus with the Dead Christ of his tomb. Furthermore, Bandinelli’s drawings that can be associated with sculpture in the round were rarely created with the intent to solve artistic problems. His drawings for the Andrea Doria monument (Fig. 3.28), for instance, take the form of modelli for patronal or public consumption and designs for the reliefs. This is also the case for the drawings connected with the tomb of Clement VII, for which there are highly finished architectural elevations in Madrid (Fig. 3.29) and Oxford (Fig. 3.30) that feature drawings for statuary as part of the architecture of the monument, as well as a modello in Rhode Island which records an idea for a unexecuted deep relief programme (Fig. 3.31).

Much of the extant preparatory work for the pendent tomb of Leo X survives in the form of drawings for the reliefs. For this project, however, there also exists a sheet with quick black chalk drawings in Florence (Fig. 3.32) for Saints Peter and Paul situated in their niches with oval reliefs overhead, as well as a black chalk life study of a head subsequently used, as Ward noted, for the head of the saint who stands to the left side of Leo X’s tomb in S. Maria Sopra
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156 A drawing in the Uffizi (Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 219-229, cat. 57) resembles the statue in general pose, although I would not suggest it was made in preparation for marble.

157 A drawing in the Uffizi (Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman, 238-39, cat. 98) resembles the statue in pose and in physiognomy, but I agree with Ward that it would that it may go too far to call the sheet a definitive study for the sculpture.

158 It should be noted, however, that Ward has catalogued an unpublished study from the Uffizi “whose features we see on the angel who holds the dead Christ” (Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman, 253, cat. 134).

159 Ward, Bandinelli, cat. 199, 280, 313, 314.


161 Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” cat. 44v, 84, 88, 126, 283, and 334.

162 Ibid., 214, cat 45.
Minerva (Fig. 3.33).\textsuperscript{163} On the other hand, all of the extant studies for the monument to Giovanni delle Bande Nere are concerned with unexecuted ideas for the relief panels.\textsuperscript{164}

For Bandinelli’s works in relief, we have a wide range of the types of drawings he produced. The majority of these drawings are concerned with composition and attempt to organize figures within a narrow band of depth, make changes to the composition of the scene, or study a single figure or small group of figures from the larger whole in order to clarify their stances. Such drawings are informed by the final medium in their relation to the depth of field, the clear relation of narrative and the constraints of the allotted space, but are not shaped by the medium in their approach to form. That is to say, Bandinelli maintained the same technical approach to compositional studies for reliefs, painting and engravings. It is tempting, on the other hand, to see Bandinelli’s life studies for reliefs as results of their intended media. The aforementioned \textit{chiaroscuro} juxtapositions create a hard appearance in which the unshaded areas are very clearly in higher relief.\textsuperscript{165} This emphasis on raised form is somewhat akin to Michelangelo’s practice of denoting anatomical structures with lines or using small circles to indicate areas of his frescoes to receive the highlights.\textsuperscript{166} This system, combined with strict contour lines, would seem to be an appropriate method of transcribing life studies into clear guides for sculptural surfaces. However, Bandinelli also employed this \textit{chiaroscuro} system in preparations for engravings, such as the two separate studies for the \textit{Massacre of the Innocents} in Paris (Fig. 3.34 and 3.35). This would suggest that, although Bandinelli’s idiosyncratic graphic approach would seem to be informed with an eye towards reproduction in stone or clay, more

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{163} Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 213, cat.44r.
\item \textsuperscript{164} Ibid. cat. 4, 287, 330 and 351.
\item \textsuperscript{165} Ward, “Observations,” 22.
\item \textsuperscript{166} Hirst, \textit{Michelangelo}, 67-68.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
likely it functioned to summarize the fall of light in a clear, readable way, which was then easily transferred to diverse media.

The inherently pictorial nature of relief likely accounts for the large number of Bandinelli’s drawings for reliefs (barring chance survival) and the very few preparatory drawings for sculpture in the round. This also helps explain the artist’s uniform, flattened graphic approach to studies for reliefs, as well as for works in two dimensions. For an explanation of the lacuna in Bandinelli’s preparatory process for sculpture in the round, we must look to another of Bandinelli’s practices: the making of three-dimensional models. As Ward has already noted, this was an element of Bandinelli’s process that was never omitted. The author has pointed to important passages from Vasari’s *Life of Bandinelli*, as well as to documents that describe Bandinelli’s creation of wooden elevations with figures and reliefs modelled in wax for the Medici papal tombs, the Bande Nere Monument, and the choir of the Duomo. It is also clear that these were extensive undertakings, for in a letter to Michelangelo dated 14 December, 1521, Leonardo Sellaio related that the large model for the tomb of Henry the VIII contained 142 figures in the round as well as reliefs.

There is, however, one project in the round for which drawings survive -- which was and is, undoubtedly, the most well-known work by the artist. For Bandinelli’s *Hercules and Cacus* there are several important drawings that may help us glimpse his graphic process for statues in the round. An instructive study for Hercules, now in the Uffizi (Fig. 3.36), reveals a rare instance of Bandinelli’s preoccupation with form in three dimensions. Importantly, the study, executed in red chalk, displays the typical characteristics that mark Bandinelli’s draughtsmanship.
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Nevertheless, the study demonstrates two interesting testaments to the final intended construction. First, the study investigates the figure from the side, indicating that Bandinelli was here negotiating this important, if subsidiary, view. Secondly, if we accept that the lines that divide the figure into four are original -- Ward claims they are\(^\text{170}\) -- then it becomes clear that Bandinelli was considering the balance of the pose from the side. Such a focus is reminiscent of Cellini’s description of the sculptor who must perfect the primary view of the figure before adjusting it, so that the subsidiary views are in harmony and have equal grace.\(^\text{171}\) Similarly a study for Cacus in Berlin\(^\text{172}\), after which there is a “nearly exact” copy in the Uffizi (Fig. 3.37), shows Bandinelli studying a version of the kneeling figure with his left hand raised above his head from front and back views, while a third side view seems to be summarily sketched at the far left.

Although these studies for Hercules and Cacus offer rare examples of Bandinelli’s interest in investigating on a two-dimensional surface the multiple views of a three-dimensional form typical of the studies by Leonardo and Michelangelo, Bandinelli did not abandon the pitch straight hatching that characteristically flatten his forms. On the other hand, the other studies for the group, which are also typical with regard to Bandinelli’s approach to form, consider the figures from the view which seemed to be most important to the artist. As Martin Weinberger first noted concerning the well-known drawing of the group in the Uffizi (Fig. 3.38), the view investigated in these drawings is that of the figures seen diagonally from the northwest corner of

---

\(^{170}\) Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 108.


\(^{172}\) Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 187-88, cat. 3v.
the Piazza Signoria, meaning that Bandinelli conceived the group at an angle across the marble block.

These studies include a red chalk drawing in the Louvre (Fig. 3.39) that Ward presumed to be after a sculptural model. This chalk drawing was followed, as was typical of Bandinelli, by a more abstracted pen study, now at Christ Church (Fig. 3.40), that is highly finished, although not without *pentimenti*, in which the figure’s pose is quite close to the final work. On this sheet, however, as in the Uffizi red chalk drawing, Hercules’ head is turned down toward his conquered adversary. These early drawings demonstrate that Bandinelli conceived of the two figures separately, a case that is further proved, according to Ward, by an unpublished copy in Berlin after Bandinelli’s study for Cacus which is reported to be similar in technique to the Christ Church drawing. There are two studies for the head of Hercules from the same primary viewpoint on the verso of the Christ Church sheet (Fig. 3.41), as well as a somewhat stronger, if otherwise identical, study at the Louvre (3.42). Again, the same step was taken for Cacus, as can be seen on the verso of the Uffizi sheet (Fig. 3.43), the recto of which shows for the first time Bandinelli’s combination of the two figures in a composition very similar to the final solution. These drawings, even those from subsidiary views, attempt to fix a pose or facial expression and do not appear to investigate the surface structures of solid forms. It is important to note, however, that Bandinelli also created several three-dimensional models including a full-


175 Ibid. Ward’s opinion of the sheet had, by this point, changed from the one expressed in his 1982 catalogue, where he described the drawing as “certainly a copy” (Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 383, cat. 359).
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scale mock up, and it would seem that it was with these models that Bandinelli investigated the group in the round.¹⁷⁹

From the extant material it would seem that the connection between Bandinelli’s lauded draughtsmanship and his sculptural projects takes the form of his projects in relief, while his monumental sculpture in the round was, for the most part, prepared with three-dimensional studies. This, along with his propensity for transferring invenzioni from sheet to sheet, helps explain the pictorial nature of his drawings. The limited connection of his drawings to sculpture in the round may also explain the reason for the critical appreciation of his relief panels and traditional condemnation of his work in the round, for its lack of, as Avery writes, “play of forms in three dimensions and the suggestion of flowing, spiral movement” so typical of Michelangelo.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ Ward, “Bandinelli as a Draughtsman,” 261.
¹⁸⁰ Avery, Florentine Renaissance, 201.
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Chapter 4

The Drawings of Other Tuscan Sculptors Working in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century

Unlike the previous chapter, this one devotes more attention to attributions and to defining the works that can be reliably given to Florentine sculptors, other than Michelangelo and Bandinelli, who were active during the first decades of Cosimo I’s reign. In addition to problems of attribution, the interchange among these Tuscan sculptors and their contemporaries in other artistic disciplines will be discussed. The greatest issue affecting the analysis of this group of sculptors as draughtsmen is the low survival rate of their drawings. Among the sculptors working in the first half of the century for whom some securely attributable drawings survive are: Benvenuto Cellini (c. 1500-1571); three sculptors who assisted Michelangelo on the Medici tombs at San Lorenzo during the 1530s -- Raffaello da Montelupo (c. 1504-1566), Fra Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli (c. 1507-1563) and Niccolò Tribolo (c. 1500-1550); and Pierino da Vinci (c. 1529-1553), the nephew of Leonardo.

The number of drawings that can be attributed to Benvenuto Cellini is small. There have been several attempts to add to this small corpus; however, the drawings that are regularly accepted as authentic are comprised of only, as Dominique Cordellier listed, the black chalk study for Juno in the Louvre for one of the dozen candelabra ordered by Francis I (Fig. 4.1), the highly finished Satyr in Washington connected with the bronze for the Porte Dorée at Fontainebleau (Fig. 4.2), and five studies for the seal for the Accademia del Disegno. To this short list, Cordellier added three life studies formerly attributed to Rosso of a garzone’s head seen from various angles (Fig. 4.3-4.5). Cordellier proposed that these drawings are connected

---

either to Cellini’s bronze *Perseus* in the Bargello or to a figure of *Earth* for the saltcellar for Francis I.\(^{182}\) Although there is little comparative material with which to validate this interesting hypothesis, it can be said that these drawings display a preoccupation in representing plastic form, especially the two studies that show front and side views of the same outward-looking positioning of the head. Furthermore, the black chalk is used to model, not shade, the three-dimensional form. This, of course, does not prove that the drawing was made by a sculptor, and such concerns, as will be described below, became a forceful concern of painters during the sixteenth century.

A similar interest in form, although to a somewhat lesser extent, informs the *Juno* at the Louvre (Fig. 4.1). In this case, the subtle modeling is present but becomes subordinated, especially along the back and left arm, by an insistent contour. The mere fact that such a *modello* in chalk by a sculptor of the sixteenth century has survived, potentially along with the three others, is exceptional outside Bandinelli’s output and, once again, reveals the dangers of associating a narrow range of drawings to a small body of evidence.

Even more exceptional than the *Juno* is the highly finished drawing of a *Satyr* in the Woodner Collection at the National Gallery of Art in Washington (Fig. 4.2), which can be connected with the finished bronze at the J. Paul Getty Museum (c. 1542, Fig. 4.6).\(^{183}\) The Washington sheet was first underdrawn in black chalk, over which meticulous hatching was applied in brown ink applied with a brush, before broader pockets of shadow and highlights in white and brown inks were applied with a brush.\(^{184}\) The contour of the *Satyr*, as well as some internal modeling, have also been applied with pen and ink, resulting in an elaborate, coloristic

drawing unlike anything surviving by cotemporary sculptors, or indeed draughtsman of any kind. This use of pen and ink is completely different from the strict hatching of so many of Bandinelli’s drawings, which, as will be discussed, has often been a defining characteristic of attributions in favour of drawings by sculptors working under the influence of the mature Michelangelo.

Of the three sculptors who assisted Michelangelo in the Medici chapel, there survive far more sheets that can be convincingly ascribed to Raffaello da Montelupo. The first step in the study of these drawings was taken by Bernard Berenson in his fundamental *Drawings of the Florentine Painters*, where he was the first to note Raffaello’s left-handedness. However, the function of many of Raffaello’s sheets remains conjectural, as none of them can be securely linked to surviving finished works by his hand. Nevertheless, there is a substantial group of studies for which a clear motivation can be deduced. In the case of Raffaello da Montelupo, unlike Tribolo or Montorsoli, there is much evidence in his drawings of the direct observation of Michelangelo’s graphic, painted and sculpted works. These drawings include:

1. Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum 1959: copy of what Jannides has shown to be Michelangelo’s drawing of the *Stories of the Brazen Serpent*.  
2. Chantilly, Musée Condé 36 (30): copy after Michelangelo’s *Allegory of Prudence* (Fig. 4.7 and 4.8).  
3. Florence, Uffizi 606 E recto: partial copy of Michelangelo’s *Stories of the Brazen Serpent* in the Ashmolean (Fig. 4.9).  
4. Florence, Uffizi 607 E recto: copy after Medici tomb elevation (Fig. 4.10).

---

185 Berenson, *Drawings*, 256-263.  
186 Raffaello’s authorship of the recto of the double-sided sheet whose verso contains writing by Michelangelo (Casa Buonarotti 6 A) cited by Hartt (Hartt, *Michelangelo Drawings*, 48) and Monbeig Goguel (Monbeig Goguel, *Maestri Toscani*, 18) is, however, not convincing.  
5. Florence, Uffizi 607 E verso: details of the *Times of Day* on the sarcophagi of the Medici tombs (Fig. 4.11).

6. Florence, Uffizi 622 E: copy after a lost page of leg studies by Michelangelo (Fig. 4.12).

7. Florence, Uffizi 17386 F: copy after Michelangelo’s Roboam-Abias lunette from the Sistine ceiling (Fig. 4.13).

8. Lille, Musée des Beaux-Arts inv. Pl. 723-902: several architectural drawings after Michelangelo’s architectural studies and copies.

9. London, British Museum Ff, 1.5: copy after Michelangelo’s *Allegory of Prudence* (Fig. 14).

10. London, Wellcome Library inv. 393461: according to Joannides, this unattributed sheet is a sketch copy by Raffaello of the *Slave* second from the right in Michelangelo’s *modello* for the tomb of Julius II in Berlin (Corpus 56).

11. New York, Christies 30 January 1997, lot 1 sale 8582: according to Joannides, this represents a copy after a lost sketch by Michelangelo made at a preliminary stage in the development of his design for Sebastiano del Piombo’s *Pietà*.

12. Oxford, Ashmolean 1846.131: copy after Michelangelo’s *Infant Bacchanal* at Windsor (Fig. 4.15).

13. Oxford, Ashmolean 1846.27: copy after Michelangelo’s *Evening* and, perhaps, a model for Duke Giuliani (Fig. 4.16).

---

188 Joannides, *Ashmolean*, 327, cat. 76.
189 Ibid., 304, cat. 66.
14. Oxford, Ashmolean 1846.129: copies after lost anatomical sketches by Michelangelo for the seated Dukes in the New Sacristy (Fig. 4.17).

15. Paris, Louvre inv. 715 recto: copy after Michelangelo’s marble *Virgin and Child* in the New Sacristy seen from the left (Fig. 4.18).

16. Paris, Louvre inv. 715 verso: copy after Michelangelo’s marble *Virgin and Child* in the New Sacristy seen from the right (Fig. 4.19).

17. Windsor, Royal Collection 0417 recto: likely copy after a lost ideal head by Michelangelo’s (very similar to the head of *Prudentia*) (Fig. 4.20).

18. Windsor, Royal Collection 0417 verso/ Joannides, 1996, copy after Michelangelo’s Roboam-Abias from the Sistine ceiling (Fig. 4.21).

19. Windsor, Royal Collection 0505 verso; copy after the Windsor version of Michelangelo’s *Fall of Phaeton* (Fig. 4.22).

From these copies, it appears that Raffaello held special interest in Michelangelo’s anatomical studies, his highly finished studies and presentation drawings; and his sculptural works. The copies after Michelangelo’s sculptures are least surprising, given the artists’ common discipline. The anatomical studies are likewise understandable, given their importance to Michelangelo’s own preparatory method, which Raffaello seemed keen to reproduce. Based on the relation of the first two concerns to sculpture, Raffaello’s preoccupation with Michelangelo’s highly pictorial graphic compositions is, however, somewhat surprising. It is furthermore noteworthy that these copies – like mostly all of Raffaello’s graphic output – are executed primarily in pen. It is, of course, possible that the lost drawings of the *Ideal Head* or the

---

*190* For this interest and Michelangelo’s anatomical studies see Hirst, *Michelangelo*, 70.

*191* Raffaello did, like Michelangelo, underdraw many of his pen drawings with chalk. However, his drawing of the *Sleeping Venus* incidentally based upon Michelangelo’s *Dawn* as Joannides points out (Joannides, *Windsor Castle,*
Allegory of Prudence were also executed in pen-and-ink, and even more likely that there exist unidentified chalk drawings by Raffaello da Montelupo. However, Raffaello’s translation of Michelangelo’s designs into pen and ink appears to reflect the younger sculptor’s preference for the medium. This was likely owing to his early training in the workshop of the goldsmith Michelangelo di Viviano, which seems to have produced artists with a particular specialty in this area, not least of whom his son, Baccio Bandinelli.

Raffaello’s copies after Michelangelo were not only important to his own development as an artist, but also for others with whom he worked. The contact between Raffaello and the young Battista Franco, for example, will serve to introduce the interrelationship between artists working in different spheres. Vasari related that Raffaello saw promise in the young Franco’s draughtsmanship and secured for the young painter his first major commission, the painting of four frescoes for the entry of Emperor Charles V on the Ponte S. Angelo in Rome.192 The biographer added that Franco then followed Montelupo to Florence where, following more preparations for the emperor, the younger artist set to work studying Michelangelo’s work in the New Sacristy.193 In fact, Vasari reproached Franco’s early approach to his art, stating, “there remained no sketch, study, or even any thing copied by Michelagnolo that he had not drawn,” but in doing so Franco,

had committed an error in never consenting to draw from the life and to use colours, or to do anything but imitate statues and little else besides, which had given his manner a hardness and dryness that he was not able to shake off, nor could he prevent his works from having a hard and angular quality, as may be seen from a canvas in which he depicted with much pains and labour the Roman Lucretia violated by Tarquinius.194

60), which leaves the figure of Venus mostly in chalk and the Cambridge sheet (1932.154) and the Oxford drawings after Michelangelo’s leg studies are exceptions among the many pen studies by Montelupo.
A sheet at Lille (Joannides, Windsor, 64, fig. 53) by Raffaello of Tityus or Prometheus, while not a direct copy, also deserves mention in order to demonstrate the impact of Michelangelo’s presentation drawings upon his younger assistant.
192 Vasari, Lives, vol. 8, 89.
193 Ibid., 91.
The technical execution of a preparatory sketch in the British Museum (Fig. 4.23) convincingly connected to this lost painting is particularly interesting in light of Franco’s early connection to Raffaello da Montelupo. As Anne Varick Lauder pointed out, Franco’s early drawings – of which there are many -- are very much influenced by Raffaello’s graphic approach and the figural types of Michelangelo. The recto of the London drawing, which Lauder described as characteristic of these early pen-and-ink studies, bears the impress of Montelupo’s economical use of thin, closely spaced parallel hatchings enclosed within thicker, more emphatic contours, as can be seen on a sheet by Raffaello in the same collection (Fig. 4.24). Evidently, Franco was also influenced by the peculiar distortions of form found in Raffaello’s studies after Michelangelo. This can be seen when Raffaello’s study in the Ashmolean (Fig. 4.16) is compared with Franco’s contemporary study at the Agnes Etherington Art Centre in Kingston (Fig. 4.25).

It stands to reason that Franco, who was evidently in contact with Montelupo, would have been keen to copy the sculptor’s drawings, as the latter had worked directly with Michelangelo and had access to the master’s original designs, which Franco, as Vasari related, was eager to copy. For instance, Raffaello’s copy (Fig. 4.15) seems to have been the source of Franco’s knowledge of Michelangelo’s *Infant Bacchanal*, figures from which Franco used in his *Deposition* at the Villa Guinigi in Lucca, which predates the circulation of prints after the master’s drawing. Nevertheless, Lauder’s assertion that Franco’s early drawings are “reminiscent of sculptor’s drawings” is misleading. Instead, the general concordance of the

---

196 Ibid., 95.
198 Lauder, “Absorption and Interpretation,” 95.
pen technique suggests the influence of the older artist upon the younger, and demonstrates the commonality of graphic vocabulary among many artists working with the pen in the first half of the sixteenth century. Indeed, as John Shearman noted of the few pen-and-ink drawings by Andrea del Sarto, “they are highly personal, perhaps the most idiosyncratic of the whole graphic work; nevertheless there is a strong kinship with the pen drawings of his Florentine contemporaries, especially with those of the early Bandinelli, Pontormo and Jacone, Sarto’s pupil.”

Not only was the content of Raffaello’s drawings influential for painters like Battista Franco, but motifs also found their way into the drawings of sculptors. Such a case is proved, in my opinion, by the appearance of a figural motif found in a study for a Lamentation by Guglielmo della Porta (Fig. 4.26).200 As Carolyn Valone has shown, Giovanni Antonio Dosio collaborated with Guglielmo and translated the drawing in question into a finished presentation drawing for the Carafa Chapel at San Silvestro al Quirinale.201 Valone also demonstrated that the mutual collaboration continued after Dosio’s departure from Raffaello da Montelupo’s workshop in the 1550s.202 Through this relationship, it would seem that della Porta gained access to Raffaello’s designs, including the figural motif on a drawing in the British Museum (Fig. 4.27). The figure is typical of Montelupo, not only in the searching contours and sparse parallel hatching, but also in the *pentimenti* found in the left leg, which appears striding in front of the right and also extending straight down. Raffaello’s propensity to shift the position of the limb

200 Werner Gramberg, *Die Düsseldorfer Skizzenbücher des Guglielmo della Porta*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Mann, 1964), cat. no. 74.
from a fixed joint, like Leonardo’s *Vitruvian Man*, appears on a number of other sheets. In Guglielmo’s study, which I believe to have derived from a copy by Dosio after Montelupo, the position of the legs is much clearer, but the idiosyncratic crossed arms and the now ichnographically inexplicable bearing of weight are both kept.

Raffaello’s architectural sketchbook at Lille, like his copies after Michelangelo, seems to have served a recognizable function. The sketchbook is mostly composed of copies after other architectural studies and may have been intended, as Nesselrath argues, to form an architectural treatise. The sketchbook demonstrates Raffaello’s eagerness to copy the graphic works of others and also serves as a reminder of his work as an architect. It relates to the well-established tradition of assembled copies after monuments in Rome such as those by the Florentine circle of Cronaca, Bramante, Raphael, the Sangallo family and Michelangelo himself. The copies after those made by Raffaello by Giovanni Antonio Dosio who, as mentioned above, was in the habit of copying studies by his master, further emphasize Montelupo’s position within this tradition of copying and recopying. For the present discussion, however, the studies are noteworthy because of their format.

As with the numerous studies mentioned above, Raffaello’s architectural drawings are presented in several views: plans, elevations, perspective views and, sometimes, cross-sections.

---

203 The verso of Ashmolean 1846.131 with the figure whose right arm is both raised above his head and down by his side; the standing figure on the Cambridge sheet (1932.154) whose right leg extends both straight down and out from his hip; the study in the Rijksmuseum (1981-23) which features a sleeping woman whose arm both holds up her shroud and raised above her head.

204 Jean-Baptiste Wicar who believed the studies to be by Michelangelo once owned the sketchbook. This attribution was first challenged in 1866 by Charles Benignat and was subsequently changed to Aristotile and Giovanni Battista da Sangallo. In 1983 Arnold Nesselrath showed that Raffaello da Montelupo executed the majority of the studies, leaving only a small number of the drawings to Aristotile da Sangallo. For a full history of the sketchbook see Frédérique Lemerle, “Livre de dessins de Michel-Ange,” in *Catalogue des dessins Italiens du Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille*, ed. Barbara Brejon de Lavergnée (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1997), 283-289.


207 See, for example, Nesselrath, “I li libri di disegni,” figs. 102 and 103.
As Charles Davis pointed out, this implicit practice of schematic representation of architecture is analogous to the essential -- albeit less formalized -- exercise of drawing forms from multiple angles in preparation for sculpture. This practice was also common for draughtsman recording antique (or modern) statues. Davis emphasized this point by drawing attention to two studies (among the many available), now combined to a single page at Lille (Fig. 4.32), which show Raphael (Sanzio) studying the head of an antique Gaul from front and side angles, as well as a letter from Anibale Caro to Vasari requesting a drawing of a Venus, drawn form every side (disegnasse da ogni banda). Such a practice is paralleled in Raphael’s letter to Pope Leo X, in which he describes the method by which architectural drawings were to be made showing the floor plan, an interior view and an exterior view.

Davis’s observation of the prevalent use of the graphic technique amongst antiquarians, architects and sculptors is an important one, but it extends further to include painters. For instance, several studies of live models from multiple viewpoints on the same sheet survive by Pontormo who used the procedure when fixing the pose of figures to be painted (Fig. 4.33). This technique was taken even further in the second half of the century by Poppi, a painter who trained in Vasari’s studiolo. In a sketchbook, now disassembled in the Uffizi, Poppi executed

\[\text{(Figs. 4.28-4.31)}.\]


\[\text{211}\] Ibid, 265 as note 19.

\[\text{212}\] The study at Lille (Janet Cox Rearick, The Drawings of Pontormo, vol.2 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), 119-20, cat. 24)) for the figure on the stairs in The Baker Taken to Execution and the Butler Restored to Office, examines the model from three angles that was misattributed to Ammanati in the late 19th century. A relatively recently discovered drawing by Pontormo investigates a model from front and side views (Janet Cox Rearick, “Aggiunte al Corpus dei disegni del Pontormo: 1981-1994,” in Pontormo e Rosso: Atti del convegno di Empoli e Volterra Progetto Appiani di Piombino, eds., Roberto P. Ciardi and Antonio Natali (Firenze: Giunta, 1996), 64-65, fig. 43)). Interestingly, this drawing is quite similar in pose to a sketch in the Uffizi (Cox Rearick, The Drawings of Pontormo, 186, cat. 150), which investigates a live model – in several different poses – from front and side views. Finally, a study also connected with the lunette fresco at Poggio a Caiano (Cox Rearick, The Drawings of Pontormo, vol.2, 186-87, cat. 151) searches the pose for a putto holding a branch from front and side views.
several highly finished drawings that include a number of multi-viewed studies after antique sculpture and live models. In one instance, the artist’s preoccupation with capturing the various views of a figure prompted him to record nine views of the right side of a model’s head (Fig. 4.34). Raffaello da Montelupo, like Bandinelli, seems to have used this technique quite sparingly and, in Raffaello’s case, only when working after existing models. This is the case with the artist’s two studies mentioned above of Michelangelo’s Medici Madonna (Figs. 4.18 and 4.19). This seems also to have been the case for a drawing, in Paris (Fig. 4.35) that features a crucified Christ seen from front and side views, which is likely based, as Joannides noted, on a lost drawing by Michelangelo similar to his study in Haarlem (Fig. 4.36).213

The majority of autograph drawings by Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli survive in a codex at the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid. They had been assembled by Montorsoli’s student Giovanni Vincenzo Casale who, although originally from Florence, later lived in Spain and Portugal.214 Many of the drawings concern architectural projects, including designs for the remodeling of the presbytery and crossing dome of the abbey church of San Matteo in Genoa, where Montorsoli lived from 1543 to 1547.215 Montorsoli’s drawings in the Madrid portfolio also take the form of designs for church architecture and ornamentation, such as those for the architectural elements of the altar screen for Santa Maria dei Servi in Bologna, where the artist worked from 1558 to 1561.216 There are, however, also some drawings related to Montorsoli’s sculptural commissions.

The first of these drawings is related to Montorsoli’s well-known Neptune Fountain in Messina, dating from the middle 1550s (Fig. 4.37). First, this drawing is important because it

213 Joannides, Windsor Castle, 96.
216 Ibid., 145-146 and figs. 10.9 and 10.10.
goes far to authenticate a finished drawing of the fountain at the Uffizi and another at the Musée Fabre at Montepellier (Figs. 4.40 and 4.41). In the Madrid drawing, Neptune (Fig. 4.38), Scylla (Fig. 4.39) and a summarily sketched Charybdis are underdrawn in chalk in identical poses to the pen and wash figures of the Uffizi and Montpellier sheets. The figures in all three drawings deviate from the poses of the finished sculptures, now in the Museo Nazionale in Messina. Although the original marble figures have been damaged, noticeable differences between the sculptures and the drawings include the raised arm, straightened head and stiffened pose of Neptune (Fig. 4.42); and the reduction in the sea monsters’ outward lean and direct upward gaze (Figs. 4.43 and 4.44).217

In the Madrid study for the Neptune Fountain the figures were left only as indications, while the architectural base – the focus of the study – was carefully overdrawn with ruled pen lines. The design for the fountain’s base is significant, because the original marble platform was damaged in an earthquake in 1908, and the fountain was rebuilt without the original base.218 As a result, the Madrid drawing survives as an important record of Montorsoli’s original design. The Madrid study is also indicative of the care with which Montorsoli considered both the architectural and sculptural elements of the work. Such care permeates the Madrid portfolio, noticeably in a more rapid sketch and a finished lateral elevation that integrate the two elements in the altar screen for Santa Maria dei Servi (Figs. 4.45 and 4.46). This concern is of particular interest, given Montorsoli’s short tenure with Michelangelo on the Medici tombs, which were as Wilde put it, “the climax of a sequence of works, and projects for works, of a particular kind [in

217 Walter Vizthum, “The Accademia del Disegno at the Uffizi [Exhibition],” Master Drawings 1 (1963): 57. As Vizthum pointed out, “drawings such as Uffizi 943 E…and its excellent replica at Montpellier…should not be discarded…Rather than copies of Montorsoli’s Neptune fountain at Messina, they may well be finished designs done as records; we know from other Florentine academicians how prone they were to repeat themselves verbatim.” The drawings at the Uffizi and the Musée Fabre seem to be works by Montorsoli or very close copies after a lost original.
218 Kubler, “Montorsoli in Madrid,” 145.
which] an assembly of statues was placed, or was to be placed, in an architectural framework
designed by the artist himself for this purpose."219 The commonality of graphic techniques
among the different artistic disciplines had a corresponding integration of the arts united by their
foundation in disegno, epitomized by the work of il Divino.

The Madrid drawings are also important as evidence for the rejection of other drawings
ascribed to Montorsoli. The graphic technique and, as Caroline Elam pointed out, the
handwriting on the Madrid studies rules out the drawings tentatively attributed to Montorsoli by
Mazzino Fossi in the 1963 exhibition I fondatori dell’accademia delle arte del disegno.220 The
Madrid sheets also go far to substantiate the study at the Harvard Art Museums for a fountain,
published by Walter Vizthum (Fig. 4.47).221 The Harvard study, in addition to an old attribution,
agrees well with the Madrid sheets connected with sculpture, especially the short curved strokes
that define the musculature of the chest and abdomen of the rightmost Triton, which are also
found in the figures for the altar screen for Santa Maria dei Servi (Fig. 4.48). The same cannot,
however, be said for the Louvre sheet often associated with Montorsoli (Fig. 4.49), 222 although it
cannot be absolutely ruled out. This type of pen-and-ink study which uses wash extensively
poses a particularly difficult attributional challenge. Although the subject matter is generally
related to Montorsoli’s fountains, the figures themselves cannot be connected with a known
work. The sheet, therefore, remains of uncertain origin.

219 Wilde, British Museum, 114.
220 For the exhibition and the attributions to Montorsoli see Paola Barocchi, Adelaide Bianchini, Anna Forlani and
Mazzino Fossi eds., Mostra di disegni dei fondatori dell’Accademia delle arti del disegno nel IV centenario della
fondazione (Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1963), 30-32, nos. 22-24. For Elam’s rejection of these attributions see Caroline
32. See also Vizthum, “Accademia del Disegno at the Uffizi,” 57. As Vizthum noted, the Lamentation scene given
to Montorsoli “is a feeble copy after a Bandinelli drawing in the Louvre.” It also seems quite possible that no. 22,
which bears an eighteenth century inscription to Montorsoli, falls under the arbitrary attribution of this type of pen-
and-ink drawing – also connected with Bandinelli -- discussed immediately below in relation to the misattribution of
Tribolo’s drawings.
221 Vizthum, “Accademia del Disegno at the Uffizi,” 101, plate 41.
222 Catherine Monbeig Goguel, Vasari et son temps; maîtres toscans nés après 1500, mort avant 1600 (Paris:
Éditions des Musées nationaux, 1972), 76, cat. 78.
Similarly, the Madrid studies do not, in the current author’s opinion, provide enough evidence to confirm Middeldorf and Elam’s hypothesis that Montorsoli was responsible for the relatively recently discovered mural drawings at San Lorenzo.\footnote{Elam, “Mural Drawings,” 592-602.} The problems surrounding the attribution of this rare type of drawing involve difficult comparisons with studies on paper, but such a hypothesis cannot be completely ruled out. Although this small number of studies provides a fascinating glimpse into the graphic output of Montorsoli, their scarcity and the careful finish of almost all the sheets likely restrict our understanding of the range of the sculptor’s drawings.

Even fewer studies may convincingly be given to the third of Michelangelo’s assistants in the New Sacristy, Niccolò Tribolo. Of the many drawings that have previously been given to Tribolo, those that seem secure -- in that they are preparatory studies for known works -- are two studies in the Louvre. The first is a sheet of quick sketches of an ephemeral equestrian monument executed in 1539 on the occasion of Cosimo I’s marriage to Eleonora di Toledo (Fig. 4.50).\footnote{Goguel, \textit{Vasari et son temps}, 146, no. 186 verso.} The second was identified by Herbert Keutner as a sketch (Fig. 4.51) connected to Tribolo’s bronze \textit{Pan} in the Bargello, dated to the summer of 1549.\footnote{Ibid., 145, no. 184 verso. See also Herbert Keutner, “Niccolò Tribolo und Antonio Lorenzi. Der Äskulapbrunnen im Heilkräutergarten der Villa Castello bei Florenz,” in \textit{Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Plastik: Festschrift Theodor Müller zum 19. April, 1965}, eds. Kurt Martin and Theodor Müller (München: Hirmer Verlag, 1995), 240-41.} Both of these sheets feature the same graphic shorthand and functioned to fix the designs of the respective projects.

On the recto of the sheet with the study for \textit{Pan} is a drawing connected to Tribolo’s \textit{Asclepius} in the Villa Medici at Castello (c. 1537-38, Fig. 4.52).\footnote{Goguel, \textit{Vasari et son temps}, 145, no. 184 recto.} In this study, the figure of \textit{Asclepius} has been set within a ruled architectural setting and the technique is, on the whole, more careful than the studies on the verso. The figure of \textit{Asclepius} was, however, shaded with
the same sparse parallel strokes that have been relegated – like the sketch for Pan and the equestrian monument – to the right side of the figures, indicating a light source to the left in each case. Although the drawing for the Asclepius is connected on somewhat less certain grounds, the fact that it is found on the reverse of an evidently authentic sketch and bears similar hatching to more reliable studies suggests that the Asclepius study is authentic.

Based on Keutner’s publications, Wiebke Aschoff suggested a similar study in the Soane Museum (Fig. 4.53) and another the Staatliche Museum in Berlin (Fig. 4.54). Aschoff connected both of these studies with the grottoes in the Villa Medici at Castello, but these drawings are difficult to authenticate. The execution of this type of wash drawing was relatively standardized, especially for drawings of sculpture set within architecture. For example, the careful studies associated with tomb of Julius II and those with the Medici at San Lorenzo do not resemble the graphic traits that characterize Michelangelo’s drawings. A similar difficulty surrounds another careful drawing in the Uffizi (Fig. 4.55) connected by Keutner with the tomb of Matteo Corte (c. 1544-48), a project with which Tribolo was associated. It should be cautioned that Tribolo did not work on any of these projects independently, and although the designs are similar there does not exist a strong link between them and any securely attributed works by Tribolo.

Despite the lack of securely attributed drawings by Tribolo, the recent history of sheets assigned to Tribolo provides an instructive case of the dangers in ascribing drawings on the basis of their ‘sculptural’ graphic technique, and demonstrates the much more fluid state of

---

228 See Hirst, Michelangelo, 82-83. See also Michael Hirst, “A Project of Michelangelo's for the Tomb of Julius II,” Master Drawings 14 (1976): 375-382. Here, Hirst noted the same was true for painters such as Pontormo and Rosso, who both employed the technique in the 1520s.
230 For example, Vasari relates that Antonio Lorenzi executed the marble Asclepius under Tribolo’s direction, assisted with the fountains of the Villa Medici, and executed the tomb of Matteo Corte under Tribolo (Vasari, Lives, vol. 10, 30).
draughtsmanship amongst different artistic spheres. Much of the confusion surrounding the scholarship of drawings attributed to Tribolo derives from a study of eight figures in the Louvre (Fig. 4.56), drawn in pen and ink and carrying an old inscription, cut off at the left of the sheet that reads: “…il / Tribolo scultorre / et Architetto Fio. / il anno 1550.”231 This sheet was connected to several others, most importantly to two drawings in the British Museum (formerly of the Fenwick collection) which carry old pencil inscriptions to Rosso Fiorentino on their mounts,232 but which were catalogued in 1935 by A.E. Popham as part of a group of six drawings by the sculptor Vincenzo Danti.233 In 1956, Karl Parker sought to invalidate Popham’s attribution by citing the Louvre drawing, the inscription on which he considered to be a signature by Tribolo, dated 1530.234 Parker noted the style of the drawings was “clearly that of a sculptor strongly under the influence of Michelangelo” and pointed out several other drawings that he believed to be by the same hand.235 The “signed” sheet in the Louvre also became the basis upon which John Shearman attributed a red chalk study in the Louvre to Tribolo.236

These attributions, with the exception of Shearman’s, were upheld by Christopher Lloyd who published the group under Tribolo’s name, citing Parker’s attribution and the Louvre inscription.237 However, in 1976 James Byam Shaw – following the advice of Ulrich Middeldorf—ascribed the entire group to the painter Jacone, a pupil of Andrea del Sarto and

collaborator of Pontormo. Shaw argued that the inscription on the Paris sheet referred not to the artist who had executed the study but rather recorded the death of the artist in that year. Secondly, the author cited Middeldorf’s discovery of two stylistically similar drawings in the Uffizi that bear inscriptions to Jacone’s name. Accordingly, the group of pen-and-ink drawings distinguished by unusual facial types and tapering, abbreviated limbs executed with broken outlines and close parallel hatching, as observed by Lloyd, have all in subsequent critical literature been unanimously attributed to Jacone.

The core group of the sheets is supported not only by the old inscription on Uffizi 882 F, but also by Vasari’s description of Jacone’s drawings, which he says were executed with “great boldness; and he was very fantastic and bizarre in the posing of his figures, distorting them and seeking to make them varied and different from those of others in all his compositions.” In this case, the re-assignment en masse of the drawings formerly attributed to Tribolo to Jacone – a painter -- underlines the fallacy of insisting that there is a sculptural type of draughtsmanship.

The move also serves to emphasize the interchanges between different artistic specializations of the sixteenth century. The drawings of Jacone, as Monbeig Goguel has discussed, owe much to

239 Ibid, 61.
240 Ibid. These are listed as “inv. 850, Two Women, two Children, and a reclining Youth in pen and ink, inscribed Giacone fiorentino in contemporary hand; and 344 F.” “Inv. 850” is likely a misprint of 882 F which matches Byam Shaw’s description of subject matter and inscription and appears corrected by Nicholas Turner (Turner, *Florentine Drawings*, 158) in a summary of Shaw’s attribution (although Turner incorrectly describes the conclusion as independent of, instead of derived from Middeldorf’s.) Incidentally, Catherine Monbeig Goguel misprinted the Uffizi sheet as well in her description of Shaw and Middeldorf’s attribution citing Uffizi 882 E in Monbeig Goguel, *Maestri Toscenti*, 13. In my opinion the chalk study cannot serve as a basis for comparison to the pen-and-ink drawings attributed to Jacone. On the other hand, Uffizi 882F does, in the main, agree with the Christ Church sheets and the figure at lower left in his altarpiece for S. Maria del Calcinaio.
241 Lloyd, “Tribolò,” 243. Interestingly, Catherine Monbeig Goguel had been aware of Middeldorf’s hypothesis in 1972 when she catalogued the sixteenth-century Tuscan drawings at the Louvre, and she supported the proposed attributions to Jacone except for the study for eight figures with the old inscription. However, the current online entry for the sheet on the Louvre website, as of 22 July 2013, notes that Monbeig Goguel has supported the attribution to Jacone of this study since 2004.
the graphic approach of Baccio Bandinelli. Furthermore, she explained that the likely intersection between the two artists was a product of their mutual friendship with the goldsmith Piloto, with whom, Vasari tells us, Bandinelli learned to draw as a youth in his father’s workshop. This line of influence does much to confirm Vasari’s statement regarding the “close relationship” and “constant interchange” between the workshops of painters and goldsmiths. Indeed, the artist who learns the fundamental art of disegno in the goldsmith’s workshop, before he is attracted to another artistic sphere, runs something like a leitmotif throughout Lives of many painters, sculptors and printmakers.

The case of Bandinelli’s influence is an interesting one, and goes further to demonstrate both the confluence of the arts in the sixteenth century and the misleading notion of a common type of draughtsmanship employed by sculptors. As already mentioned, Bandinelli was exceptional in post-Leonardo Italy for his preference for pen over chalk. His students and other sculptors of the Cinquecento shared this preference – although the graphic approach of the latter group, as will be discussed below, differs from Bandinelli’s. As a result, Bandinelli’s name has been historically used to classify many sixteenth-century drawings in pen that feature planes of parallel or cross-hatching in order to achieve chiaroscuro effects.

William Young Ottley (1771-1836) connected the association of this type of drawing with sculpture as early as 1823 in his Italian School of Design: a series of fac-similes of original Drawings by the most eminent Painters and Sculptors of Italy. First, Ottley connected pen-and-
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245 Vasari, Lives, vol. 3, 247
246 For painters, Vasari mentions Masolino, Ghirlandaio, Botticelli, Francesco Francia, Timoteo da Urbino, Lorenzo di Credi, Baldassare Peruzzi, Andrea del Sarto, Francesco Salviati and the author himself. For Sculptors he mentions Luca della Robbia, Lorenzo Ghiberti, Brunelleschi, Paolo Romano, Lorenzo Vecchietti, Antonio Pollaiuolo, Verrocchio, Baccio Bandinelli, Cellini and Vincenzo Danti. Finally, for printmakers he mentions Maso Finiguerra and Baccio Baldini.
ink drawings which he considered to be by Donatello with those by Baccio Bandinelli. The sheets were in fact, as Anna Forlani Tempesti has shown, by Giovanni Bandini, Bandinelli’s pupil, and, thus they resemble his teacher’s drawings.\footnote{Anna Forlani Tempesti, “Disegni di ‘Apostoli’ di Giovanni Bandini,” Prospettiva 57-60 (1989): 66-73.} In addition to linking the Quattrocento and Cinquecento drawing techniques of sculptors, Ottley continued, “Next to Michelangiolo, Baccio Bandinelli merits, perhaps, to be considered as the greatest designer of the Florentine school of the period...he sometimes gave to his studies of naked figures, a grandeur and purity of style, nearly resembling what we so much admire in the productions of ancient Greek art.”\footnote{Forlani Tempesti, “Disegni di ‘Apostoli’,” 68-69.} In so doing, Ottley not only expressed the notion that the technique employed was common amongst important sculptors separated by a century, but the appearance of the drawings was itself inherently sculptural, reminiscent of the noble grandeur of ancient Greek statuary so admired by his neo-classicist predecessors. This is not to say that Ottley was responsible for the notion of the ‘sculptor’s drawing’, rather that his analysis provides an early example of a tendency that would repeat itself: the view that all drawings that resemble Bandinelli’s or Michelangelo’s early pen technique are inherently sculptural. This view, for example, seems to have formed the basis of Popham’s attribution to Danti, despite the lack of connection to any of the artist’s works, and Parker’s statement that the drawings later attributed to Jacone were clearly executed by a sculptor.

Like his influence on Jacone, Bandinelli’s impact upon a number of important painters and draughtsmen can be traced through several different connections, often in greater detail. In this regard, it should be remembered first that the drawings of Bandinelli’s contemporary and collaborator Rosso share his juxtapositions of planes of light and shade. Consequently, attributions between these two have been the source of much debate. Similarly, there exists a
history of critical confusion surrounding Passarotti’s boldly crosshatched pen-and-ink studies, which have often been mislabelled as Bandinelli’s. It seems to the current author that the similarities between the two styles is less likely to be a result of direct exchanges of graphic material, as was suggested by Joannides, and more probably owe a debt to common sources in contemporary engravings, a medium with which both artists also worked. It is also noteworthy that Bandinelli’s reputation as a draughtsman and his self-promotion through his drawings caused his designs to be used by painters. As Janet Cox-Rearick has illustrated, a modello by Bandinelli submitted to Cosimo de’ Medici formed the genesis of Bronzino’s altarpiece of the Lamentation for the Chapel of Eleonora di Toledo in the Palazzo Vecchio. Likewise, Cox-Rearick also noted Borghini’s claim that Alessandro Allori, Bronzino’s pupil, painted a Deposition after a Bandinelli drawing. Moreover, Bandinelli directly impacted the draughtsmanship of younger painters who trained in his workshop.

In his Life of Francesco Salviati, Vasari related that he was placed in Bandinelli’s workshop by Ippolito de’ Medici where he recruited his friend Salviati “with great advantage to them both, for the reason that while working together they learned more and made greater progress in one month than they had done in two years while drawing by themselves.”

Vasari’s early studies after the works of other artists and his own preparatory designs confirm,
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249 Joannides, Windsor Castle, 112.
251 Cox-Rearick, Bronzino’s Chapel, 378 as note 29. “un Deposto di croce ritratto di un disegno del Cavaliere Bandinello.” See also Pierre Rosenberg ed. La Donation Jacques Petithory au Musée Bonnat, Bayonne: Objets d’Art, Sculptures, Peintures, Dessins. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux, 1997, no. 269 (entry by Catherine Monbeig Goguel). This line of influence also seems to have been the basis for Catherine Monbeig Goguel’s attribution to Andrea Boscoli (a student of Sani di Tito who was, in turn, a student of Bronzino and Bandinelli respectively) of a sheet formerly catalogued as a copy after Bandini and as Bandinelli before that.
252 Vasari, Lives, VIII, 163.
among other influences, his debt to Bandinelli’s example (Fig. 4.57). This was to be suppressed in the late 1530s for a more graceful style owing much to Parmigianino when the harder figure types and of planes of pen-and-ink hatchings were increasingly replaced by a more refined elegance and the used of wash for shading. Similarly, Salviati’s debt to his early teacher is attested to by a number of pen-and-ink and chalk drawings which have been erroneously classified under the name of the latter, including a double sided sheet previously attributed to Bandinelli and Ammanati, which was recently attributed to Salviati by Alessandro Nova (Figs. 4.58 and 4.59).

It is useful to remark again that the two models that have served as the epitome as ‘sculptural’ drawings during the sixteenth century, the pen studies of Michelangelo and Bandinelli, were greatly informed by sources that were not sculptural. In Michelangelo’s case his early experiments with crosshatching in pen and ink were influenced by his training with Ghirlandaio – a painter who had trained as a goldsmith – and his observation of northern prints before he had ever picked up a chisel. In Bandinelli’s case, his graphic approach was also influenced in part by prints and served an almost exclusively pictorial function in his preparatory process. Importantly, in both cases, it is not possible to establish on appearances alone whether a given drawing was intended for a work in two-dimensions or three.

Like Tribolo, a number of important central Italian sculptors active in the first half of the sixteenth century have had many attributions proposed to them, but none securely connected to
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their sculptural projects. Such is the case with Jacopo Sansovino.256 A drawing in black and red chalks typically believed to be by Sansovino257 after the Laocoon was first published by Middeldorf in 1932.258 Following this, a double-sided sheet of figure studies also in red and black chalks at the Louvre and, more recently, a study in red chalk for the younger son of Laocoon also in Paris were ascribed to Sansovino.259 There seems to be no evidence against these attributions, but their authenticity must be considered cautiously as none of them can be connected with a known original project by the artist. Similarly, a long list of drawings has been attributed to Vincenzo Danti.260 However, at present the most likely attribution to the artist, made recently by Charles Davis, rests on the validity of an old mount inscription of a drawing at Christ Church and no other comparable material.261 The same case obtains for Bartolommeo Ammanati’s studies for sculpture. Currently, the drawings most closely associated with Ammanati take the form of architectural studies and drawings after monuments.262

An exception to this rule is Pierino da Vinci, a sculptor active in the middle of the sixteenth century. Pierino was briefly apprenticed to Baccio Bandinelli, but soon left to work under Tribolo at the Medici Villa at Castello.263 The extant drawings by Pierino have been catalogued by Britta Kusch-Arnold and feature several architectural studies, as well as rare examples of drawings for goldsmith projects.264 Among these are two studies originally published by Middeldorf that are connected with Pierino’s relief of the Restoration of Pisa (c.

257 Ibid., 377, no. 129.
259 Boucher, Sansovino, 377, nos. 131 and 132.
260 See Davis, “Disegno,” 262, note 13 for a list of the drawings formerly attributed to Danti.
261 Ibid., 230-238.
262 Monbeig Goguel, Meastri Toscani, 17.
1551-52). The earlier of the two is a loose sketch at the Uffizi (Fig. 4.60) executed in black chalk that is concerned with organizing a multitude of figures within a narrow band of depth. A second version of this design at Chatsworth (Fig. 4.61), executed in pen and ink with an underdrawing in black chalk, describes the scene with greater clarity. Based on the technique of these drawings, Wilde identified two other studies (not included by Kush-Arnold). The first is a black chalk study at the British Museum (Fig. 4.62) derived, as Wilde noted, from Michelangelo’s Sistine ceiling frescoes, in preparation for Pierino’s relief of the *Death of Count Ugolino and his Sons* for Luca Martini.\(^{265}\) The second is a black chalk study of figures in the Uffizi (Fig. 4.63) considered by Wilde to be a scene of the *Raising of Lazarus*.\(^{266}\) Significantly, this drawing exhibits, “one of the first attempts in Italian art at adopting the style of the ‘Last Judgment’ in a monumental history, and shows at an early stage the peculiar calligraphy and shorthand in which Pierino and other artists of his generation tried to reproduce Michelangelo’s forms in drawing”.\(^{267}\)

For our purposes, it is noteworthy that in both examples published by Wilde, Pierino’s sources were Michelangelo’s painted works. Wilde’s statement concerning the similarity of Pierino’s shorthand to other late-century imitators of Michelangelo serves to illustrate the continued interdisciplinary graphic approach among artists – both painters and sculptors -- of the sixteenth century, based strongly on the example of the influential master.


\(^{267}\) Wilde, “Ugolino Episode,” 127.
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Fig. 4.7. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Prudentia*, Chantilly, Musée Condé.

Fig. 4.8. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Prudentia* (verso of Fig. 4.7), Chantilly, Musée Condé.
Fig. 4.9. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Brazen Serpent* in the Ashmolean, Florence, Uffizi.

Fig. 4.10. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s design for the Medici tombs, Florence, Uffizi.

Fig. 4.11. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s designs for the *Times of Day* (verso of Fig. 4.10, Florence, Uffizi.)
Fig. 4.12. Raffaello da Montelupo, derived from Michelangelo’s studies of legs, Florence, Uffizi.
Fig. 4.13. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s Roboam-Abias lunette from the Sistine ceiling, Florence, Uffizi.
Fig. 4.14. Raffaello da Montelupo, after Michelangelo’s *Prudentia*, London, British Museum.
Fig. 4.15. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Infant Bacchanal*, Oxford, Ashmolean.

Fig. 4.16. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Evening* and, perhaps, a model for Duke Giuliani, Oxford, Ashmolean.
Fig. 4.17. Raffaello da Montelupo, copies after lost anatomical sketches by Michelangelo (perhaps for the seated Dukes in the New Sacristy), Oxford, Ashmolean.
Fig. 4.18. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Medici Madonna*, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.19. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy after Michelangelo’s *Medici Madonna* (verso of Fig. 4.18), Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.20. Raffaello da Montelupo, likely a copy after a lost ideal head by Michelangelo (similar to the head of Prudentia), Windsor, Royal Library.
Fig. 4.21. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy of Michelangelo’s *Abias* from the Sistine ceiling and a study of a male figure (verso of Fig. 4.20), Windsor, Royal Library.
Fig. 4.22. Raffaello da Montelupo, copy of Michelangelo’s *Fall of Phaeton*, Windsor, Royal Library.
Fig. 4.23. Battista Franco, study for Tarquin attacking Lucretia, London British Museum.
Fig. 4.24. Raffaello da Montelupo, studies of a lioness, a horse’s leg and architecture, London, British Museum.

Fig. 4.25. Battista Franco, study of a reclining male nude with a mask and another figure, Kingston, Agnes Etherington Art Centre.
Fig. 4.26. Guglielmo della Porta, study for a *Lamentation*, Düsseldorf, Kunstmuseum.
Fig. 4.27. Raffaello da Montelupo, studies of figures, London, British Museum.
Fig. 4.28. Raffaello da Montelupo, perspective elevation of the *Tempietto* at San Pietro in Montorio, Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts.
Fig. 4.29. Raffaello da Montelupo, interior perspective elevation of the Tempietto at San Pietro in Montorio (verso of Fig. 4.28), Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts.
Fig. 4.30. Raffaello da Montelupo, perspective elevation and an elevation of the doorway of the Tempietto at San Pietro in Montorio, Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts.
Fig. 4.31. Raffaello da Montelupo, plan and interior elevation of the *Tempietto* at San Pietro in Montorio, Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts.
Fig. 4.32. Raphael, studies of an antique Gaul and a reclining Silenus, Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts.
Fig. 4.33. Pontormo (Jacopo Carucci), studies of a nude male, Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts.
Fig. 4.34. Poppi (Francesco Morandini), studies of a head, Florence, Uffizi.
Fig. 4.35. Raffaello da Montelupo, *Crucifixion*, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.36. Michelangelo, *Crucifixion*, Haarlem, Teylers Museum.
Fig. 4.37. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, study for the *Neptune Fountain*, Biblioteca Nacional.
Fig. 4.38. Detail of Fig. 4.37.
Fig. 4.39. Detail of Fig. 4.37.
Fig. 4.40. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, design for the Neptune Fountain, Florence, Uffizi.
Fig. 4.41. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, design for the *Neptune Fountain*, Montpellier, Musée Fabre.
Fig. 4.42. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, Neptune, Messina, Museo Nazionale.
Fig. 4.43. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, Scylla, Messina, Museo Nazionale.
Fig. 4.44. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, Charybdis, Museo, Nazionale.
Fig. 4.45. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, sketch for the altar screen for Santa Maria dei Servi, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional.
Fig. 4.46. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, elevation of altar screen for Santa Maria dei Servi seen from the south, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional.
Fig. 4.47. Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, sketch for a fountain, Cambridge, Harvard Art Museums.
Fig. 4.48. Detail of Fig. 4.46.
Fig. 4.49. Attributed to Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, Tritons and sea monsters, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.50. Niccolò Tribolo, study for an equestrian monument, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.51. Niccolò Tribolo, studies for *Pan*, of a satyr and various figures, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.52. Niccolò Tribolo, design for the *Asclepius Fountain* (recto of Fig. 4.51), Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.53. Attributed to Niccolò Tribolo, design for a fountain, London, John Soane Museum.
Fig. 4.54. Attributed to Niccolò Tribolo, design for a fountain, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.
Fig. 4.55. Attributed to Niccolò Tribolo, design for the tomb of Matteo Corte, Florence, Uffizi.
Fig. 4.56. Unknown draughtsman, a study of eight figures, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.57. Giorgio Vasari, *Christ in the House of Mary and Martha*, Paris, Louvre.
Fig. 4.58. Francesco Salviati, study of a nude male, New York, Michael Hall collection.

Fig. 4.59. Francesco Salviati, study of a nude male (verso of Fig. 4.58), New York, Michael Hall collection.
Fig. 4.60. Pierino da Vinci, study for the *Restoration of Pisa*, Florence, Uffizi.

Fig. 4.61. Pierino da Vinci, study for the *Restoration of Pisa*, Derbyshire, Chatsworth House.
Fig. 4.62. Pierino da Vinci, study for the *Death of Count Ugolino*, London, British Museum.
Fig. 4.63. Pierino da Vinci, study for a *Raising of Lazarus* (?), Florence, Uffizi.
Summary/Conclusion

Until the fifteenth century, the notion of a sculptor creating his own graphic designs for his project was novel. Before that time, when a sculptor required a drawing for contractual purposes, he was given recourse to a painter or draughtsman. The first sculptors who regularly created their own drawings emerged from the workshops of goldsmiths. Importantly, this was the same training received by many contemporary painters, and, increasingly, Florentine artists were moving towards a multi-disciplinary approach in various media. The earliest graphic output of the fifteenth century by sculptors seems to have taken the form of contract drawings, but this output soon included – in the extant material -- preparatory studies in which the artist explored various solutions to specific artistic problems. These exploratory studies, and indeed draughtsmanship of all types, were propelled forward at the turn of the century by Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo.

Leonardo’s few drawings that may be connected with sculpture exhibit an approach to form that prioritizes the figure’s surface plasticity and multiple viewpoints that function to describe a three-dimensional presence (Fig. 1.9). Significantly, however, Leonardo’s drawings of the human figure that cannot be connected with any known sculptural project exhibit equal attention to the sculptural presence of form, and his practice of drawing the human body from various points of view also permeates his anatomical studies (Figs. 1.10 and 1.11).

Similarly, Michelangelo’s drawings for both painting and sculpture prioritize a sculptural appearance to the human figure. Although Michelangelo’s drawings for sculpture exhibit the clearest and most detailed of his anatomical study of surface structure (Fig. 2.32), the approach also pervades his studies for painting, which in some rare cases have even been studied from multiple points of view (Fig. 2.40). Moreover, the other characteristics that have been associated
with the artist’s sculptural preoccupations, such as his densely crosshatched studies and his quick preparatory sketches, are demonstrably not motivated by their intended media. Like Leonardo, Michelangelo thought on paper in profoundly three-dimensional terms, regardless of whether the study was to be sculpted.

Unlike those by Leonardo and Michelangelo, Baccio Bandinelli’s drawings are insistently flat. Ironically, of the many surviving sheets by Bandinelli, who is known almost exclusively as a sculptor, only a handful can be connected with sculptural projects in the round. The great number of surviving studies executed in pen and ink – the medium with which he became inextricably linked – has had a profound impact on the critical literature concerned with drawings by sculptors.

Many of the attributions made to sculptors of the early sixteenth century have been informed by the characteristics of Bandinelli’s pen-and-ink drawings and, to a lesser extent, the early pen-and-ink drawings by Michelangelo, which have repeatedly been seen as inherently sculptural. Many of these attributions, however, are open to question. Instead, the small number of drawings by these sculptors, although often executed in pen-and-ink, take many different forms and defy a generic type. When seen against the larger background of sixteenth-century draughtsmanship, it can be observed that this small corpus generally agrees with the contemporary practice of painters.

It appears that the notion of a sculptural type of drawing has been imposed on the surviving evidence and not one that has been derived from it. Although some drawings exhibit a functional approach that is motivated by the three-dimensionality of the final medium, such an approach is not mutually inclusive to drawings for sculpture. Furthermore, the drawings by sculptors employ a technical approach that is indistinguishable from the procedure employed by
painters. This similarity in technique is understandable considering the commonality of training received by painters and sculptors alike and the interchange between the arts in the sixteenth century.
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