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ABSTRACT

Unbeknownst to the public and many scholars, the vast majority of ancient sculptural works – which are displayed in museums and cited in many textbooks as original and canonical pieces – are actually extensively restored eighteenth-century variations. Although during that time period extensive, and often creative, restoration was a well accepted practice, this does call into question the authenticity of these pieces and their usefulness as paradigms of ancient art.

This is especially true for one of the most iconic and well known of ancient sculptural works - the Discobolus. The original bronze statue of a young nude discus thrower was created in the mid-fifth century BC by the Greek artist Myron. The original sculpture no longer exists. The extant works are all restorations of Roman marble copies with linkage to an extremely prolific eighteenth-century Italian sculptor and restorer, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi.

This dissertation explores the work and practice of Cavaceppi during the early period of Neoclassicism, with special emphasis on the restoration of five different variants of the Discobolus. It begins with an examination of the original Greek statue and why so many Roman copies were made. The main focus, however, is on the variations that were introduced when the Roman pieces were restored between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, most notably those connected to the workshop of Cavaceppi. Using the Discobolus as a case study, my intention is to clarify the nature of these restored ancient pieces.
INTRODUCTION

The Problem: Originals, Copies, Restorations and Variants

Students of classical art are taught largely from an accepted canon of works that are ostensibly examples of Greco-Roman art. While these works were originally created in the styles of their respective periods, what is rarely discussed is their extensive restorations. As a student of classical art, it frankly came as a surprise to me that many of the statue attributions are arguable, many poses are conjectural, and that a significant portion of the ancient statues are actually more “modern” or eighteenth-century than antique in fabrication.

Myron’s early classical sculpture of the Discobolus, or Discus Thrower, is just such a case in point and is at the center of this study. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 1.1) Multiple marble copies were made by artisans in the Roman Empire, patterned after Myron’s original, a Greek mid-fifth-century BC bronze statue. When Rome fell in 476 AD, many of these copies were subsequently broken and buried throughout the late antique period, finally reemerging during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Their rediscovery was precipitated by sporadic excavations inspired by the Renaissance and later Neoclassical movements. The eighteenth century in particular saw the birth of archaeology and the collecting of antiquities, which ultimately led to the formation of national museums. It was a period of extensive sculptural restoration, including five different restorations of the Discobolus. This study reexamines these five major variants – chronologically, in the order that they were restored – in an attempt to understand how Myron’s Discobolus came to be depicted as we see it in
museums today. I will also examine some critical aspects of the business and practice of restoration, so as to more fully understand what these copies-variants-objects ultimately represent, what they tell us about the original creative work, and also about the periods in which they were re-created.

First, before broaching the topic of the restored Discobolus, a look back at the inception of the original Greek sculpture and its subsequent Roman copies is in order. Chapter One begins with a short discussion on the work of the sculptor Myron (ca. 480-440 BC). An examination follows of what ancient authors wrote about Myron and his Discobolus. How the ancient Greeks created and perceived sculpture in general is also examined, in order to establish the context for the original statue. Chapter Two shifts the focus to the Roman period where copies of prominent Greek originals were made out of marble. There is a common misconception that Roman art was almost entirely derivative of Greek art, and that the Romans added little originality of their own. This is not true, so an explanation of how the Romans viewed Greek aesthetics, and came to broaden and refine them, is relevant to the topic at hand.

Chapter Three makes a leap in time to the 1700s. It was in the latter half of that century that all Discobolus torsos discussed here were excavated, restored, re-cut, or all three. They are now referred to as torsos, as none of the variants were found with their full arms, legs, strut or discus. A major focus of Chapter Three is the most productive sculptural restorer of the period, the Italian Bartolomeo Cavaceppi (ca. 1717-1799). The restoration of all five variants of the Discobolus can be connected in one way or another to this individual. His teacher, Pierre-Étienne Monnot, was involved in restoring the first
two *Discobolus* torsos. The earliest of these had been restored initially in the beginning of the seventeenth century as *Endymion*, and later in the century the same piece was re-restored as *Fleeing Niobid*. Monnot seems to have been involved in an even later, eighteenth-century re-cutting of that piece, and was certainly the restorer of the second *Discobolus* torso as the *Fallen Warrior*. Cavaceppi himself restored the third excavated torso as *Diomedes Stealing the Palladium*, a piece commissioned by a British dealer and intended to go into an English collection. Two of Cavaceppi’s most gifted students, Giuseppe Angelini and Carlo Albacini, restored the last two torsos – both of them, finally, as Myron’s discus thrower, but not without some significant variations. Angelini restored the Massimi *Discobolus*, (now in the National Roman Museum), and Albacini restored the Townley *Discobolus*, (British Museum).

Chapter Four examines chronologically and in-depth the process and context of these five major variants. I focus on the sculptor, the restored piece he produced, and why it was likely to have been reassembled in the manner that it was. The importance of the sculptors, dealers and patrons, along with their business practices, cannot be overstated. On a few occasions in this study, due to the unavailability of reliable source material, the discussion is necessarily conjectural – and I clearly indicate when that occurs. Little official or archival documentation was left by the eighteenth-century restorers themselves. Instead, personal letters, known influences and examination of other related works often provide the best available evidence. The sculptural fragments themselves are also in some cases fraught with confusing and contradictory histories. For each variation I reveal what is factually known about the circumstances of its restoration – relying on
letters, biographies, primary and secondary source material. When no clear information has been available I venture a few educated guesses to help complete the picture. The need for some speculation is inherent to the study of ancient art and part of what makes it as vexing as it is intriguing. In any case speculation on the part of scholars, artists, patrons and dealers is a significant element of this story.

Acting as sculptor, restorer, dealer, and antiquarian, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi helped to form the tastes of his diverse clientele, and he in turn was influenced by his patrons’ reactions to his pieces. Works restored by Cavaceppi number in the hundreds and are said by Thomas Hoving, the retired director of the Metropolitan Museum, to comprise ninety percent of all ancient works displayed in the Capitoline, Vatican and Hermitage museums. Yet few scholars or curators have questioned how these and other extensively restored originals are being presented to the public, what their didactic role should be, or even whether or not they are accurate representations of classical art.

In the concluding Chapter Five I restate my main argument: that the five variants display more about the aesthetics and ideology of the period in which they were restored, than about the age in which they were created. I offer this as a means of detangling the before from the after, in a desire to identify what message should be conveyed to students and aficionados of art. It is my hope that this investigation of the origination of the Discobolus, and a critical examination of the methods and motivations of the people involved in its eighteenth-century restorations will facilitate a fuller understanding of that

---

1 Thomas Hoving, False Impressions: The Hunt for Big-time Art Fakes (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 64.
seemingly well known work, and, by extension, a more nuanced comprehension of ancient art in general.

For existing scholarship that deals directly with Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, Professor Emeritus at the University of California (Davis) Seymour Howard stands out above all others. He was the first, and is still to date the only scholar to work on Cavaceppi in depth. His 1958 dissertation, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi: Eighteenth-Century Restorer is the place to start for anyone interested in the subject.² He has since written eight articles on Cavaceppi for a variety of scholarly journals, with a continuing focus on cataloging and attributing Cavaceppi’s works. He has also written a five page article entitled, “Some Eighteenth-Century Restorations of Myron’s Discobolos”.³ It too is a good place to start for an overview of the topic at hand. A full list of Howard’s works relevant to this study is in the bibliography.

A few other scholars have investigated Cavaceppi, but mainly as a means to create an authenticated list of his restored works. Carlos Picón’s brief work in 1983, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi: Eighteenth-Century Restorations of Ancient Marble Sculpture from English Private Collections, is well written, but still primarily a catalogue.⁴ Longer, but in the same vein is the 1994 book, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi: Scultore Romano (1717-1799) by


Maria Giulia Barberini and Carlo Gasparri.\(^5\) Their monograph again attempts to establish a complete catalogue of the workshop production of Cavaceppi. In 2000 Thomas Weiss compiled a series of articles into a book entitled *Von der Schönheit Weissen Marmors*, concerning Cavaceppi’s works, especially those that were found in German collections.\(^6\) A brief biographical article on Cavaceppi, by Howard, is included there, as is also a short article on one of Cavaceppi’s associates and the executor of his will, Vincent Pacetti. The latter is written by the Roman scholar Nancy Ramage. I am indebted to each of these scholars, but their works are more focused on cataloging than on examining any one work in depth.

The image I initially saw that launched this project is in *Art in Rome in the Eighteenth-Century*, edited by Edgar Bowron and Joseph Rishel. Published in 2000, this is a voluminous, detailed and copiously illustrated catalogue of eighteenth-century art.\(^7\) It contains a two-page description of the *Discobolus* torso which was restored by Cavaceppi as *Diomedes Stealing the Palladion*. Also covering eighteenth-century restorations, although in an entirely different way is *Fake? The Art of Deception*.\(^8\) Edited by Mark Jones, it was published in 1990 to accompany the exhibition of the same name at the

---


British Museum. It has a one-page discussion on the Townley or British Museum
Discobolus, which did indeed whet my appetite for more.

Providing general information on collection, restoration and museum display in the
eighteenth-century, Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny co-wrote Taste and the Antique.\textsuperscript{9} This 1982 work traces the trajectory of ninety of the most famous pieces of sculpture
from the year 1550 to 1900. It is a valuable reference when trying to assess why patrons
bought certain pieces rather than others, and includes a brief overview of many famous
statues such as the Laocoon and the Dying Gaul. Separately, the two scholars have also
written books which focus variously on the use of marble, collection practices, and
patronage during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

With regard to eighteenth-century aesthetics and collecting, Viccy Coltman’s 2006
work, Fabricating the Antique, is a well-researched and thoughtful analysis of the
period.\textsuperscript{10} Her discussion of the interface between education, collection and the British
Grand Tour is extremely illuminating and she mentions Cavaceppi as well. Other books,
such as the 1992 Archaeologists and Aesthetes, by Ian Jenkins, clarify the complicated
internal politics that were going on at the British Museum.\textsuperscript{11} Similarly, Jeffrey Collins
has researched and written about the confusing and shifting Papal politics of the period in

\textsuperscript{9} Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny. Taste and the Antique (New Haven: Yale University

\textsuperscript{10} Viccy Coltman, Fabricating the Antique: Neoclassicism in Britain, 1760-1800 (University

\textsuperscript{11} Ian Jenkins, Archaeologists & Aesthetes in the Sculpture Galleries of the British Museum

On to the topic of restoration of ancient sculpture itself, in the mid 1990s research was initiated at the Getty museum by scholars such as Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany and Marion True. Their publications, such as the 2003 *History of Restoration of Ancient Sculptures,* offer some much-needed examination in detail of the extent and accuracy of restorations.\(^{14}\) Concerning Myron and ancient sculpture, B. S. Ridgway has written extensively on the nature of Roman copies of Greek originals, and Cornelius C. Vermeule has written voluminously on the Roman desire for and display of Greek art. In *The Ancient Art of Emulation,* edited by Elaine Gazda, various authors address the need for scholars to grapple with the larger issue of loaded terminology such as “copy” and “original.”\(^{15}\)


To date, however, there is no single text that discusses the larger and overarching questions that beg to be asked of the extensively restored Discobolus torsos. As a teacher of survey art history courses who has tried to explain the function, aesthetics, and basic stylistic evolution of ancient art, I find the exclusion or glossing over of these issues to be intellectually dishonest. I feel a need to step back and, using the Discobolus as a case study, examine issues that concern me as a scholar and a teacher. There is often a significant disconnect between what the student is looking at – a questionable restoration of an average Roman copy – and what they are listening to – the professor extolling the virtues of sophrosyne and refined Greek aesthetics.

The specific intent of this study is to achieve a clearer understanding of the role of the restorer in the eighteenth century, and to address the larger topic of how accurate a reconstruction can ever be. Ultimately, it begs the question: when has an object been so completely redone that it no longer should be considered a restoration of a prior work, but instead treated as its own entity?

---

16 GENERAL NOTE ON ORTHOGRAPHY: There are numerous equally correct spellings encountered when reading about Greek, Roman, Italian and English subjects. For consistency, the orthographic convention adopted herein for names, places and other proper nouns is, as much as possible, to use Latin-based spelling (e.g. Palladium, instead of Palladion), except in a few cases where common usage trumps any logic (e.g. Erechtheion). This approach has some precedent for this topic as Bartolomeo Cavaceppi was Italian, and generally used Latin terms for sculpting but Italian spellings for locations. Names of works of art are underlined. Foreign terms are in italics while foreign names are not. The name for the central piece in this study, the Discobolus, is italicized and underlined throughout, as it is both the ancient Greek word for discus thrower, and a work of art.
CHAPTER 1: ANCIENT GREECE AND HER SCULPTURE

Myron is the first sculptor who appears to have enlarged the scope of realism, having more rhythms or composition [rhythmos] in his art than Polykleitos and being more careful in his proportions or commensurability of the parts [symmetria]. Yet he himself so far as surface configuration goes attained great finish, but he does not seem to have given expression to the feelings of the mind, and moreover he has not treated the hair and the pubes with any more accuracy than had been achieved by the rude work of olden days. – Pliny the Elder

Myron and the Function of Greek Sculpture

As noted by Andrew Stewart in his book Greek Sculpture, the Greeks wrote early and poetically on their own aesthetics as can be evidenced repeatedly in the literature of Homer and the philosophical writings of Aristotle. A few artists also wrote their own academic treatises, such as the Canon of Polykleitos, a text today known only in fragments. But despite the abundance of descriptions, attributions, and commentaries,


2 Andrew Stewart, Greek Sculpture vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University, 1990), 19. While it was likely Protagoras who encapsulated Greek humanism with the catch phrase, “Man is the measure all of things” it was Aristotle who initially fleshed out epistemology, or the theory of knowledge. Aristotle was more interested in the physical than spiritual world, and in his Nicomachean Ethics, he defines arête or the concept that is loosely translated as the Golden Mean; things that bring beauty and balance are a reward in and of themselves. He denounces excess or stinginess, a core concept which underlies much of Classical Greek aesthetics. A synopsis of Greek aesthetics is difficult in this limited space; see in particular Helen North, Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966).

they all tended to be concise, implying that the targeted Greek audience already knew the works under discussion. They seemed not to have needed a detailed description.

The scant paragraph quote at the beginning of this chapter is by the well-known Roman historian Pliny, and is one of only two references about the fifth-century BC Greek sculptor, Myron. In keeping with a minimalist tendency, Myron, well known to both Greek and Roman aesthetic circles, was barely mentioned. In an intellectual sphere where philosophical writing was prolific and had been for centuries, detailed discussion on the aesthetics and function of art were conspicuously absent. Pieces such as the Discobolus, famous in their day, were rarely and fleetingly referred to in the literary record – which points to the first problem in how objects are conceptualized today versus how they were in their own (ancient Greek) time period. Statues were predominately pragmatic in function, not artistic.⁴

The interaction between viewer and object in the Greek world was just that – an interactive pursuit. It was not the passive, de-contextualized viewing experience of a “work of art” by a twenty-first-century museum visitor. Ancient Greek sculptures were generally speaking religious, made to function as dedicatory offerings. As religious objects, sculptural pieces were placed in sanctuaries to serve as votives, formal stand-ins for prayers to be granted for the dedicator. In essence, it was a tangible quid-pro-quo

---

⁴ For a streamlined explanation of the function of Greek sculpture, see Gisela Richter, A Handbook in Greek Art (New York: Phaidon Press Limited, 1980), 53-5. For a much more nuanced view, representing the shift in the understanding their function, see Nigel Spivey, Understanding Greek Sculpture (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1996) and Andrew Stuart, Greek Sculpture (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
arrangement; if one offered repeated and substantive acknowledgments to the gods, they would return the favor in kind. Statues were thus treated with reverence for their conductive ability to transfer information, wishes and thanks to the divine world. The Greeks themselves did not look at them as solely material objects, much less as artistic statements made manifest.\(^5\) That would have totally missed the point. Rather, whether the image was of Nike of Samothrace – created in gratitude for naval successes, or the Delphi Charioteer – as thanksgiving for a pivotal chariot victory, they were necessary accoutrements for nurturing the important relationship between man and the divine world.

Despite the natural tendency to see statues of male nudes such as the Discobolus with our own contemporary perceptions as statements or trophies of personal glory, they too were conceived of as necessary religious objects. Due to the religious and philosophical environment of the Olympics, athletes were seen as physical embodiments of the philosophy of humanism – mankind’s attempt to achieve physical perfection through manly and notably war-like arts.\(^6\) The thinking part of a person’s education was in the realm of drama and philosophy – topics extensively written about by Greek authors. Concepts of body and mind were indeed separate.\(^7\)

---

5 See the discussion in Spivey, *Greek Sculpture*, 80-104.

6 At the Panathenaic Games, both prowess and beauty was judged; the Greek term euandria denotes this combination.

While heroic nude statues were set atop bases inscribed with names of people and cities, they were never meant to represent any particular individual. They were universal expressions of the best a man could be. Portraiture was not a pursuit of either the Archaic or Classical Greek periods, but arguably made its appearance in late Hellenistic art before becoming an accepted genre under the Romans. ⁸ This is, to me, why Pliny’s criticism of the statue lacking “expressions of the feelings of the mind” seems to have missed the mark; he expected Myron’s statue to conform to his (Roman) artistic and cultural standards – something a Greek work would have been unable to do. Likely for the Greeks, the *Discobolus* performed more than admirably. Judging by the extant, multi-media copies, the Romans were able to see the original as well as variations on the theme depicted on gems, pottery and statuettes.

All of the copies of the *Discobolus* that I discuss in this study are Roman marble copies of Greek bronze originals, so while its potency as an aesthetic image remained unarguable, its meaning did not. As will be explained in the following chapter, Romans did view and then collect Greek art aesthetically, unlike the Greeks who actually created it. To the Greek world the statue was essentially a votive; beautiful, perhaps even exceptional, but it was not the end in and of itself. At its core, the difference between how the two cultures viewed sculpture reinforces the polemics of Plato – the Greeks privileged the idea of a thing; the Romans, its physical form.

The second problem in understanding the essence of the Greek *Discobolus* is in our own contemporary tendency to include the artist and the style as integral aspects of the

analysis. The interest in an individual artist, and by extension a biography, is a mode of thinking first introduced by the late Renaissance art historian Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574). The concept of art being a personal expression of an artist was extensively developed during the Renaissance. It would not have been easily comprehended by the ancient Greek audience, who would have thought this oddly hubristic and distracting. The maker of the object was secondary to the person who funded it, and even more subordinate to the entity to whom it was being presented. This probably explains why, compared to literature or philosophy, so in comparison to other humanistic topics, few ancient authors wrote about art. Frankly, the lives, studios, students, or techniques of artists would not have been of primary concern. It was the performance of the object that mattered, not the act of creating it.

Beyond the study of the artist, art historians have also expressed the need to find a standard set of physical and technical characteristics by which to place objects in a chronological order, something wholly understandable for didactic reasons. Style as a construct, however, is especially complicated for Greco-Roman works. One problematic aspect is that the conceptual separation of Greek from Roman art, in fact the first true

---

9 Spivey, Greek Sculpture, 84.

10 The traditional, and from personal experience, most expedient way of teaching art history to students, is by teaching style through sequential chronological examples. But this method, as exemplified by texts written by Helen Gardner, Art Through the Ages (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, first ed. 1926); and later H.W. Janson, History of Art (New York: Prentice Hall, 1962) is currently under attack. Some scholars object to the particular author’s inclusion or exclusion of particular works, as this a defacto creation of an artistic canon. Others also do not approve of the traditional, linear way of explaining art works chronologically, preferring a thematic approach to the topic. Arguably, the main problem is in the inter-disciplinary nature of art-history itself.
discussion of period style, began in Italy during the eighteenth century under Johann Winckelmann (1717-1768).\textsuperscript{11} This was the exact time period and location when large numbers of ancient fragments were being dug up and assembled for public resale. While Winckelmann was trying to systematically discern the physical signs that arguably denote style, the restorers were creating finished objects out of pieces according to their availability and the preferences of the patrons buying the work. These two events, of one group sorting while the other was literally combining, were at cross purposes. The heavy and hurried restoration of most ancient pieces has made any subsequent nuanced understanding of them difficult.

Lastly in regards to the assessing and assigning of style, Greek as well as Roman art had periods of archaizing – objects were intentionally created in an earlier style as a traditional means to curry favor with the gods, or later in the case of the Romans, with the public and their rulers, who at times found “new” or “foreign” art too florid. The Roman Emperor Augustus (63 BC- 14 AD) was notorious for his preference of retro-movements as but one corrective to this and as a means to promote “older” conservative values.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Johann Winckelmann, the author of the 1764 book, \textit{Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums} or the History of Ancient Art, is considered to be one of the earliest scholars who recognized the differences and sought to separate Greek from Roman art. He did so in the eighteenth century, amidst continuous ongoing excavations and restorations. His personal connections with the Vatican as well as his thoughtful observations, albeit occasionally bordering on the florid, helped establish him as the arbiter of the aesthetics of his day. As such he is called the “Father of Neoclassicism” and will be discussed in context in Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{12} For a firsthand account of Augustus’ values, see F.W. Shipley, trans. \textit{Res Gestae Divi Augusti} The Deeds of the Divine Augustus (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924) For his preference and use of classical Greek imagery, see David Castriota, \textit{The Ara Pacis}
The preceding paragraphs have briefly highlighted the potential pitfalls, as I see them, in analyzing the *Discobolus* using a traditional art-historical approach – based on academic aesthetic principles, stylistic characteristics, and the individual artist. Still, it would be foolish to disregard any consideration of the specific circumstances of the creation of a piece of art when, as in this case, the original artist is known. The following is a summary of what is known about the Greek sculptor Myron, albeit offered here with a *caveat emptor*.

**Primary Authors on Myron of Eleutherae**

A search through extant ancient literature for references to the work in question reveals three Roman authors and one anonymous Greek author who substantiate that Myron of Eleutherae was the sculptor of the *Discobolus*. The earliest of the Roman authors, Pliny the Elder (23-79 AD), offers the only biographical information along with a brief comparative analysis of Myron’s work. The Roman writer Quintilian (30-100 AD) comments on Myron’s revolutionary attempt to depict motion. The later Roman author Lucian (125-180 AD), in a satirical dialogue, mentions the actual pose of the *Discobolus* and confirms it to be the work of Myron and finally the anonymous Greek author/compiler of the *Anthologia Palatina* (a compilation of poems and epigrams from the Classical and Byzantine periods), confirms that it was originally a work cast in bronze. Below, loosely in chronological order, is what each author wrote about the

---

Discobolus and the context in which his commentary might be understood. I have
omitted a one-line reference made by Cicero concerning Myron from the discussion here,
as it is only part of a list of pieces sold by Heius and bought by Verres, and contains no
meaningful information or description.13

Gaius Plinius Secundus (Pliny the Elder)

Pliny the Elder was born circa 23 A.D and was educated in Rome. He served a
lengthy amount time in the military service, but is today best known for his voluminous
writings and untimely death due to the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in 79 AD. His last work,
written circa 77 AD, is the Historia Naturalis, a set of thirty-seven books dedicated to the
Roman Emperor Titus. Dealing with the sciences and arts, it was an encyclopedia of
sorts, based both on first-hand observations as well as his extensive readings. Book
XXXIV of this work deals at length with the various aspects and uses of ancient metals,
and it is here that he makes his only extended reference to Myron- specifically
mentioning the Discobolus:

Myronem Eleutheris natum, Hageladae et ipsum discipulum, bucula maxine
nobilitavit celebratis versibus laudata, quando alieno plerique ingenio magis
quam suo commendantur. Fecit et Ladum et discobolon…
Primus hic multiplicasse veritatem videtur, numerosior in arte quam Polykleitos
et in symmetria diligentior, et ipse tamen corporum tenus curiosus animi sensus
non expressisse, capillum quoque et pubem non emendatius fecisse, quam rudis
antiquitas instituisset.14

University Press, 1932), 12-14.

14 Pliny, Natural History, trans. H. Rackham, books 33-35 (Cambridge: Harvard University
Press, 2003), 169.
Myron, who was born at Eleutherae, was himself also a pupil of Hegelades; he was specially famous for his statue of a heifer, celebrated in some well known sets of verses-inasmuch as most men owe their reputations more to someone else’s talent than to their own. His other works include the Ladas and a Man Throwing a Discus…

Myron is the first sculptor who appears to have enlarged the scope of realism, being more prolific in his art than Polykleitos and being careful in his proportions. Yet he himself, so far as the surface configuration goes, attained great finish but he does not seem to have given expression to the feelings of the mind…”  

Pliny initiates his discussion on Myron with a reference to the sculptor Ageladas (Hegelades). This is important to note, as he was also known to be the teacher of Myron’s slightly younger rival, Polykleitos. As the author of a lost treatise on sculpture called the Canon, Polykleitos was widely considered to be the finest sculptor and theoretician of his day. This reference helps to establish 480 to 440 BC as the working dates for Myron, as well as to substantiate not only his high level of talent, but also the respect he merited among his contemporaries. Myron and Polykleitos are in fact repeatedly compared to one another as can be seen in the writings of both Pliny and Lucian. I would argue that for these authors, Myron and Polykleitos represented two different approaches by which Greek sculpture had been conceptualized and constructed.  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{15}}\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{16}}\text{The fifth century was crucial in the development of Greek sculpture. Myron was one of the earliest fifth-century sculptors to attempt to give his pieces dimensional form and a sense of motion. Works by other artists of the period, such as Critius’ Boy, also showed significant progression in the realistic representation of human figures in three-dimensional space. These achievements were facilitated by improvements in sculptural techniques and conceptual developments such as contrapposto. Polykleitos’ Doryphoros exhibits both these kinds of advancements.}\]
In another passage in the *Naturalis Historia*, Pliny mentions that Myron intentionally used Aegean bronze, while Polykleitos instead preferred Delian.\(^\text{17}\) As Pliny explains, a third type not used until after 146 BC, Corinthian bronze, was the most prized of all. As a precious metal, Corinthian bronze was second only to gold for Pliny’s contemporary Romans.

But the older and, according to Pliny, more proper type of bronze for casting images of gods and men was Delian. This was the type used by Polykleitos for his works such as the *Diadoumenos*.\(^\text{18}\) However, the kind of bronze mentioned by Pliny, chosen intentionally by Myron and likely the material used for the *Discobolus*, was made only at Aegina. It was different from the two other types of bronze due to an undisclosed compounding process done at the workshop. Curiously, Pliny does not clarify either the visual or structural differences between these types of bronze, but he does offer the opinion that, of the three, Aegean was the lowest in quality. The basis of this assessment is unclear, as is the reason that Myron preferred it. Both he and Polykleitos would have had access to both types of bronze. It may have been that the Aegean method of bronze compounding created greater tensile strength which allowed for more dynamic and extended sculptural forms, such as the *Discobolus*. It may also have been that Aegean


bronze was simply cheaper, easier to pour or finish, or held a better sheen than did the other type.

Regardless, it is clear that this more modest grade of bronze offered some special advantage to Myron. Repeatedly described as the first sculptor to show an image in motion or *rhythmos*, perhaps he liked its ability to be used more expressively, and not for any precious materiality. In any case Myron’s willingness to use something outside the norm (at least according to Pliny) suggests that he experimented with the material as well as with the pose of his sculptural pieces. It may have actually been this innovativeness that established him in the consciousness of the ancient world as being the master of what would be later called Severe, Transitional or Early Classical art (480-450 BC).

Pliny’s comment about Myron “enlarging the scope of realism,” that is, making the sculptural figures seem life-like, is also intriguing. On this point in particular, it is interesting to speculate on whether Pliny was looking at the bronze original or a Roman copy of the work. Sadly for us he does not give any clues as to which *Discobolus* he either saw personally or knew of. Initially, his choice of the word *veritatem* would seem to be a reference to what art historians refer to as verism. Verism refers to the quintessentially ancient Roman preference for visual truth in likeness – in other words showing all details and imperfections, especially in a face. Some translators connect this concept to the later artistic idea of realism. But the *Discobolus* that Pliny would have seen, arguably with an accurate marble copy of the original bronze head, has the typically idealized and expressionless face that is characteristic of the Greek Severe style. In fact, the entire statue is anything but veristic with its smooth features and emotionless eyes.
What Pliny more likely meant by *veritatem* was the realistically kinetic pose of the *Discobolus*. This expression of movement so vividly depicted by the *Discobolus* was in opposition to the work of Polykleitos, whose elegant and canonical male nudes visually define hermetic stasis.\(^\text{19}\) As Pliny pairs them, the artists seem to represent the polar opposites of action versus inaction, form over material.

Taken then as a whole, Pliny’s brief discussion of Myron establishes a trajectory from where the classical Greek period of Polykleitos had evolved, and by extension, where it could ultimately go. Since his commentary seems technically correct, non-conjectural and very much in context with the ancient mindset, it provides a seminal key to understanding the significance of Myron.

**Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (Quintilian)**

Quintilian was born circa 30 AD in Rome where he received his training in rhetoric and advocacy. In his later life he was highly regarded as both as teacher and author, and became a tutor to Pliny the Younger (63-113 AD) and to the heirs of Emperor Domitian (51-96 AD). It was shortly before 96 AD that he wrote *Institutio Oratoria* or *Training of an Orator*.\(^\text{20}\) In Book 2.13.8-10 he gives a brief reference to the *Discobolus* and its unusual pose:

---


\(^\text{20}\) The book was a compilation of all “the best of” rhetorical thought from Greece and Rome, so it should not be thought of as being all original writings by Quintilian. That being said, it was greatly respected in its time.
Expedit autem saepe mutare ex ille constituto traditoque ordie aliqua et interim decet, ut in statuis atque picturis videmus variari habitus, vultus, status… Quid tam distortum et elaboratum quam est ille discobolos Myronis? Si qui stamen, ut parum rectum, improbet opus, nonne ab intellectu artis abfuerit, in qua vel praecipue landabilis est ipsa illa novitas ac difficultas?²¹

But it is often expedient and occasionally becoming to make some modification in the time-honored order. We see the same thing in pictures and statues… Where can we find a more violent and elaborate attitude than that of the Discobolus of Myron? Yet the critic who disapproved of the figure because it was not upright, would merely show his utter failure to understand the sculptor’s art, in which the very novelty and difficulty of execution is what most deserves our praise.

As a teacher of rhetoric, Quintilian employed metaphor as a way to relate to his students, and in this section he is using a prominent example from the visual arts to convey the adaptive qualities of oratory. He warns that rigid adherence to rules can lead to mediocrity and that thoughtful modification or variations were not necessarily incorrect – they could actually be praiseworthy. Here, Myron’s Discobolus is held up as a good variation that displays appropriate “novelty and difficulty of execution.” For Quintilian, the purposeful and skillful use of novelty was an important technique for his students to understand and master.

In his text, Quintilian saw no need to describe the Discobolus, from which we can infer that he presumed his readers would have known of Myron and would have had an immediate mental image of this sculpture in particular. Roman copies of Greek sculptures were plentiful in Rome during this period, so this presumption is justifiable. This reference in a scholarly text, without any background explanation, indicates that an

awareness of Greek art was an expected part of being a well-educated citizen of Rome. Students must also have been aware of the typical range of sculptural poses, understanding which ones were considered to be standard and which were more daring. In this context, the *Discobolus* serves as a readily understood example of something that, while differing from the norm, was considered extremely successful.

**Lucian of Samosata**

Lucian was born in 120 AD in the Roman controlled region of Syria. The years of his educational training, in rhetoric and sophistry, coincided with the reign of Marcus Aurelius (121-180 AD), a period when a revival of interest in Greek art and literature was intense. Lucian wrote at least eighty different satirical works in Greek, *The Golden Ass* being the most famous. With works such as these he created a new genre, the comic dialogue, and it would not be unreasonable to describe Lucian as the Mark Twain of his age. In his late work *Philopseudes (Lover of Lies)*\(^{22}\) he discusses the pose of the *Discobolus*. The following passage occurs in a dialogue between a Narrator, also known as The Skeptic, and Eucrates:

Eucrates- ‘Didn’t you see as you came in a very fine statue in the courtyard, made by Demetrius the portrait maker?’

Narrator- ‘Do you mean the Discus-thrower’ I asked, who is bending forward in the act of throwing, looking back at the hand holding the discus, one leg slightly bent, and seemingly about to rise up as he makes his throw?’

\(^{22}\) This work also contains the often-retold story of the hapless Sorcerer’s Apprentice. Mickey Mouse was given the title role in the 1940 Disney Film, *Fantasia*. Goethe too borrowed from Lucian in a 1797 poem, *Der Zauberlehrling*. 
Eucrates- ‘Not that one’, he replied: ‘that is one of Myron’s pieces, the discus-thrower, you are talking about. Nor do I mean the one besides it, the man tying a band on his head- a handsome figure, for this is the work of Polykleitos. Ignore those on the right as you go in, which include the tyrant-slayer fashioned by Critius and Nesiotes.\(^{23}\)

In this passage Lucian is setting up an extended discussion in which he critiques the common tastes of his day by first dismissively referring to these masterworks as to be ignored by the Narrator. Tantalizingly, he is the only author who suggests how the Discobolus might have been displayed in a Roman villa. But since his work is satire, and not a treatise on art or history, the physical relationships conveyed in his passage probably should not be taken too literally. What can be taken from Lucian is an insight into Roman humor and his pointed references to sculpture. Then as now, brevity is the soul of wit, and he provides a punchy short-hand of what would have been perceived as the most salient characteristics of these well-known Greek works.

The first piece of sculpture he mentions is a portrait of the Corinthian general Pellichus, by the artist Demetrios of Alopeke.\(^{24}\) Demetrios worked circa 400-360 BC and was known for the uncompromising realism of his bronze portraits. Quintilian, in his Principles of Oratory (XII.i.9–10), stated that he was ‘criticized because he was too realistic and fonder of verisimilitude than he was of beauty’. Later in the dialogue, Eucrates and the Narrator engage in a long debate as to whether or not Demetrios’ statue could speak, which is more an exploration of the gullibility of man than a description of a


\(^{24}\) There are only descriptions of the piece as the original work is lost and there are no known copies.
Roman statue gallery. But the juxtaposition of Demetrios’ work against the better known and more widely accepted fifth-century Greek masters is important, in that it acts as a foil for the others. Demetrios’ work was veristic, Roman in conception and use, and yet still displayed the opposite tendency of the fifth century BC, which privileged the universal over the specific, as exemplified by the works of Critius and Nesiotes, Myron and Polykleitos.

The *Discobolus*, as one of the most important examples of Greek art, is singled out for special attention, and again it is the pose that garners the longest description. As was the case in Pliny’s encyclopedic reference, Lucian (literally and figuratively) places the work of Myron on par with that of Polykleitos. The *Discobolus* is described in complete detail, while the equally if not more famous *Diadoumenos* (Youth Tying a Fillet), known today from twenty-five different full-size copies, is only mentioned as a “handsome figure.”  

(For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 1.2) This reinforces the impression that, at the time Lucian was writing, the sculptor Myron was to pose what his rival Polykleitos was to form.

The last sculpture mentioned in the passage is the *Tyrannicides* which depicts the consummation of Athenian heroes Harmodius and Aristogeiton. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 1.3) A copy of an earlier work done circa 475 BC by Critius and Nesiotes it is now thought to be one of the earliest examples of the Severe style. It was an entirely different type of statue from the others cited, as it was highly patriotic in

---

nature and had been beloved by the Greeks. The two heroes were considered to have been martyrs for a democratic cause. In both its implied message and style, the *Tryannicides* represented fifth-century tradition and constancy. The marble *Tryannicides* Group was set up in Athens circa 510 BC, but the pieces were stolen and displayed as war booty by the Persians thirty years later. Thereafter they were invoked by authors as often for their veiled political allegory as for their aesthetic attributes. While the *Discobolus* represented novelty of pose, the *Diadoumenos* represented the canonical perfection of human form. In essence, these works encapsulated the evolution of fifth-century Greek sculpture as seen against Roman verism or hyper realism as represented by the initial reference to the *Demetrios* of Alopeke.

A final consideration of the Lucian passage involves the early availability of its translation. The four major dialogues written by Lucian, *Cynicus*, *Menippus*, *Philopseudes* and the *Tyrannicida*, were translated from Greek into Latin in 1506 by the English scholar Sir Thomas More, ten years before he wrote *The Utopia*. More’s translations became the canonical versions of Lucian’s works, read widely throughout Europe as part of the Renaissance humanist movement. By 1535 there were fourteen editions, and by 1550 there were 270 printings in circulation, sixty of those being

---


interlinear in Greek.  This is quite significant as it could be convincingly argued that Cavaceppi as well as his British patrons could have (and really, should have) read the passage in the Philopseudes which described the correct pose of the Discobolus. This point will be further explored in a later chapter dealing with eighteenth-century sculptural practices and patronage.

**Anthologia Palatina**

Touching on the sculptor’s general technique, rather than specifically on the Discobolus, the last ancient literary reference to Myron comes from the anonymous author of the *Anthologia Palatina*. In section 16:54, a passage in a victor’s poem reads:

> Just as you were in life, Ladas, flying before the wind
> Thymos, touching the ground with the tips of your toes
> So did Myron cast you in bronze, on all of your body
> Stamping your expectation of an Olympian crown.

This passage serves to verify that Myron worked in bronze and was known for his revolutionary attempts at kinetic poses. Also important, however, is the identity of the

---

28 For his pivotal influence on Erasmus, and also the availability of his texts, see Christopher Robinson, *Lucian and his Influences in Europe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

29 The *Anthologia Palatina*, or Greek Anthology, is a collection of poems and epigrams from various authors, and dates from the classical up through the Byzantine period. The most complete volume to date was translated by the Scottish scholar J.W. Mackail, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1906). For the life of Salmiasi, see Phillibert de la Mare, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs de Bourgogne* (Dijon, 1745).
translator of this work. In 1607, the French scholar and linguist Claudius Salmasius (1588-1665, also known as Claude Saumaise), translated these and other previously unknown works from Greek into Latin, the volume known as the *Anthologia Palatina*.  

This manuscript was a more complete form of a Byzantine version compiled by Cephalas in the tenth century under the reign of Constantine VII (905-959 AD). Salmasius had found the unknown Greek manuscript in a library in Heidelberg, and, after translation, it became accessible and very desirable to the intellectual and social elite of his day. People included in his circle of friends and patrons were Queen Christina of Sweden (1626-89), Prince Frederick Henry of Nassau (1584-1647) and John Milton (1608-74). In addition to this and other works, he translated a popular version of Pliny’s *Naturalis Historia*. Thus both ancient texts containing descriptions of the *Discobolus* would have been available to any well-heeled European interested in ancient art.

Taking these primary sources together, a few constants appear. The *Discobolus* of Myron must have been extremely well known, in both artistic and literary circles, throughout wider Greece and Rome. The innovative kinetic poses of his sculptures initially set Myron apart from other artists, and gradually his work secured a separate but equal place in public perception alongside that of the preeminent form-giver and

30 Besides being an accomplished translator of Greek and Latin, Claude Saumaise was a prolific scholar, writing also on history, astronomy, the occult, religion and political science.

31 For a description of the social network they shared, see David Masson *The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical and Literary History of his Time* (London: Macmillan and Company, 1877), 625-27.

theoretician, Polykleitos. Based on the numerous Roman copies of their works and descriptions by Roman authors of works by both of these sculptors, by the second century AD their production was iconic. A reference to one implied a parallel comparison to the other – a type of intellectual pairing typically Greek in origin and enthusiastically adopted by the Romans.

Due to the timing, location, and distribution of the translations of Pliny, Lucian and the Anthologia Palatina, eighteenth-century restorers and patrons would have had access to descriptions of the Discobolus. Reference to such primary or ancient source material was by then a well-established practice. In 1506, Michelangelo and multiple Papal antiquarians confirmed the rediscovered Laocoön as being an authentic Greek work based on a description of the piece in Pliny. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 1.4) Copies of various works by Pliny were in Rome by the Renaissance and were used during various time periods to verify the location and authenticity of ancient work. Why none of the restorers or patrons involved with the Discobolus

33 Gregory Leftwich, “Polykleitos and Hippokratic Medicine”, Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition, Warren Moon, ed. (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 38-51. Leftwich argues that both Myron and Polykleitos were revolutionary in their attempt to depict human motion. He finds Myron’s approach to “…depend on silhouette and the diagram made by the limbs”, and goes on to explain that what Myron created was a static moment in the course of one continuous action. In comparison, Leftwich states that Polykleitos had a different approach to the rendering of movement. “The statue does not attempt to imitate a specific action, as does the Discobolos. Rather, it visualizes the underlying principles necessary to any human movement through a system of binary oppositions.”

34 For an insightful discussion of the impact that Pliny had on Renaissance Rome, see Leonard Barkan, Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Rome, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
openly refers to the ancient authors’ descriptions of the piece in their scholarly writings or records of authentication is unclear. In some cases they seem to ignore them purposefully. This may be due to marketplace pressures and other circumstances in eighteenth-century Rome, a topic to be treated later.

This is essentially all that is available from original ancient sources regarding the Discobolus written within about five-hundred years of its creation. The paucity of written description combined with the complete lack of an unadulterated physical record allows for considerable speculation on the actual nature of the Greek sculpture that started it all. What is clear, however, is that Myron’s discus thrower was well known – even iconic – long before its frequent appearance in our own day as an instantly recognized symbol of athletic and artistic excellence. But how did it get from there to here? The next link in the connecting chain would be forged in ancient Rome, where the Discobolus was transformed from an offering into a much admired – and heavily copied – object of art.
CHAPTER 2: ROME AND THE USE OF GREEK SCULPTURE

For, before that, Rome neither had, not had ever seen, any of those fine and exquisite rarities; nor was any pleasure taken in graceful and elegant pieces of workmanship.
- Plutarch, Life of Marcellus

In the previous chapter, the primary source material concerning the original Discobolus was discussed, along with a brief overview of how, in general, the Greeks conceptualized their sculpture. This chapter examines how the Romans shifted this Greek paradigm from revering an image as a stand-in for the divine to valuing it as an object of art. This shift from profound symbolic interpretation of an object to its commodification is significant. Also relevant to this discussion is the effect that high Greek art had on the evolution of Roman taste. Initially – from a Roman Republican viewpoint – the art and literature of the Hellenistic east was overly sophisticated, ornate and feminizing. They would later come to appreciate its qualities. The initially reluctant and then openly imitative connoisseurship of the Romans would be a key link in carrying forward the ideas conveyed in Greek art works, such as the Discobolus, to later generations.

Vincebamur a victa Graecia; or when the Captive becomes the Master

According to Plutarch, the Censor Marcus Cato (234-149 BC) believed that the various strands of Greek material and intellectual culture were in the main effeminate and

ineffectual.\textsuperscript{2} He found their art work in particular to be decadent in both design and material, and believed that this infection of Greek art, would ultimately lead to the destruction of the Romans. Pliny held a similar opinion of the decadence of Greek art as compared to the simple virtues of native Roman crafts, remarking “…although the origin of bronze statuary is old, the images of the gods which were dedicated in our sanctuaries were most often wood or terra cotta until the time of the conquest of Asia, whence came all ill forms of Luxury.” \textsuperscript{3} To the Romans of the Republican period (509-27 BC), Greek culture was at least overtly said to be overly indulgent and self-serving. It represented luxuriousness, a very un-Roman and un-stoic state of being. At the core of the Republican psyche was the notion that they were a rustic, hardworking, no-nonsense, agrarian people.\textsuperscript{4} In general, acquisitiveness was highly discouraged. Admiring and collecting objects, especially those epitomizing the aesthetics of the vanquished, was perceived to be a waste of energy and resources. While rulers needed a few prestigious objects to prove their status, they and by extension their subjects, should not be desirous

\textsuperscript{2} The entire family of Cato was known for its strict adherence to the conservative, some would argue xenophobic, traditions of the Roman Republic – what today might be identified as right-wing politics. Cato indeed would have understood what underlies the catch-phrase “family values.” Plutarch gives examples of this lifestyle in his \textit{Parallel Lives}. It is no coincidence that the Cato Institute bears his name, although one degree removed; it was named after the so-called \textit{Cato’s Letters}, a series of libertarian pamphlets written during the American Revolution.

\textsuperscript{3} Pliny, \textit{Natural History}, 11-113, this author’s own translation.

\textsuperscript{4} The reform movements of the Gracchus brothers point out how deeply seated these notions were, as do the works by Cicero on this subject. But for an example with curious contemporary political overtones see Andrew Stephenson, \textit{Public Lands and Agrarian Laws of the Roman Republic} (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1981).
of high-end foreign goods. Thus the tendencies in Hellenistic art, and certainly those of its Greek antecedent, towards introspection, humanistic detail, and material opulence were considered highly suspect. But as fervently as this attitude was endorsed in official conservative quarters, it was effectively overpowered by the influx of artistic goods brought into Rome by the capture of Greek cities: Syracuse in 211 BC by Marcellus, and Corinth in 146 BC by Mummius. By the second century BC, the city of Rome was inundated with all forms of Greek art and the Roman citizens liked what they saw.

Greek material culture was by no means new to the Italian peninsula, as it had been introduced through colonization since the eighth century BC. For mostly limited personal use, artists of Greek heritage made ceramics and small cult votives initially in and around Naples (Ischia) while their various Italianate neighbors looked on. By contrast, the indigenous art produced in this period was Etruscan in taste – streamlined and geometric. These local pieces were typically of a scale ranging from very small to three-quarter life sized and were made in a technique using fired terra cotta and lost wax. The first large scale bronze, clearly influenced by Greek contact, as it was a cult statue of Ceres, does not appear until approximately 480 BC. Thus, while the locals were exposed to examples of Greek art, it took a long time before they were significantly influenced by it. The bronze statue of Brutus is an example of this slow cultural convergence. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 2.1) Categorized as a Mid-Italic work,

---


6 Otto Brendel, Etruscan Art (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 33-42. Also see Nigel Spivey Etruscan Art (London: Thames and Hudson, 1997).
it displays indigenous Etruscan artisanship merging with Hellenistic portraiture. This merger would evolve, and eventually flourish as Roman art. There would, however, be notable instances of more direct and extensive cross-cultural exposure. During the Punic wars, the Romans were handed over the originals – literally, the Greeks and their objects.

The main antagonist in the three Punic Wars was Carthage, a state that had established itself as a bane to Rome and its environs by attacking and defeating the Greek colony of Akragas (Agrigento) in 406 BC. As victors, the Carthaginians carried off soldiers, ships, and *kataskeuasmata*, “a variety of arts,” a pattern of behavior that the Romans would repeat. The complicated and shifting affiliations that occurred during the Punic Wars between Rome, Gaul, Carthage and the Greek colonies (264-146 BC) are beyond the scope of this discussion; however, the result of the second of these wars would prove most consequential to cross-cultural influence. It was during this pivotal encounter that Rome defeated Hannibal and effectively came into possession of the Mediterranean. The first massive influx of people and goods occurred when the general Marcellus brought into Rome the *spolia* he had captured from Syracuse.

The taking and displaying of war objects, booty as it were, was and would remain a long-standing Mediterranean tradition. Verres (120-43 BC) was notorious for art theft in Sicily, and both Sulla (138-78 BC) and Nero (37-68 AD) ignited public outrage by their

---


8 For a contemporary view of the cultural cost of the wars, see H. J. Edwards’s translation of *Histories* by Polybius.
various appropriations of art from Delphi.\textsuperscript{9} During his time period, however, Marcellus was apparently the first general to display these \textit{ornamenta urbis} to the unrestrained extent that he did.\textsuperscript{10} Livy conveys a sense of how this must have struck the Roman viewer when he writes of the slightly later triumph of Marcus Fulvius Nobilius in 187.\textsuperscript{11} The triumphal march, conducted in honor of the Roman defeat of the Aetolians, was pointedly described by Livy as smaller than the one of Marcellus and included 285 bronze and 230 marble life-sized statues – a living Roman army trailed by a polished Greek one.

How would such an overt and extensive display of Greek goods become appropriate over time? As Plutarch writes in his Parallel Lives, “[Marcellus and others]…wanted to make a visual impression of triumph.” Even given this rational justification, the overt display of foreign goods was initially disapproved of. In spite of this sentiment, Marcellus in particular widely distributed huge quantities of war accoutrements such as shields, helmets, swords, ship prows, etc. along with the more artistic commodities of statues, paintings, ceramics, furniture and texts. These were divided up and distributed to venues throughout the Republic where they were purposefully displayed in impressive abundance on top of podiums and columns inside public stoas, temple precincts, and


lining thoroughfares into and out of city centers. Intrinsically Hellenic in their scale, symmetry, attention to detail, and sheer material value, these objects were intended as a public expression of the meteoric rise of Roman power and status. Rome had vanquished the once-powerful Greeks and had the booty to prove it. But while the mass quantities of Greek objects testified to their strength, it also showed them up, for included in the displayed collections were many pieces from the best and most famous artists – the nobilia opera. The “Greeks”, Praxiteles, Skopas and, of course, Myron, had arrived in Rome. Through their overt display Marcellus and the other conquering generals exposed Romans to Greek aesthetics, and instead of disdain, their reaction was one of admiration, acquisitiveness, and eventually imitation, due largely to market forces of supply and demand.

From Capturing to Collecting

The Roman Empire was itself a collection of cultures, and the various objects of the vanquished, whether acquired through pillage, purchase, loan or gift, were a visual manifestation of Roman might. The statues in particular also served a more subtle didactic function in the aesthetic that they conveyed – material beauty and symbolic content.

Buildings were the most frequent locations for the display of this seemingly endless plunder. From the second century BC onwards, porticoes placed in forum centers acted as the primary locus of these objects – once foreign but now re-contextualized in Roman

---

12 For a vivid description of the visual effect it had on the ancient Romans, see Peter Stewart, Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1-5.
settings with new contemporary meanings. Hundreds of statues, along with a bewilder ing array of military and cultural artifacts, were placed not only in forums but in temples, colonnades, bath complexes, basilicas, and private villas. It is estimated that by the third century AD, the statue “population” of Rome numbered well over half a million, while the human population of the city during that period was approximately 1.5 million.\(^{13}\) This impressive legion of statues, one for every three people, as the ancient writer Cassiodorus implied, maintained a silent but omnipresent vigil.\(^{14}\) While the amount of statuary adorning every niche and atrium must have been staggering, it could have been even more. Leaders such as Sulla (138-78 BC) had ordered some of the bronze works to be melted down to make coins, as a means to offset taxes. Still, the statues that survived this fate were of sufficient quantity and quality to physically dominate the public scene until the time when Constantine transferred the seat of power from Rome to Constantinople. After that cultural watershed many more of the statues in Rome would be reduced to their basic materials for utilitarian purposes. Bronzes were melted down and recast into various forms of armament, and marble works were crushed to make lime for construction as late as 1443.

Throughout the Roman Empire, however, these objects remained omnipresent. Though in the main they could be characterized as the fruits of random plunder more than


any calculated collecting, the roll call of artist’s names is impressive. Pliny stated that the
sculpture on the Capitoline was represented by Myron, Praxiteles, Euphranor, Lysippus
and Chares, while on the Palatine, pieces by Myron, Phidias, and Skopas were displayed.

The reaction to the sheer number and high quality of these objects fell into two basic
camps. The first followed the previously noted opinion of the Censor Cato, who found
Greek art to be morally degenerate in both material and content, and as such, dangerous
for Roman consumption. Augustus, as evidenced in his memoir inscribed in bronze Res
Gestae, shared this outlook. Concerned about the potential for moral decay caused by
exposure to these foreign artistic objects, he wanted them displayed only in sanctioned
public exhibitions, which would presumably be appropriately contained and controlled
venues. The opposite or connoisseur’s stance argued that, due to their fine quality and
demonstration of developed aesthetics, Greek artistic objects were essential cultural
resources for the refinement of Roman taste. They believed Greek art to be worthy of
preservation and display, and while allowing the wealthy to create their own private
collections, they wanted a large number and variety of pieces placed in outdoor common
areas as a means to edify the public. The underlying tension between these two factions
was nationalistic in nature, as the Cato-led camp tended strongly towards cultural
isolation – some would say bordering on xenophobia – on this and other issues. By the
end of the Republic the more open, connoisseur-led group had prevailed, and with this
triumph came the birth of the first full-scale Western art market.

While considered frivolous by some and downright pretentious by others, the Roman
collectors embarked upon their hobby with all the enthusiasm still evident in art
collecting today. The oldest, most prominent, and most intact objects were the first to be acquired, but initial demand soon turned into a buying frenzy, and as early as the first century BC dealers, art appraisers, restorers and contemporary artists had found their niches in this heated market. Cicero’s (106-43 BC) letters to Atticus convey not only his level of excitement over collecting but his willingness to part with large sums of money for the honor of housing these once-suspect works.

Imitation, Reinterpretation, Appropriation; Decorum and Phantasia

As noted in Ellen Perry’s work, The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome, the intellectual core of Roman aesthetics centered around two key concepts – decorum and phantasia. Decorum, which influenced all aspects of Roman life, was conceived of as adherence to a tradition based on suitability of behavior, congruence of style to subject matter and an appropriateness of conduct in a social and physical context. Decorum thus tended to promote conservatism and replication of established precedent. The second concept, phantasia, a quality that Romans believed good artists inherently possessed, allowed for a more nuanced expression when it came to the arts. Phantasia was the ability to see beyond the general or literal interpretation of an object to its bare essentials – to conceptualize and then materially re-create the intrinsic qualities of a divinity, politician, hero or athlete. Thus when the Romans could no longer
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15 Perry uses the Greek terms here instead of the Latin, as she argues that they convey the meaning more clearly. See Ellen Perry, The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
readily acquire Greek originals and turned to commissioning copies, the artists were afforded some latitude. If they felt that the piece to be imitated had captured an essential truth, it could be faithfully copied without any loss of artistic pride. If, on the other hand, the artist believed he saw a more essentially correct way to depict the subject that too was acceptable. The concept of duplication was already as old and accepted as Socratic philosophy – objects were reflections of an idea, not of a physical form. Roman Stoic philosophy had taken this one step further insisting that all objects, grains of sand to take Cicero’s example, had individual uniqueness. All, however, related back to their original essential ideal. This perhaps explains why Pliny tended not to differentiate originals from copies, as it was not necessarily considered a meaningful distinction. In Roman thinking, if an object had decorum and phantasia, it was real and plausible – it had the dual qualities of truth and reason.

The choice of either a strict or loose imitation of a work of art depended to some extent on the object’s destined location and why it was placed there. Since decorum dictated different behavior and attitude in a gymnasium than in a temple, variation was required in the general depiction, pose and iconography of images that would be displayed in these diverse locations. A statue of Zeus made for one kind of place would not necessarily make sense in a different context. As would later be the case in England during the eighteenth-century, thoughtful Roman artists and patrons were expected to inherently and independently recognize the correctness of a work of art to its setting – to understand why a nobly restrained pose for a particular subject was appropriate in one place, while a more exaggerated, dynamic pose for the same subject was suitable in
another. The Roman art of “copying” was, therefore, not imitative per se, but can be more fully appreciated as *mimesis*, the idea of getting it right in the essential, Platonic sense. Both Plato and Aristotle saw *mimesis* as representation of the perfect – adherence to the timeless spirit of the law rather than the letter.\(^6\)

Evidence that the Romans did not perceive repetition to be derivative, or the art of the copyist to be constrained by the details of the original, can also be noted in their approach to architecture. For example, when an important monument, the Hut of Romulus, was damaged, both Livy and Vitruvius point out that it was rebuilt at the same place, and though at times constructed with varying materials, it was always conceptualized as being the same as the original.\(^7\) It was authentic because it had the essential quality, not because it had been slavishly re-copied using original materials and details.

Although well-instructed in the principles of *decorum* and *phantasia*, Romans still found themselves connecting strongly to the established cadre of Greek artists. The canonical Myron, Polykleitos, Praxiteles and Lysippus were recognized as having been the best practitioners, not only of their medium and day, but also of their subject matter. As noted above, examples of these sculptors’ works were placed in various public fora, and the race was on to collect other pieces that became available. A nuanced


appreciation, however, soon emerged in the taste for art collection and display. Appropriateness of tone would often trump the cult of celebrity.

Romans wanted objects around them that reflected their own personal ethics, family history, diplomatic connections and social status. When it came to collecting, they tended to choose objects that were consistent with their personal ideology. Cicero, for example, refused to include a famous Greek statue of the war god Ares in his collection, as he did not want to be considered an advocate of violent behavior. Hadrian, a philhellen in the extreme, had replicas of the Erechtheion Caryatids placed at his Villa at Tivoli, and the Pantheon could arguably be considered as Hadrian’s personal phantasia-inspired version of the Parthenon. Copies were thus not thought of as somehow lesser or once removed, but were instead considered to be fine-tuned, personal reactions to an essential concept. It was up to the patron, be it private or state, to know which variation of a subject, style or artist a work should mentally invoke.

Another example from a parallel, contemporary field illustrates this point. Quintilian noted that no single author could embody every style with perfection. To understand the entire range of literature, one had to study various authors to gain an understanding of the whole. Quintilian taught rhetoric, but he repeatedly used art as examples in his lecture, so it is not a stretch to assume that this same paradigm applied to the realm of sculpture. It also may explain how a sculptural piece considered by some to be a confused pastiche, such as the Orestes and Electra appearing in altered form as Orestes and Pylades, came
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into being.¹⁹ (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 2.2) These kinds of works could be considered representative of a kind of omnibus or “the-best-of” compilation. They were composite images that conformed to the spirit of what was best or essential in various originals – not slavish copies of a single piece.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway notes that by the late Hellenistic period (323-27 BC), most Athenian artists were working for Roman markets.²⁰ Artists then as now had *aemulatio* or artistic rivalry, and while having to satisfy Roman expectations, they also would have perceived themselves as intellectually competing with the heritage of their own Greek predecessors.

Thus ends the pre-restoration saga of the *Discobolus*. It has gone from an object of religious significance to an artistic collectible and paradigm for imitation. Still, at this point the trajectory had been relatively straightforward. The imitative artists likely had access to originals, and no reconstructive amalgamations had yet been created. When it again resurfaced – quite literally – hundreds of years later, things would be different. Rome would be Christianized, but due to the Renaissance, ancient culture would be

---

¹⁹ Orestes is a character from a play (408 BC) of the same name by the Greek playwright Euripides. He is overcome with madness in the play due to the killing of his mother, Clytemnestra, and it is only his sister Electra who can calm him down. The pair was the subject of statues, as can be seen in the statue located in Museo Nazionale, Naples. The likeness of Electra was sometimes changed into that of Pylades, a male friend of Orestes. The S. Ildefonso Group is an example of this transformation. It has also been called “Castor and Pollux”, and Winckelmann referred to it as “Orestes and Pylades”. For a discussion on the litany of identity that the statue has been given, see Haskell and Penny, 173-4.

valued and ancient Roman artifacts avidly collected. Tourists, especially those from Britain, would flock into Rome, and vie with one another to partake of the antique. Their training, emphasizing the classics as we shall see, paired with the British Industrial Revolution, would create market forces conducive to the restoration – faithful or fanciful – of objects such as the *Discobolus*. 
CHAPTER 3: EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ROME AND COLLECTING

Rome Faces Nostalgia

By the year 1470, due in part to extensive building renovations precipitated by an imminent and greatly promoted Papal Jubilee year, the environs in and around Rome were yielding spectacular material remains from nearly all realms of ancient art and culture. High quality coins, medals, gems, inscriptions, and sculpture were being unearthed in increasingly large numbers. This trend would continue and by the eighteenth century it was indisputable – the epicenter of discovery and trade in ancient art was Rome.

More than any other city, eighteenth-century Rome had the requisite conditions to fuel the engine of commerce in antiquities: a large quantity of the objects of greatest interest and value, an established and heavy concentration of wealth, an abundance of scholars, and a resurgence of Grand Tourists, as the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht had enabled northern Europeans to once again safely travel across the Alps. Other eighteenth-century events
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1 For an interesting overview on the type, funding and placement of art that was produced for the various Papal Jubilees, see Maurizio Calvesi and Lorenzo Canova, Rejoice: 700 years of Art for the Papal Jubilee (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1999).

served to further stimulate this perfect storm of market forces. The rediscovery of Herculaneum, Pompeii and Stabiae, the establishment of an expatriate Stuart court, and the ascendance of an overtly anglophile Papacy all helped to establish Rome as a virtual *Bon-Ton* for all aspects of the collection of ancient art objects.³

The antiquities trade was a lucrative endeavor for all involved, and as such it was heavily regulated by the Vatican authorities who devised ways to profit from it as well. All objects to be exported abroad were required to leave Rome from a prescribed set of quays on the Tiber River, and then, along with the required documentation, had to be recertified in Civitavecchia, the main harbor outside of Rome. Finally it was from the port of Livorno, or Leghorn in English, that British merchant ships were allowed to depart Italy bearing ancient artifacts. If all was in order, export licenses would be granted by the officials of the Papal Antiquity, a process that was notoriously time-consuming and expensive. In order to acquire an object, in addition to paying its price and restoration costs, the buyer had to fund document fees, packing and freight, insurance, a 3 to 4% tax on the declared value of the object, and finally a 20% import tax when it landed in a British port.⁴ The process was arduous, but the ownership and display of these objects was so desirable in eighteenth-century, upper-class British society that the market thrived despite the complication and expense.

³ Located in York, Pennsylvania, the *Bon-Ton* was one of the earliest department stores in the United States that offered both quality and quantity of merchandise. It opened in 1898 and in 2006 it was merged into Sak’s (Fifth Avenue) Incorporated.

A few words are in order here about an institution that benefited the cultural education of British young men and the vigor of the antiquities trade as well. The Grand Tour, as it was known in British circles, was the custom of sending a young gentleman on an extended family-funded trip through a predefined agenda of culturally significant European venues to gain first-hand knowledge of the world and an appreciation of his heritage. One major catalyst for the Grand Tour was the book, *The Voyage of Italy*. Written by Richard Lassels, it was published posthumously in Paris in 1670 and in London in 1705. An expatriate Catholic priest living in Rome, Lassels wrote this book over a ten-year period. Containing, maps, itineraries and points of interests, interspersed with eloquent essays, it subsequently became an important guidebook for those contemplating or preparing for the Tour. Lassels contended that the Tour taught intellectual, ethical, political and social development which allowed for comparisons between the opinions and behaviors of the British and continental Europeans. Perhaps most significantly, the Tour was thought to encourage the development of political statecraft. Accordingly, young men would come out of this extended experience more socially polished and culturally aware. Other books, such as *The Grand Tour* by Thomas Nugent, a four-volume set originally printed in 1743 (and with frequent re-printings), further refined and promoted the idea of the Tour as an important rite of passage.

To maximize the benefits and minimize the risks, the first requirement was to secure a tutor-cum-guardian or *cicerone* to ensure that the Tourist would have a safe and educational experience. The mentor would generally guide his charge through a fixed itinerary which included the main areas of interest: Paris, Turin, Florence, Rome, Naples
and Venice. After leaving Dover, they would land in Calais and then embark on a six-month stay in Paris. Along the way they would see the sights, fulfill social obligations, and be tutored in language and social deportment. Next they were off to Italy for one to two years – the time period deemed necessary to widen one’s intellectual horizons, allow for the maturation of taste, and establish social networking amongst their fellow elite.

While the cultural and social maturation of the individual was ostensibly the goal, a significant side effect was the cross fertilization of arts and ideas, along with the influx of material goods into the home country. By the eighteenth century, Britain was now a mature Protestant nation on the verge of the Industrial Revolution. An important concept to both of these developments was the notion that “God helps those who help themselves” – not Biblical in origin but rather a quotation from Benjamin Franklin’s Poor Richard’s Almanac of 1757. One indicator of wealth, and therefore of God’s favor on industrious souls, was the possession of high-quality objects which in turn resulted in the extensive importation of antiquities for display in upper-class British estates. Evaluating, comparing, and collecting antiquities were all part of the Grand Tour experience, and were all considered to be valuable lessons for young connoisseurs. These experiences taught them language, history and taste – in essence, how to differentiate between the common and the fine. But it also satisfied the upper class urge for acquisition. The effect of this phenomenon on purveyors (such as Bartolomeo

Cavaceppi) of the most highly prized antiquities (such as the *Discobolus*) will be explored further in the next chapter.

It was not just the Roman venue and high-societal institutions that influenced the eighteenth-century antiquities trade, but a few notable individuals as well. If procedural problems arose on the Italian side of the equation there were well-connected men who acted as intermediaries between the mostly British patrons and Papal authorities. For much of the eighteenth century the go-to negotiator was Alessandro Albani (1648-1721). The wealthy Albani family had been influential in both Papal and secular political affairs since the mid-fifteenth century, and a few of the members such as Giovanni Francesco Albani had ascended all the way to the Papacy, in his case as Clement XI (1648-1721). As a young man, Alessandro Albani had been well educated in science, languages and classical literature, although his primary professional training was for a career in the military service. As a minor officer he had performed admirably on the battlefield, but due to early failing eyesight in 1718, he was reoriented by his family for an ecclesiastical career. He was ordained a Cardinal in 1721 by Pope Innocent XIII, another Albani relative, and Alessandro proved to be even shrewder in politics than he had been in battle. At the same time that he became a Cardinal, the 29-year-old was also appointed the Protector of the Holy Roman Empire, a position which afforded him the authority to
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oversee the German congregations in Rome. He would hold various important posts and have other titles bestowed upon him, such as being made an honorary member and director of study at the *Accademia di San Luca*. The twin Renaissance spheres of religion and humanities would swirl around him throughout his entire life.

But despite his family connections and professional responsibilities, Albani’s true love was not religion but ancient art and commodities. In his mid-twenties for good or ill, he was mentored and befriended by the brilliant but infamous scallywag Philipp, the Baron von Stosch (1691-1757).\(^7\) The wealthy and scholarly Stosch, on the surface of things a German diplomat, was an avid gem and coin collector who was whispered by many to also be a spy for the British government.\(^8\) Although considered suspect by many in the Vatican for his founding of the first Masonic Temple in Florence, he and Albani had common interests and went on impromptu “excavations” in Nettuno and Tivoli.\(^9\) It was in large part due to this early friendship, based on shared interests of connoisseurship and collecting, that Albani became familiar with the sites that yielded much of his own personal collections.

Albani was as much broker as connoisseur, as evidenced when his extensive collections were sold off more than once and usually *en masse*. In the mid-1720s he sold his collection of Roman coins to Innocent III and in 1728 the King of Poland bought his

---


\(^9\) Ibid., 324.
original sculpture collection. In 1734 Clement XII bought a group of over 400 busts and fragments, which became the core of the Museo Capitolino. Family connections repeatedly facilitated Albani’s passion for collecting. At about this same period, he became involved with another relative, Ercole III, the Duke of Modena (1727-1803). Modena, an art collector and broker who sold Ruben’s Saint Jerome and Titian’s Tribute Money, to Augustus III of Saxony owned the land that included and surrounded Hadrian’s Villa and the Villa d’Este. Along with Naples and Rome, these two areas produced many of the most spectacular finds of classical art to date among them copies of the Caryatids of the Erechtheion. It was these intricate insider business connections that facilitated the purchase by antiquities dealer Thomas Jenkins in 1791 of a Discobolus torso. After its restoration by Carlo Albacini, a student of Cavaceppi, this Discobolus would become a centerpiece of the famous Charles Townley collection. The history of the piece will be elaborated in a later chapter.

Thus well connected, astute, fluent in German and interested in all things English, Albani became the de-facto cultural ambassador for most German and British expatriates in Rome. An educated and nearly manic connoisseur, he facilitated and participated in virtually all aspects of the antiquities export trade from the mid 1720s until his death in 1779, and provided support, training and mentoring to Neoclassical artists such as Anton

---

10 Albani was notorious for overspending on antiquities and then having to selling off his collections.


Mengs. His last holdings, now part of the Villa Torlonia Collection, came into and out of Albani family hands until 2005, when they were purchased by the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi.\textsuperscript{13} Deeply involved in both the political and religious affairs of the country, Albani later met and advanced the career of another key figure in the antiquities market, the German scholar Johann Winckelmann.

By his untimely death in 1768 at the age of fifty, Johann Joachim Winckelmann would be the foremost authority on Greco-Roman art. That would have seemed unlikely in his early academic career, which had gotten off to a slow start in his homeland of Prussia. But in 1755, already middle-aged, Winckelmann published an important essay, Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture.\textsuperscript{14} Following its positive reception in Rome, he moved there later in that same year. The essay was essentially an open letter calling for intellectual exchange among the various classical scholars of the day, and since Rome was the indisputable center of classical studies, he felt he needed to be there. In 1756 he was introduced to Albani, who by then had been the Protector of the Holy Roman Empire for more than thirty years. Winckelmann’s inclinations and abilities would not go unrecognized. Until his death in 1768, he would serve as the main Papal librarian and curator of the Papal collections.\textsuperscript{15} It is important to note that Winckelmann’s deepest aspirations were scholarly, not business-oriented. For the last five years of his life, he served as Prefect of Papal Antiquities, a position that

\textsuperscript{13} Another modern Italian political figure, Benito Mussolini, lived in the villa in the 1920’s.

\textsuperscript{14} Johann Winckelmann, Reflections on the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks; with Instructions for the Connoisseur, Henry Fusseli, trans. (London: A Millar Publisher, 1765).

\textsuperscript{15} Leppmann, 240.
afforded him access to the objects he most wanted to study and the time in which to do it. Living under the financial support of Albani, he did not need to sell antiquities to support himself, so instead he took full advantage of the unique circumstances and became the first critical art historian. His masterpiece, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* or *The History of Ancient Art*, was published in German between 1763 and 1764, before being translated into Italian by Carlo Amoretti (1741-1816) in 1764 and later annotated by the Abbé Angelo Fumagalli (1728-1804) and archaeologist and archivist Carlo Fea (1753-1836) in 1779. Although some of Winckelmann’s stylistic suppositions have been disproven, and he did not truly differentiate between Greek and Roman sculpture, he was the first scholar to create a clear and thoughtful chronology based on stylistic characteristics of Greco-Roman art by using first-hand and empirical analysis.

Baron von Stosch left Rome for Florence with a personalized copy of Winckelmann’s first book, and the two would continue to correspond. Albani would remain in even closer contact with Winckelmann, as he now frequently turned to his librarian for advice, and took him on informal digs in and around Rome. Many of the objects discovered in this period were written about and published by Winckelmann. The *Antinous Bas Relief*, found at Hadrian’s Villa, was one of those. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 3.1) Examined and discussed by Winckelmann, it provides further tangible evidence of the strong connection between Albani and its probable restorer, Cavaceppi.

---


17 Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Spies*, 189.
The first mention of the piece is actually an engraving after a drawing in 1736 by the Grand Tour portraitist, Pompeo Batoni. Excavated the year before, it was said to have been found at Tivoli, and restored by an unnamed sculptor – who could very likely have been Cavaceppi, based on the dates and the restoration techniques used. The *Antinous Bas Relief* was repeatedly referred to as a beautiful and important piece. Pompeo Batoni used it as a prop in a Grand Tourist portrait, and Edward Gibbons adoringly described it as “admiringly finished, soft, well turned and full of flesh”.¹⁸ (For more information on the painting by Batoni, see Appendix A, 3.2) For his part, Winckelmann wrote that it had an especially melancholic expression. It was conspicuously hung above a fireplace in a room designed specifically for it in the Villa Albani. Winckelmann must have considered it to be of high importance as he has an image of The *Antonius Bas Relief* in front of him in the 1768 Anton von Maron portrait of himself. This choice is significant for another reason, as Antinous, always depicted as a beautiful young male, the famous lover of the second-century AD Roman Emperor Hadrian. Winckelmann himself was known to be a homosexual; by choosing to have his portrait include an image of Antinous, instead of any number of other ancient pieces that he could have selected, he is in essence openly stating his sexual orientation. As was earlier the case with the provocative depictions of male youths created during the Baroque period by Caravaggio and done for relatives of the Pope, homophobia was not apparently an issue amongst the Papal elite.¹⁹

¹⁸ Gibbons wrote of Antinous in his diary *Autobiographies of from Men of All Ranks* vol. 2, reel 1, Ad 34874 (London: British Museum, 1795), 98.

¹⁹ For a catalogue with the major images of Antinous, see Caroline Vout, *Antinous, the Face of the Antique* (Leeds: Henry Moore Sculpture Trust, 2006).
While the area around Hadrian’s villa was being unscientifically excavated by these gentleman-scholars, the area around Naples was also being exploited, again driven by events and circumstances. In 1738 the Spanish Bourbon monarch Charles VII of Naples requested a new summer palace at Portici. Portici was five miles southeast of Naples, located at the base of Mt. Vesuvius. The Bourbon monarch was aware that for years ancient objects had been serially rediscovered nearby in Resina (renamed Ercolano in 1969 in honor its original name - Herculaneum). A long-standing practice among local residents was to secure water by drilling artesian wells, often unearthing bits and pieces of the ancient city along with the water. Evidence of just how prolific the area was had literally resurfaced as early as circa 1530 during the reign of Charles V, when four large, male, togate, marble statues were discovered and initially placed in the Piazza dei Mozzi. In the late seventeenth century local scholars such as Andrea Simone Imperato had already written informal catalogs with lists of objects. Early attempts at more formal excavation took place under Pope Clement 1703, as he appointed Francesco Bianchini to be the superintendent of antiquities. Bianchini published a book of his finds by the Appian Way in 1727. The first overtly public notice of the archaeological potential of the area had occurred in 1711. The long and complicated history of the excavation of

20 For a thorough discussion on the early archaeology of the site, see Christopher Charles Parslow, Rediscovering Antiquity: Karl Weber and the excavations of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabiae (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), especially 24-46.

21 Murray. 152.

22 Valentin Kockel, Brigitte Sölch and Martin Heise. Francesco Bianchini (1662-1729) und die europäische gelehrte Welt um 1700. (Augsberg: Akademie Verlag, 2005).
Herculaneum and Pompeii is clearly beyond the scope of this study; but it bears noting that by 1759, when Charles left Naples to become King Charles III of Spain, the general site was being openly and haphazardly explored. By royal decree the objects were initially to remain on site, and they would be scrutinized over the following decades by various scholars such as Winckelmann. This helped to fuel the Neoclassical movement.

In the preceding description of the societal and institutional forces at play in the excavation of antiquities, some key personages have emerged, many with names very recognizable to scholars and historians. The next phase of the story – restoration of the excavated artifacts – features a leading man whose name is not so well know.

**The Life and Work of Cavaceppi**

In 1716, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi was baptized in the parish church of *Santa Maria del Popolo*. The vicinity around St. Mary of the People was then, as now, populated by artists, favored by well-heeled families and dense with clergy. It was considered to be a politically important section of Rome due to the influential nature of the wealthy citizens and church officials who lived there, many of whom preferred the area for the unique nature of the location itself. Three major roadways that linked the city from north to south – the *Via de Ripetta*, *Via del Corso* (originally the Roman *Via Lata*) and the *Via Babuino* – converged from the south into the *Piazza del Popolo*, located directly in front

---


of the church. (For more information on map by G.B. Nolli, see Appendix A, 3.3.) The configuration of the roadways formed a distinctive trident pattern, which was favored by Renaissance urban planners as a variation of the radial-concentric scheme. The papacy had taken a special interest in the area, as it had been conceived of since the Renaissance as being the northern-most boundary of Rome. In an attempt to create a symbolic gateway into the city, Pope Leo X had enlarged the Via Ripetta in 1513, and Clement VII had widened the Via Babuino in 1525 – a Jubilee year that gave rise to many important architectural renovations. For all these reasons, by the time of Cavaceppi’s humble birth, the venue into which he was born was a crucial urban quarter of Rome. Bordered by the Tiber River to the west and the Villa Borghese to the east, the area around Santa Maria del Popolo was a hub of political and social activity. Notably for the life work of Cavaceppi, it was also the major center in Rome for sculptors and their art, from the Renaissance throughout the eighteenth century.

The Church of Santa Maria del Popolo was built in 1099 adjacent to the site where, according to legend, Emperor Nero’s body had been unceremoniously buried. Located at the southern end of the Via Flaminia, an ancient Roman highway, the church was completely renovated between 1472 and 1479 at the request of Pope Sixtus IV. During this same time period the unusually large urban plaza, the Piazza del Popolo, was

---


26 Gross, Rome in the Age of Enlightenment, 19.

extended in front of the church. Extremely influential artists such as Bramante, Raphael, Lorenzetto, Annibale Carracci, Caravaggio and Bernini had their works placed in and around the church. In 1511 Martin Luther stayed at the adjacent monastery.\textsuperscript{28} At the adjacent \textit{Porta del Popolo}, the sculptor Bernini redesigned the main gate in honor of Queen Christina of Sweden (1626-1689) who made her formal entry in 1655 to the city. Thus, while modest by Vatican standards, the church had a distinguished history.

Just before Cavaceppi was born, two additional churches were built on the opposite side of the Piazza. Mirroring each other in shape and form, the churches of \textit{Santa Maria di Montesanto} and \textit{Santa Maria di Miracoli} flank the beginning of the \textit{Via Corso}. Adorned with high-quality art of the period, they were clearly intended to demarcate the \textit{Piazza del Popolo} as the formal entrance into Rome. As a devout Catholic, Cavaceppi grew up in and around these churches and chose the area for his home and studio, both located near the end of the \textit{Via Babuino}, which faces the Spanish Steps.\textsuperscript{29} The numerous examples of art, surrounding him throughout his life, could not help but serve as visual cues which formed and fueled his work.

Bartolomeo Cavaceppi would write in his autobiography, regrettably no longer extant, that he was born in Rome in 1716. According to contemporary authors, who cited his autobiography as their main source of information on his early years, he lived most of his

\textsuperscript{28} For a curious summary of Luther’s time spent in Rome, see James Wylie, \textit{History of Protestantism in Germany to the Leipsic Disputation, 1519} (Rapidan: Hartland Publications, 2003)

life in the same neighborhood where he was born, in the vicinity of the aforementioned parish church.30 The second of nine children, almost nothing of his early life, upbringing or family influences is known. The pursuits of his parents and siblings are largely unclear. A notable exception is his younger brother Paolo, who was listed by the Vatican as being a minor sculptor and restorer for Clement XII under the direction of Giovanni Battista Visconti.31 Paolo Cavaceppi’s only known original works are two large marble niche statues dating to 1775. Personifications of Christian Faith and Wisdom, these figures are columnar in form and adhere to their corresponding printed images in Cesare Ripa’s 1764-7 Iconologia.32 (For more information on the sculpture, see Appendix A, 3.4) These statues, located across from each other inside the Church of SS Apostoli in the Cappella di San Bonaventura, drew little comment during his day.33 Paolo Cavaceppi generally merited only a few scant references in Vatican documents as an assistant to his more famous brother, Bartolomeo.

---

30 The fullest discussion of this is in Seymour Howard, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, Eighteenth-Century Restorer (New York: Garland Publishing, 1982), 5-6.


32 Between the years 1593-1779, there were a total of nine Italian and eight non-Italian editions produced of his text (French, Dutch, English and German). For an interesting article on the importance of Ripa on Italian art, and the various editions used, see Christopher L. C. E. Witcombe “Cesare Ripa and the Sala Clementina”, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. 55 (1992): 277-82.

33 Next to nothing is written about Paolo Cavaceppi; for a brief outline of his work, see Minor, “The Mind’s Road to God,” 485.
Although sources are contradictory as to the exact dates, from approximately the age of thirteen to sixteen, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi worked as an apprentice in the workshop of Pierre-Étienne Monnot. Monnot, born in Orchamps-Vennes in 1657, was originally trained by his father as a wood carver before being apprenticed at the age of nineteen to Jean Dubois, a sculptor in Dijon. Monnot trained there for a year before he moved on to Paris circa 1677, staying there for a decade. Becoming an official student of the French Academy in Rome, he took up residence there in 1687 and became a well regarded academic follower of the Baroque master Bernini. While still receiving official commissions from the French government, Monnot opened his own school for sculptors on the Via Arco della Ciambella. Cavaceppi would become his most adept and famous pupil.

Monnot initially made a name for himself in Rome with his copies of contemporary Italian Baroque paintings and engravings – the painter Domenichino being an especially favored source of imagery. He also was well regarded as a restorer of fragmentary ancient statues. It was Monnot who fancifully restored a Roman torso after Myron's *Discobolus* as *A Fallen Warrior* or *Wounded Gladiator*, a piece which was given by Pope

---


36 The location he chose was significant as it had originally been adjacent to the site of the Baths of Agrippa. See Samuel Ball Platner and Thomas Ashley, eds., *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), 518-20, and Enggass, *Early Eighteenth-Century Sculpture in Rome*, 78.
Clement XII to the Capitoline Museum in about 1734.\textsuperscript{37} This unusual adaptation will be discussed more extensively along with all the various manifestations of the \textit{Discobolus}.

Monnot had also occasionally received important sculptural commissions directly from the Vatican, as when asked by Pope Clement XI to create St Peter and St Paul. These two separate niche pieces were part of the Lateran Apostles, a group of twelve saints begun in 1708 and destined for the newly renovated nave of \textit{San Giovanni in Laterano}. This ambitious project revolved around twelve larger-than-life-size figures, which were designed by Carlo Maratti, a prominent painter, teacher and later head of the \textit{Accademia di San Luca}. No material expense was spared, and the completed marble statues were the most expensive sculptural project of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{38} Four of the twelve were executed by French artists. Aside from the two by Monnot, statues of St. Bartholomew and St. Thomas were made by Pierre Le Gros the Younger. (For more information on the sculptures, see Appendix A, 3.5)

Le Gros, an academically trained artist and early \textit{Gran Prix} winner, was well known in Rome by 1695. He had just beaten out the local competition by winning the coveted commission for the St. Ignatius altar in the mother church of the Jesuits, \textit{Il Gesù}. This acceptance of French artists into a normally Roman sphere was due to their established artistic ability, but it also was part of a purposeful diplomatic policy. The Vatican wanted to forge a financial and religious alliance between itself and the Catholic King of France,

\textsuperscript{37} Enggass, \textit{Early Eighteenth-Century Sculpture in Rome}, 81.

Louis XIV (1638-1715), and the currency of the alliance was to be art.\textsuperscript{39} Objects might physically reside in Rome, but their message was unambiguous and ubiquitous: Rome was the epicenter of Catholicism, so art in Rome was for \textit{all} Catholics. Although Louis XIV declined to contribute funds for the project, Germany (specifically the cities of Wurzburg and Bavaria, two Catholic enclaves during this period) and Portugal did graciously send money.\textsuperscript{40} This symbolically secured their place in the diplomatic alliance. In awarding a prominent commission to Monnot, a French artist, the Vatican was in part attempting to re-establish the link of cultural, financial and religious dialogue between Italy and France.

A detailed analysis of his style is not relevant here, but in general Monnot’s work was in the classical baroque style, and effectively blended in with the work of Bernini. The closeness of the two artists’ styles can be seen in Monnot’s first major commission, the 1696 bas-relief of \textit{Shepherds and the Flight into Egypt}. Located at the right transept altar inside the church of \textit{St. Maria della Vittoria}, it is a busy triangular creation that conforms well to the Baroque predilection for classical forms and complex compositions.

In 1714 Monnot left Rome to work for the Germans, creating what is considered to be his masterpiece, the interior of the Marble Bath Building (\textit{Marmorbad}).\textsuperscript{41} This summer

\textsuperscript{39} Johns, \textit{Papal Art and Cultural Politics}, 77.

\textsuperscript{40} King Peter II of Portugal (1648-1706) was one of the wealthiest monarchs in Europe during this time period; refer to Johns, \textit{Papal Art and Cultural Politics}, 82-3, for an interesting discussion of his involvement in Papal art and politics.

\textsuperscript{41} For a discussion of the Marble Bath building, see Jens Ludwig Burk. “Pierre Étienne Monnot und die Entstehung des Kasseler Marmorbades - neue Archivfunde Marburger
residence had a pseudo-bath house that was used for rituals (the spigots and other plumbing fixtures of which were never connected to water); it was located next to the Orangery in the Karlsaue Park at Kassel. Work on this unique structure had begun earlier, in 1702 as a royal summer residence. Neo-Palladian in scale and style, André Le Nôtre had designed the gardens around the square-plan pavilion, and its entire interior circumference was a late Baroque interpretation of an Imperial Roman, barrel-vaulted gallery. From 1714 until 1729, Monnot traveled frequently between Kassel and Rome, as he planned the work and supervised his shop in the execution of the interior wall revetments and twelve life-size marble statuary groups, all of which were installed inside the ambulatory. In addition to these pieces, there were sixteen polychromatic marble reliefs, all done in the contemporary Baroque style and representing themes taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This theme was a calculated choice, as it had already been made popular by Annibale Carracci in 1587 (The Farnese Ceiling) and again by Bernini in 1625 (Apollo and Daphne). Executed with technical aplomb, the project was extremely well received.

Most of the groupings are individually signed with the name MONNOT in capital letters, followed by ROM (Rome). Even the inscription over the door jamb of the main room attests to the claim that “Monnot alone made all of these marble works in 1728”

---


(P. TRVS. STEF. MONNOT. FECIT. AMNIA. OPERA. MARMOIS. ANNO. D MDCCXXVIII).\textsuperscript{43}

The sheer amount of work entailed in such large and complicated pieces, along with the inclusion of ROM inscription on the sculptural groupings, argues for their manufacture in Rome, with 1728 as the likely completion date in the workshop. The installation in Kassel was not completed until 1733. By contrast, due to their weight, size, and lack of any specific production-locale markings, the marble panels were more than likely made in a local German workshop under Monnot’s direction.

Since he was known to have been apprenticed to Monnot for four years during this exact period, the teenage Cavaceppi would almost certainly have been a junior member of Monnot’s Roman workshop. It seems logical to assume that he would have been involved with the latter stages of the production of the \textit{Marmorbad} pieces and possibly even with their installation.\textsuperscript{44} Relocated to the \textit{Via delle Carrozze}, Monnot’s large studio appears to have employed approximately fifty students, mostly from Italy and France.\textsuperscript{45} The studio was truly international in character, frequented by French, German, English, and Italian patrons. Here Cavaceppi would have become fully acquainted with the practice and trade of sculpting, as well as the tastes of the marketplace. Wealthy English Grand Tourists, such as the Earl of Exeter, John Cecil, frequented Monnot’s studio and purchased both contemporary and restored antique works. Shipped to his estate, the

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 79.


\textsuperscript{45} For the number of students see Howard, \textit{Bartolomeo Cavaceppi}, 6, and regarding the location of the studio see Enggass, \textit{Early Eighteenth-Century Sculpture in Rome}, 80.
Burghley House, examples of both Monnot’s and Cavaceppi’s works are still owned by Cecil’s heirs.\textsuperscript{46}

In 1732, while still an apprentice to Monnot and at his urging, the sixteen-year-old Cavaceppi sporadically attended the most prestigious art school in Rome, the Accademia di San Luca. The Accademia di San Luca had been originally founded in 1593 by the painter and architect Federico Zuccari, but due to chronic underfunding and a lack of coherent leadership, it did not provide consistent education until the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Reestablished in 1715 by Clement XI, arguably due to this Pope’s desire to regain control over public commissions and the arts in general, it became the preeminent school in Rome.\textsuperscript{47} Clement XI wrote and implemented various statutes, whose purpose was to fully fund and give the school technical and methodological rigor. Largely because of these personal Papal efforts, the Accademia di San Luca gained an international reputation. Modeled after the French Royal Academy, it quickly became known for the high quality of its workmanship. The Accademia was also well known for doctrinal adherence to its own academic principles of mimesis, in this context interpreted to be the strict copying of antique works.\textsuperscript{48} Except when approved by Papal authorities, students were expected to emulate the works of the past instead of creating original compositions. Clement XI also reestablished the tradition of holding yearly student competitions – a \textit{prix}, in the spirit of the French Royal Academy. This traditional

\textsuperscript{46} Enggass, \textit{Early Eighteenth-Century Sculpture in Rome}, 78.


\textsuperscript{48} Howard, \textit{Bartolomeo Cavaceppi}, 11.
contest, referred to as the *concorsi clementini*, was in place from 1702 until 1869. Inviting visiting scholars and Grand Tourists to attend these lavish ceremonies, both Clement XI and his nephew, Cardinal Alessandro Albani, were known to have periodically appeared in person to hand out the awards. These staged events gave personal prestige to the winning artists – not to mention exposure to wealthy patrons – fueling both local and international interest in the Roman art market.

During Cavaceppi’s first year at the *Accademia*, and while still working in Monnot’s workshop, he won an important *Concorsi Clementini*: the 1732 grand prize for the best artist in the beginning sculpture class. His winning piece, a terra cotta work entitled *Angels in a likeness of those by Bernini* is now lost, so aside from the minimal information in the title itself, nothing is known of its characteristics.

In 1734, in the middle of Cavaceppi’s formal training, Monnot died at the age of seventy-two, and his studio was disbanded. But as luck would have it, Cavaceppi had caught the eye of the art collector Albani who had seen him win the *Concorsi* at *San Luca*. Albani placed him under the tutelage of the Vatican restorer, Carlo Antonio Napoleoni. Cavaceppi still continued his coursework as his other obligations would allow, and in 1738 he even won another prize, this time for an original terra cotta work representing his own interpretation of *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife*. This piece too has

---


been lost and no further description has been recovered to date. By 1738 he was eighteen years old and in need of stable employment, so he stopped attending classes. Napoleoni, about twenty-five years older than Cavaceppi, recognized and valued the younger man’s ability to work with different media and rare materials, and very much needed able assistants with just such skills. Napoleoni had been hired by Albani to do extensive restoration work in 1733 and was thereafter repeatedly inundated with more objects. Cavaceppi went to work for him full time. He was hired in particular to restore fragments of antique statues collected by the Vatican and initially intended to become part of Albani’s private collection, housed in the Villa Albani. Many of these fragments ultimately were incorporated into restored statues that are still key holdings in the Capitoline, Lateran and Vatican museums. But in 1742, still in the early stages of the sorting and restoring process, Napoleoni died suddenly, leaving the studio to his nephew Clemente Bianchi. Bianchi was about the same age as Cavaceppi, and the two knew each other well from their years together in the studio.

According to the Archivio di Stato, Antichita e Belle Arte the studio was located at the present site of the Capitoline Museum, on the Via Gesù e Maria. There the two young sculptors were surrounded by a largely unsorted and undocumented collection of fragmented antique busts and statues also owned by Albani. Unfortunately, Albani’s archives from this period, which included inventory lists of the objects restored, were lost

---

52 Bowron, Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century, 239.
53 Weiss, 67.
54 Bowron, 238. Also see Howard, “Boxers,” 240, note 6.
in a fire.\textsuperscript{55} This only adds to the confusion of the ordering, execution and extensiveness of the restorations, as Albani was one of the most prolific, if also haphazard, of collectors. As if intentionally trying to obscure, or at least enhance the mystique, of the process, Albani never wrote any instructions or correspondence directly to Cavaceppi. As Howard points out, their relationship is revealed only through short comments of contemporaries, comparison between the works illustrated and described in Cavaceppi’s three-volume catalogue, \textit{Raccolta d’ Antiche Statue, Busti, Teste Cognite}, and the corresponding restored and signed pieces in the Villa Albani and Vatican museums.\textsuperscript{56} That Albani had a constant urge to collect is indisputable, as he had been forced to sell his first collection of some four hundred pieces in 1733 due to debt. The collection was bought by Clement XI and used to establish the Capitoline Museum. By 1734 when he hired Cavaceppi directly, Albani was rebounding from financial difficulties and was looking for an affordable but exceptionally skilled artist to restore these various fragments.\textsuperscript{57} Cavaceppi would continue to work for him for the next thirty years, and his skills would help create the core of Albani’s second collection to be housed in his Palazzo in Rome. By 1750 Cavaceppi was the most successful restorer in Rome. It may, however, have been this constant influx and factory-like processing of these expensive but plentiful artifacts that gave him a notably casual attitude toward the antique. When

\textsuperscript{55} Howard, \textit{Bartolomeo Cavaceppi}, 14; and Rome: \textit{Archivio di Stato}, III, Nos. 95, 127.

\textsuperscript{56} Howard, \textit{Bartolomeo Cavaceppi}, 15.

\textsuperscript{57} Picón, \textit{Bartolomeo Cavaceppi}, 13.
supplies of any commodity appear endless, the value of the individual objects doesn’t seem 
that exceptional.

In 1744 Cavaceppi and Bianchi were hired by the Marchese Capponi, the first 
director of the Capitoline Museum, to restore the fragments of the *Fauno in Rosso Antico*, 
or *Antique Red Marble Faun*.\(^{58}\) (For more information on the sculpture, see Appendix A, 3.6) The fragments, excavated by Giuseppe Furietti in 1736 at the site of the small palace 
of Hadrian’s Villa, consisted of a nude torso, battered head, partial left arm, torso of a 
companion goat, and a fragment of a cylindrical basket of fruit.\(^{59}\) The faun was 
originally made popular as a Hellenistic sculptural subject, due to its sly sexual subtext. 
The *Fauno Rosso* in question stylistically dates to the Hadrianic period (73-138 AD) 
and seems to have been a copy of a Greek bronze. As restored by Cavaceppi and 
Bianchi, it is a 5’-6” tall nude and moderately muscular figure, whose head seems rather 
impish and immature in comparison to the torso. A grape and pomegranate laden *nebris*, 
or draped cloak, is fastened over his left shoulder and his left arm projects out to the 
viewer, holding a walking staff. The right hand, heavily laden with grapes and leaves, is 
raised in a toast to the heavens. His right hip leans against a tree stump, upon which is 
slung a pan flute. On the left side is a goat looking upwards, standing over a slightly 
open, fruit-filled wicker basket. For this particular work, Cavaceppi seems not to have

---


been using Bernard Montfaucon’s 1722 text, *Antiquity Explained and Represented in Sculptures*, a well known contemporary source.\(^\text{60}\) (For more information on the book, see Appendix A, 3.7) A very detailed two-volume work, Montfaucon’s book provides voluminous iconographic explanations, using antique works to illustrate his points. It was used repeatedly as a reference for artists and scholars. Curiously, Cavaceppi’s *Faun* looks nothing like the images Montfaucon chose for his section on *Fauns, Pans and Satyrs*.\(^\text{61}\)

According to the *Codice Capponi*, both men were paid the same amount for their labor, but Bianchi was hired solely to carve the expensive red marble; Cavaceppi was to make the preparatory models and casts of the missing parts.\(^\text{62}\) He was also the one paid to dowel, glue, smooth, polish, and clean the final piece.

By 1746 Cavaceppi had added the missing sections.\(^\text{63}\) As can be detected by close visual examination of the grains or striations in the dark-red marble, he had carefully cut clean breaks into the existing fragments which would make the joint to the spliced part look more like a natural or accidental crack in the original stone, cleaned the edges smooth, and then doweled on the new parts. Red stain was added to hide the differences in coloration between the new repair piece and the patina of the ancient marble.\(^\text{64}\)


\(^\text{61}\) See Howard’s remark, that Cavaceppi repeatedly used this source, “Some Eighteenth-Century Restored Boxers”, 242-3.

\(^\text{62}\) *Codice Capponi* Pitture e anticaglie, MS. 92, 190, 200 (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1717-46), 293. Also see Bowron, 239.

\(^\text{63}\) Howard, 23.

\(^\text{64}\) Howard, *Bartolomeo Cavaceppi*, 25.
new pieces also were given an “antiqued” appearance by roughing up their surface and by intentionally creating small cracks in logically stress-prone areas such as limbs. This was apparently done using a point chisel and can also be noticed on other of Cavaceppi’s restorations.

Since this is an early, expensive and important example of Cavaceppi’s restoration techniques, certain aspects of the Red Faun are noteworthy. The chamfered base – flat at the back but with octagonal cut edges that face the viewer – was never intended to pass as part of the original ancient piece, as the inscription along its front edge commemorates the Pope who donated the work to the Capitoline Museum, Benedict XIV (1675-1758). This inscription is done in low relief and uppercase block print. With two registers and a rolled edge at the top and bottom, the vertical face of the base suggests an entablature band. The red marble used for the base is the same color as the statue itself, so even in this clearly added element Cavaceppi took care to achieve a uniform and unified look.

The tree trunk, another element added by Cavaceppi, is about the same diameter as the faun’s upper thigh and rises straight out of the base. It is slightly engaged to the side of the faun’s calf, echoing the shape of knee area, and converges fully with the upper thigh of the figure, providing critical stability for the statue. Large sections of the carved trunk were made to look like peeling or stripped-back bark, but the effect is anthropomorphic or perhaps reminiscent of diaphanous drapery falling off a limb. Even the general lines of the tree trunk undulate, more akin to sinew than wood.

A seven-bundled flute or syrinx is slung over a cut branch, knee high. This feature, as it was not recorded as one of the recovered fragments, is detail added to reinforce the
identity of the figure as a faun. The flute is also a reference to Ovid, one of the few ancient authors to explain the origin of the pan flute in his text, *Metamorphosis*. As mentioned earlier, this text was a frequent source for Baroque artists and iconographers.

The goat too is Cavaceppi’s in conception and execution, as only a portion of its original torso was found. Its size, rendering of fur, congenial demeanor (impishly tilting back the top of the wicker fruit basket), and “smiling” open mouth are pet-like, which helps to engage the viewer by adding a degree of mirth to what could otherwise be interpreted, due to the potential sexual connotations that sometimes were attached to fauns, as a dark mythological theme.

The nude torso of the faun was restored facing the viewer, and was re-worked in various places by Cavaceppi to allow for the addition of the limbs and *nebris*. The faun’s contrapposto, open stance, sinuous S-curve and delineated genitals are very similar to the piece attributed to Praxiteles, *Hermes and Dionysius*, a work not excavated until 1877 in Olympia. By contrast to the somewhat squat proportions of the faun’s calves, both of its feet appear oversized, and the up-stretched right arm seems disproportionately muscular when compared to the other limbs. The head, child-like in its features, seems undersized on a curiously bulbous neck. This all adds to the sense of the underlying theme of the work – a scene of metamorphosis – a changeling, literally emerging into

---


66 The position of the body of Hermes was much copied by the Romans. The version found in 1877 is thought by some scholars to be an original. For a clear image of this work, see Mary Beard and John Henderson, *Classical Art: From Greece to Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 101.
adulthood. Arguably intentional, these compositional choices which initially seem incongruous, if not outright crude, combine to form a work whose point is indeed a depiction of transition – a youth turning into a man, metaphorically and physically. Bernini had earlier provided a paradigm for this kind of depiction with his 1625 work, Apollo and Daphne. Following the story found in Ovid, Bernini carved Daphne’s skin in the moment it was changing into a laurel tree. Perhaps Cavaceppi was following Bernini’s lead in carving the faun’s tree stump in a similar anthropomorphic manner. That possibility would help explain the somewhat unexpected characteristics of the added and restored pieces as purposeful creative license exercised by an emerging master in the art of restoration.

Cavaceppi included the Red Faun as plate number 28 in volume one of his 1768 catalogue, Raccolta d’ Antiche. It is not known whether he or someone else in his studio made the illustration drawing for the catalogue, but it is curious to note that it is not simply a likeness of the statue as restored. Rather it has differences that one might argue are refinements. In the drawing, done some twenty years after the restoration was completed, the features of the faun have been greatly softened. The hair is less choppy and now has the typical leonine mane and wrinkled forehead of Alexander the Great, both characteristics preferred during the Hellenistic period. The torso seems shorter and the entire figure is more evenly muscular; the goat’s hooves have been awkwardly repositioned, as have the tree trunk and basket. However, at the revised angles they create a compositional “V” that better frames the faun. The shape of the plinth has also

---

67 For a clear image of the Red Faun, see Haskell and Penny, 214.
been simplified – shown now as a square narrow base without chamfered corners – and the dedicatory inscription has been removed. The caption below the image calls the piece simply “Fauno”, and describes the provenance as being the Villa Tiburtina (Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli). The catalogue illustration caption also states that Cavaceppi made another copy in bianco (white) marble.

The differences between the restored sculptural piece and its illustration could be interpreted in two ways. Since the catalogue was made twenty years after the statue was restored and placed in public view at the Capitoline Museum, Cavaceppi may have intentionally altered aspects of the work that he himself was dissatisfied with or that had received criticism from others.  

There is, however, another, more likely reason for the mismatch between the sculpture and its illustration. The image depicted in his catalogue is probably not actually the Red Faun at all, but the second copy made in white marble. It is logical to assume that in a later sculptural reproduction Cavaceppi would have fixed anything that he disliked in the first version, and would prefer to have this “new and improved” piece shown in the catalogue for any potential buyers to see. Although a comparison between the two sculptures would readily clarify this point, the location of the White Marble Faun is

---

68 All reviewers were not so critical. Mariana Starke literally gushed over the Red Faun in her famous travel book of 1820, Information and Directions for the Travellers on the Continent. She had a zero to three exclamation point system to rate the works she saw. Cavaceppi’s version got “!!!”. This text was the guide book that Nathaniel Hawthorne used during his stay in Italy. However, Hawthorne would be indifferent to Cavaceppi’s Red Faun, of which he made no comment. Instead he became enamored of the Faun of Praxiteles, which served as inspiration for his book, The Marble Faun, 1868. Mrs. Starke gave that one only an honorable mention rating of “zero!”
unknown. Its loss opens yet another question, even more relevant to Cavaceppi’s work as it relates to this investigation: did he carve the white marble piece from scratch, or was too a restoration using ancient marble fragments?

Providing further evidence of the character, quality and high-profile reception of Cavaceppi’s restoration work is another piece from this period closely connected to Cavaceppi by proximity and restoration style: the Antinous Relief. This sculpture was located in the Villa Albani, which was built in stages from 1746-1763 by Carlo Marchionni, an Italian architect working for the Vatican. It was designed to be not only a sumptuous private residence, but also a prestigious gallery and a kind of salesroom.69 (For more information on the Villa, see Appendix A, 3.8) Located within a Versailles-like park setting, the interior decor of the Villa Albani featured various fragmented and restored ancient sculptural pieces, along with contemporary artwork such as the famous fresco ceiling by the German painter Anton Raphael Mengs. An important international artist and fine scholar in his own right, Mengs had picked up on Winckelmann’s effusive appreciation, both in writing and in person, of the famous Apollo Belvedere.70 Mengs’ 1760-61 fresco entitled Parnassus, located prominently on the ceiling of the main salon in the Villa Albani, is arguably the earliest work done in the Neoclassical style. (For more information on the ceiling painting, see Appendix A, 3.9) Visitors walked in between

69 For an interesting discussion on the architect Marchionni’s use of Pliny in the conceptual design of the Villa, see Pierre de la Ruffinière Du Prey, The Villas from Antiquity to Posterity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 104-6.

70 For a discussion on the Apollo Belvedere, see Senff Reinhard, Das Apollonheiligtum von Idalion: Architektur und Statuenausstattung eines Zyprischen Heiligtums (Jonsered: P. Åströms Förlag, 1993).
rows of statues and other displayed antiquities, and then could look up to see Apollo and the Muses at play. The theme for the painting was from Raphael’s *Parnassus*, one of the four frescos in the *Stanza della Signatura* at the Vatican, although Mengs had reworked the main figure into the pose of the statue of *Apollo Belvedere*. The room’s success was dependent upon the viewers seeing themselves amongst the cultural elite of eternity. The total effect of the salon was intellectual enlightenment – modern classicism in a *trés moderne* setting. While today the ceiling is often described as a curious mixture of baroque, rococo, and “antique” styles, at the time of its inception it created an updated atmosphere for Albani’s salon and served his purposes well. He and his erudite guests were duly impressed.71

Finding antiquities sales to be a welcome by-product of a gentleman’s education, Albani made certain to show his guests his marble bas-relief of the handsome but infamous youth Antinous, the lover of the Emperor Hadrian.72 Excavated in the ruins of Hadrian’s Villa in 1735, it had been purchased by Albani that same year and depicted in a drawing by the Italian artist Pompeo Batoni.73 The restorer of the piece is undocumented,

71 The Villa Albani would continue to impress; the building and its contents were bought by the Torlonia family in 1866 for the equivalent of 725,000 dollars. In 1911 it was again for sale, nearly becoming the new home for the American Academy in Rome; the asking price was 1,000,000. But due to political machinations and a lack of solid funding, the deal fell through. See the “Rome Academy’s New Plan”, *New York Times*, (January 8, 1911).

72 For an interesting Victorian view on the various images of Antinous, see “The Antinous”, *New York Times*, (March 30, 1879).

73 Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 144-6. For Batoni’s engraving, see *Venuti,1736, 7-8, plate IX.*
but it is logical to assume, based on style and previous work history, that Napoleoni and Cavaceppi were involved. Both had established themselves with Albani by this period. The restored piece, as restored, has an extreme simplicity, crispness of outline, and smoothness of surface detail that suggests extensive reworking by skilled Neoclassical restorer(s) rather than a largely original sculptural work from Imperial Rome.\(^7^4\)

Close examination of the Antinous bas-relief is problematic, as this work, and the entire Villa Albani, have since 1866 been privately owned by the reclusive Torlonia family. The contemporary response to the piece was intensely positive, and in 1762 Albani commissioned the construction of a separate viewing room, designed by Carlo Marchionni, for the Antinous Relief.\(^7^5\) Multiple plaster casts of it were produced, sold and distributed throughout Europe to both private collections and museums.\(^7^6\) Pompeo Batoni used it at least twice as a contextual element in portraits he made of various Grand Tourists.\(^7^7\) Scholars such as Ridolfino Venuti (one of the founders of the Accademia Etrusca) and the historian Edward Gibbon lavished it with praise; it was “expatriated” by

\(^7^4\) Howard, p. 16. Also see Nicholas Penny “Townley at the British Museum and Cavaceppi as the Clarendon Gallery”, Burlington Magazine, (May 1984). Here, in a review of the corresponding catalogue, Penny disagrees with Seymour Howard’s assertion that Cavaceppi was the restorer of the Antinous Relief. Penny cites a lack of archival evidence, and that Cavaceppi never publically acknowledged the work. However, when given the chance to explain this argument in his various editions of Taste and the Antique, Penny remains silent on the issue. Due to the style of restoration and working relationship between Cavaceppi, Albani and Winckelmann, I support Howard’s original assertions.

\(^7^5\) Haskell and Penny, 144.

\(^7^6\) Haskell and Penny, Taste and the Antique, 146.

\(^7^7\) See Batoni’s Portrait of a Young Man, c. 1760-5, in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
the French in 1798, and subsequently returned to its home in the Villa Albani in 1820.\textsuperscript{78} Winckelmann became especially smitten with the piece, and it was included in the 1768 portrait of him done by the Austrian painter Anton von Maron.\textsuperscript{79} (For more information on the painting, see Appendix A, 3.10) Depicted in his private study, a room in the Villa Albani, Winckelmann is shown as an active scholar, quill in hand. Staring plaintively out towards the viewer from behind a writing desk, he is dressed in a robe with oversized scarlet and fur trim. On the table by his right hand is Batoni’s engraving of Antinous, laid diagonally over his own manuscript. Its placement there seems more for inspiration than edification. The American author Henry James also found the Antinous to be “a strangely beautiful and impressive thing”, but in 1858 it was Nathaniel Hawthorne who finally added a more critical note to its appraisal:

\begin{quote}
This is said to be the finest relic of antiquity next to the Apollo and the Laocoön; but I could not feel it to be so, partly, I suppose, because the features of Antinous do not seem to me beautiful in themselves; and that heavy, downward look is repeated till I am more weary of it than of anything else in sculpture... The Antinous has at least the merit of being almost as white and fresh, and quite as smooth, as if it had never been buried and dug up again.\textsuperscript{80}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{78} Notice des Statues, Bustes et Bas-reliefs de la Galerie des Antiques, Paris An IX (1800). Also see Haskell and Penny, 146.

\textsuperscript{79} The only known portrait of Cavaceppi is also by Maron. Cavaceppi wears a very similar robe and head dress, and is positioned in the same way, sitting in front of a desk. As a sculptor, Maron depicts him at work, holding a carving tool in front of a clay model loosely basely on the Capitoline Venus. (The one depicted is not “pudica” or modest – neither of her arms covers her body) In 1765, Maron married Mengs’ sister, the miniaturist Theresia Concordia Mengs, while at the same time he was a professor at the Accademia di San Luca. Thus Maron, Mengs, Winckelmann and Cavaceppi were linked together in both social and professional circles.

\textsuperscript{80} Nathaniel Hawthorne, Italian Notebook, May 1858. For Henry James, see Henry James, Italian Hours (Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing, 2004 re-print of 1909), 143.
Hawthorne had picked up on the fact that it seemed too white and too smooth, oddly contemporary when compared to other ancient pieces he had seen. But arguably its merit was in its evocation of the spirit of the antique – its exact origin of material, frankly being immaterial.

If indeed Cavaceppi were the principle restorer of the Antinous Relief, he must have been amused by the tender affection it garnered in its day, but also gratified by the praise and recognition. In any case, the amount of restoration work he is known to have received and its contemporary acceptance indicates that he understood the pulse of his times. In 1750 he established his first studio. By 1756 he was in the one where he would remain for the rest of his professional life – a venue as much showroom as workshop, commonly known to the locals as the “Museo Cavaceppi.”  

(For more information on the image, see Appendix A, 3.11) Located between the Spanish Steps and the Piazza del Popolo, it housed a factory full of workers, such as Carlo Albacini. His studio-factory-museum introduced procedures of mechanization and division of labor. Along with the restorations, Cavaceppi’s studio was said to have made hundreds of antico bozzetti or terra-cotta models loosely based on the antique. These models were actually copies of fragments that he pieced together in various different poses which served as templates for

---


later use in the reconstitution of statuary fragments. A view of this can be seen in an image of his workshop.83

With restoration work providing the main revenue for his studio, Cavaceppi turned to his business connections in an attempt to secure commissions for original compositions.84 Cardinal Albani was eager to place his protégé in Papal circles, and in 1759 recommended Cavaceppi to be the sculptor for new work, a statue of St. Norbert to be placed in St Peter’s. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 3.12) The Pope, Clement XII, had previously requested that his favorite in-house sculptor, Pietro Bracci, receive the commission. Albani convinced the Pope to allow Cavaceppi to make preparatory drawings and a plaster cast, but upon seeing the model, the “artistic counselors” on the peer review board of St. Peter’s rejected Cavaceppi’s design outright and retracted his preliminary contract. Albani argued with the board while Cavaceppi’s stucco model remained placed in the niche, but ultimately the Pope prevailed, and Bracci replaced Cavaceppi as sculptor.85

83 See the frontispiece of Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, Raccolta di Antiche Statue Busti Bassirilievi ed Altere Sculture, vol. 1, 1768-1772.

84 Cavaceppi was also at this time restoring pieces for Matthew Brettingham the younger (1725-1803). Brettingham, son of the architect of Holkham Hall, Norfolk, was a purchasing agent for Robert Walpole, the Duke of Oxford, and Thomas Coke, the Earl of Leicester. The restored fragments, consisting of busts, reliefs and torsos, had originally been purchased from Albani. Brettingham sites sixteen of them as being personally restored by Cavaceppi, but they remain outside of the focus of this study. Suffice it to say, Cavaceppi had a large output of work.

Exactly why he lost this important commission remains unclear, although it was rumored that Cavaceppi’s work was rejected due to its poor overall quality and its general incompatibility with the other works to be placed around it.86 Judging only by a print, it appears that his proposed St. Norbert was much heavier and more masculine than Bracci’s, and it was more columnar in its body shape. But the overall affect was more melodrama than inspiration, with its directionless windswept drapery and dreamy face upturned toward the heavens. In the end, it is difficult to discern if it was the character and quality of the design itself or preferential treatment by the Pope of his favored sculptor that cost Cavaceppi what could have been a career-making commission.87

Following this professional debacle, at least in the realm of original creative endeavor, Cavaceppi turned again to the safe haven of restoration. Enticed by English antiquarians, local art dealers and members of the Accademia di San Luca all of whom were promoting restoration work, Cavaceppi followed the money. Due to the politics and economics of his day, the big money was coming from Britain. In the eighteenth century, London was a thriving hub for collecting, and Rome was a bountiful fount of collectibles. Together the two cities formed a truly symbiotic relationship. This was not only due to the more

86 Ibid, 480.
87 The work is known only in print; see the 1762 engraving of Saint Norbert by F. Morel, located in the Victoria and Albert Museum. For a general idea of original works made by Cavaceppi, see Howard, “Cavaceppi’s Saint Norbert” pages 483-485. There Howard has listed all known objects made by Cavaceppi. The list was compiled by using two inventory lists, the Ferri ms. Archivio di Stato, 1799, and an 1802 sales catalogue, Lanciani ms, Palazzo Venezia. Howard also includes original works shown in Cavaceppi’s Raccolta, and a few other works in private holdings; all are confirmed to be Cavaceppi’s in contemporary correspondence. There are twenty-four marble and plaster works, and forty-three terra-cottas and sketches. All are of portraits and mythological beings.
obvious motives – commercial stimulus for Roman merchants and class-based acquisitiveness for London’s status seekers, but also to an underlying cultural phenomenon: a fundamental belief in the value of enlightenment through a classical education. The actual process of acquiring and practicing that education was well established: study then travel; collect then display; and, once at home – elucidate for others the important qualities that Classicism embodies. These were the sequential steps necessary to become culturally elite and refined, and to have tangible proof of one’s good taste. The antiques themselves, whether real or in replica, marble or manuscript, ultimately became an important credential for a bona fide member of the upper class. A brief look at the British educational system of the period sheds light on how this value system became an ingrained societal institution.

In “Eighteenth-Century Public Schools and the Education of the Governing Elite,” M. V. Wallbank includes examples of the class schedules from 1766 until 1771 of former students and of an assistant master at Eton. Eton’s curriculum, typical for its period and clientele, allocated eighty-eight percent of its lecture time to subjects under the heading of Classics. From the ages of nine to fifteen, which was then the standard period for public schooling, students were inundated with all things antique. One of the essential

---

88 Eighteenth-century authors such as Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, Reid, Burke and Alison wrote on the notion of aesthetics, or what defines and constitutes “Good Taste”. The student of this period would have been familiar with these arguments.


keys to culture was, of course, language. Latin was taught in the lower grades and had to be thoroughly understood before Greek was introduced. The mastering of Greek then broadened the student’s classical horizon and reinforced the nuanced meaning of Latin by allowing a comparison of the two linguistic traditions. Successful students became fluent in both languages by constantly switching between texts, for example, from Homer (Greek) to Suetonius (Latin). They also wrote original works of verse and prose, which were often then required to be translated from Greek into Latin, or vice-versa, and back again. The young British male elite had six years of this intense education. Their textbooks and readers were steeped in ancient philosophy, aesthetics, history, poetry, geography, political science and drama. This created an elite group of citizens naturalized, so to speak, to the Greco-Roman world. And once they were done reading about it, they were anxious to experience it firsthand.

Sent to Rome, almost always in the company of tutors and minders, these classroom-educated Grand Tourists had to first become acclimated to their new surroundings. Once the general necessities of lodging, banking and formal introductions were complete, they would have turned their attentions to sightseeing. The difference between the mental image of a place, as conjured up by reading about it in class, versus the actual vibrant sights and sounds of eighteenth-century Rome, must have been exhilarating and surprising to some and downright incongruous to others. But it would all have had a sense of familiarity to them, due to their drilled instruction in classical culture. During these trips, social connections were made with both fellow British travelers or expatriates and high-born Roman locals. These interactions would include
advice, sometimes self-serving, in how to find or buy any type of desired objects. Navigating this commercial and cultural milieu was difficult. There was a bewildering array of honest and educated dealers interspersed with a number of unscrupulous ones. Choosing a fellow countryman as your commercial agent or advisor in this endeavor was no guarantee of procuring anything worthy, much less authentic. In his 1766 letter to the British Lord Burghley, entitled “Advice to Travel in Italy,” William Patoun advises,

I need not Caution your Lordship against purchases at Rome. You have too much taste to buy a bad thing and the good are not to be had. Jenkins an English Picture dealer and Broker in the Corso will try to tempt you. He does not enjoy the best reputation in the world… Mr. Hamilton the History painter has more true taste then anybody at Rome. He will be very happy to have the Honor of Attending your Lordship sometimes to the great Collections.  

Thomas Jenkins and Gavin Hamilton were well known in Rome and dealt extensively with Cavaceppi on behalf of the Grand Tourists. Other primary sources substantiate Patoun’s opinion: Jenkins and Hamilton appear to have represented somewhat opposite poles of honorableness in the antiquarian-cum-dealer circle. 

Cavaceppi seems to have first met the Scotsman Gavin Hamilton through a mutual friend, the architect Matthew Brettingham. Hamilton had gone to Rome in the 1740s to train in painting under Agostino Masucci, an Italian academician whose students included Pompeo Batoni and Johann Zoffany. By 1748 Hamilton had departed for  

---

91 See the full letter, which is located in the Exeter Archives at Burghley House, in John Ingamells, Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701-1800 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), XLVII.

92 See Ingamells, 447-450 and 553-556.


94 Gross, Rome in the Age of Enlightenment, 319.
Naples in the company of Brettingham and two other architects, James Stuart and Nicholas Revett. The foursome hired guides and carried out informal archaeology in the area from 1748 until 1750. Later, in 1762, Stuart and Revett would write the seminal work on Greece of this period, *Antiquities of Athens*.

This also was the time that Hamilton began to occasionally export marbles to England. By 1756 he had moved permanently back to Rome, and was working on a series of paintings based on the Homeric cycle and various Roman Republican subjects. His first piece, *Andromache Bewailing the Death of Hector* received some critical acclaim by Winckelmann and others. (For more information on the painting, see Appendix A, 3.13) Hamilton’s style was slowly evolving into what would become typical of the Neoclassical. He was elected as a member of the *Accademia di San Luca* in 1761, (coincidentally, the very same day as Thomas Jenkins), and should have felt very accomplished and successful. Privately, however, Hamilton complained to his friend Daniel Crespin that he was not making enough money due his lack of skill in the “colouring” of his works.

---


96 The first recorded exportation to England occurred in 1758. Ingamells, Dictionary, 448.


98 Daniel Crespin was a friend of the painter Nathaniel Dance and Benjamin West. See the Seafield, MSS, GD 248/49/2, March 11, 1763.
to be “indolent.” According to Thomas Pelham, the income from sales of his works in addition to the fees retained from his students in Rome was not creating a satisfactory income, and Hamilton sought ways to augment it.

The British Lord Spencer, who had initially hired him to paint *Agrippina Landing at Brindisium with the Ashes of Germanicus*, formally commissioned Hamilton in 1766 to be his art dealer. This role was not entirely new to him. From as early as 1758 and continuing until 1779, the latter part of that time in the employ of Lord Spencer, Hamilton facilitated the exportation to England of various old masterpieces. Paintings by Domenichino, Guercino, Raphael, Poussin and even Leonardo da Vinci’s Milan version of the *Virgin of the Rocks* were exported by Hamilton and purchased by British collectors. It was arguably due to his own expressed self-doubt – the sense that there was something lacking in his painting skills and perceptions – that he began to move away from painting. Hamilton instead gradually began turning his attention to dealing in antiquities. In addition to feelings of insecurity with regard to painting, he would have been led in this direction by the encouragement of his earlier foray into excavations. By 1769 he was conducting private excavations in and around Rome, which required buying

---

99 See Thomas Pelham, MSS, f. 287 (August 2, 1777); “…he has been very indolent for many years…”

100 Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 448.

101 Ibid., 448-9.

102 Irwin, 87.
the necessary concession for the site or cava. While one third of the findings were required by law to be handed over to the state, there was still plenty of money to be made. And who had the liquid capital to lend dealers such as Hamilton the money to pay for the concessions until some of the excavated pieces could be sold? The British artist turned banker, Thomas Jenkins.

Thomas Jenkins was a painter, dealer and antiquarian but, most predominantly and profitably, he was a banker to the English in Rome. Little is known of his influences or upbringing until the point when he studied painting in London, under the portraitist Thomas Hudson. After a short time at this, Jenkins moved to Rome in 1751, living on the same street where Cavaceppi’s studio was located. He and the English landscape painter Richard Wilson had found lodging there on the Piazza di Spagna until 1753. As a struggling artist at this point in his life, Jenkins was befriended by the philanthropist and political Whig, the Honorable Esquire Thomas Hollis. In 1753, Hollis began to loan Jenkins modest sums of money so that he could set himself up in business. With access to the social circle of Hollis, Jenkins met other moneyed men such as Lord

---


104 Samuel Redgrave, A Dictionary of Artists of the English School, (Bath: Kingsmeade Reprints, 1970), 239 lists it as being in Devonshire while Ingamells Dictionary, 553, gives his birthplace as Rome.

105 Hollis would later become a major benefactor to Harvard University. For a fascinating review of Hollis’ life and friendship with, of all people, Benjamin Franklin, see Caroline Robbins, “The Strenuous Wig, Thomas Hollis of Lincoln’s Inn”, The William and Mary Quarterly, vol. 7, no. 3, (1950): 406-453.

Dartmouth, who also loaned him money. Through the buying and selling of prints and lesser-quality antiquities, Jenkins slowly established himself financially. By 1754 he was procuring exportation documents that were of substantial enough size to be noticed by the government of Rome.\textsuperscript{107} In 1757, sponsored yet again by Hollis, Jenkins became a member of the Society of Antiquaries in London. This membership gave him academic authority among the Grand Tourists. His prestige and wealth – he himself was now able to loan out large sums of money – made him an obvious center of attention in Rome. His home and showplace for his acquisitions, many of which were for sale, was frequented by the elite. Albani, Winckelmann and Cavaceppi were among the frequent guests.\textsuperscript{108}

By 1759, the principal players were all in business together. The classically educated Grand Tourists were lusting after antiques, and their countryman and publicly acknowledged scholar, Thomas Jenkins, could point them in the right direction, even loan them the money. He had respectable local friends in very high places, such as Albani and Winckelmann, and he even had personal access to Pope Clement XIV. Respectable artists such as Gavin Hamilton were often seen in Jenkins’ company, and both of them had the highest regard for Cavaceppi. As evidence of this, and a notable case in point for the processing of antiquities, Cavaceppi was hired by Thomas Jenkins to restore an original marble torso of Venus.\textsuperscript{109} Jenkins had purchased the piece in 1763 from Gavin Hamilton, who in turn had procured it in fragmentary form from the cash-strapped Donna

\textsuperscript{107} Ingamells, \textit{Dictionary}, 554. Jenkins was repeatedly rumored to be a spy for the British court.

\textsuperscript{108} Howard, \textit{Bartolomeo Cavaceppi}, 60.

\textsuperscript{109} B.F. Cook \textit{The Townley Marbles} (London: British Museum Publications, 1985), 53.
Cornelia Costanza, the Princess Barberini (1716-97). The result of Cavaceppi’s efforts would be the heavily restored Newby Venus, a name it would be given when it was subsequently bought and then exported to England by William Weddell, the wealthy owner of Newby Hall (built in 1748). This swirling circle of scholars, patrons, financiers, artists and restorers would fuel the art market, especially in Rome and London, over the latter half of the eighteenth century. This was the fertile ground which would give rebirth to one of the most well-known and yet enigmatic of statuary forms, the Discobolus.

**Tricks of a Trade: Materials and Practices of Cavaceppi**

To appreciate a success, one has to understand the challenge. The first two chapters discussed what is currently known of the original Discobolus and examined how and why the Romans created so many copies of it. The first sections of this chapter have described the circumstances around the rediscovery of ancient works such as the Discobolus, and traced the working life of one of its key restorers, Cavaceppi, and his relationships with his mentors, sponsors and moneyed patrons. But to truly understand how Cavaceppi, by some accounts a medicore sculptor, turned himself into an internationally renowned restorer, practical knowledge of eighteenth-century workshop is required. His media was generally previously worked marble pieces of ancient vintage, so a brief regression to the development of the use of this material in Greece and Rome is instructive. All of this then frames the context for an analysis of the various manifestations of the Discobolus that he created.

---

110 Haskell and Penny, 326.
In eighteenth-century Italy an original sculptural work began with the translation of an idea into a preliminary design sketch. Through a time-consuming sequence of steps, the sketch was turned into a small wax model (*modello*), then a more refined clay version (*bozzetto*). This was often followed by a plaster cast of the clay which (if all went well) culminated in a full-sized work. This would have been the way that Cavaceppi, or any other sculptor of his day, would have undertaken to create an original work of art. The art of restoration, however, was markedly different. A restorer would by various means acquire costly remnant parts, identify or assign attribution, find an interested and moneyed patron, and then begin a painstaking process of re-assembly, recreating the missing parts as needed. Sculptures could be restored on speculation but this was a risky proposition. Marble was an expensive commodity, and, since it had been the material of high-quality sculpture for centuries, it was an essential staple of the restorer’s art as well.

The Greeks began the widespread use of marble in the seventh century BC.\footnote{Norman Herz, “Stable Isotope Analysis of Greek and Marble: Provenance, Association and Authenticity”, *Marble: Art Historical and Scientific Perspectives on Ancient Sculpture*, (Malibu: The Getty Museum Press, 1990), 101-102.} In addition to its organic beauty it was soft enough to be intricately carved and was well suited to their anthropomorphic art. Marble is limestone that has been heated and compressed by natural forces over time. High quality marble sparkles when cut, can be translucent and is highly receptive to polishing.\footnote{Although counter-intuitive, marble is relatively soft, ranging from four to seven on the Mohs scale of mineral hardness, which runs from one (talc) to ten (diamond).} Extracted by tunneling along extensive underground veins, it is obtainable in large blocks of matching color and striation that run
in discrete grains. However, as is the case for other luxury stones such as diamonds, quality specimens of a large size are exponentially more valuable than small or less pure varieties. Marble was in fact so expensive that some medieval sultans traded pound for pound their date palm sugar, a valuable trade good in its own right, for Italian marble.¹¹³ The palaces of Marrakesh are but one outstanding example of the use of the acquired stone.

The earliest large-scale Greek marble quarries were on the Cycladic islands of Naxos, but the marble there was coarse grained, not translucent, and tended to have dark bluish-grey veins running through it. With its much whiter color and finer grain, Parian marble quickly became more popular.¹¹⁴ It could be quarried in large blocks, and had a translucency like alabaster, and so became the most desirable marble for large-scale sculpture. Beginning in the sixth century, the area around Ephesus was heavily quarried, but by the fifth century the quarries surrounding Mt. Pentelikon, outside of Athens, dominated the material market for Attic sculpture. Pentelikon marble was used in the construction of the Parthenon, the Erechtheion, the Propylaea, and the temple of Olympian Zeus, to name but a few of the most notable architectural works.

The marble initially preferred for later Roman works came from another Greek island, Thassos. First quarried by the Phoenicians, Thasian marble is extremely dense, bright white and has a glittery sheen. The Romans used it extensively while also opening quarries in Turkey and Proconnesus (the island now called Marmara). Apuan marble,


from the famous Italian quarries of the area around Carrara, was not used extensively until the late first century BC. It would become the favored stone for Roman Empire-period sculptors and consequently a requisite material for later restorers of their work. Carrara marble, in pure or streaky white varieties, is in fact still quarried today in large quantities. It was used by the Romans until the late fourth century when a prohibition on the building of pagan temples was issued by Christianized Roman rulers. Marble quarrying was slowly revived during the Renaissance, but the operations were so secret as to be akin to a modern-day diamond cartel. The marble industry was reorganized in the late eighteenth century by Elisa Baciocchi of Lucca (1777-1820). She was the sister of Napoleon, who made her the princess of Massa-Carrara so that he alone would have access to its treasured marble. Carrara enjoyed a long preeminence as a preferred stone for preeminent sculptors, including Michelangelo who preferred it above all others.

As to the subject at hand, there is substantial evidence in a letter by Vincent Pacetti, Cavaceppi’s student, and later head of the Accademia di San Luca, that the preferred marble for modern restoration was always Carrara. This is borne out in the pieces known to be reworked by Cavaceppi.

115 Ibid., 101-2.
118 Weiss, 80.
Once a restorer such as Cavaceppi received a commission, he first had to examine the various parts and decide how best to reassemble them. He made a master model of how all the pieces would be joined, and then proceeded to find or make the missing parts. While the restoration plan would ideally be guided by scholarly accuracy, the technical challenges could often prevail. It can require much more skill to hide broken or repaired joints than to carve a new stone. Depending on the object, the weight of the marble, at 173 pounds per cubic foot, could be an extra challenge to the sculptor in reconnecting old parts or in adding a new.\textsuperscript{119} Some joints were gravity-assisted, such as an upper torso which could be set on top of a trunk, with the weight of the marble helping to keep the body together. The kinds of connections that were more frequently required, however, were gravity-defying, with the hardest challenge being the addition of limbs or other appendages to the main body of the work. The limbs could angle off in cantilevered positions, and require a strong adhesive or other artificial assistance to secure the joint.

Ancient adhesives were made out of lime, beeswax, and lead oxide or the lime resin which is discussed by the Roman author Pliny.\textsuperscript{120} The eighteenth-century practice was to use lime casein glue, which can provide key evidence as to the date when a joint was repaired.\textsuperscript{121} Casein, which is derived from milk, was added to quick lime or gypsum to


\textsuperscript{120} For an interesting discussion on the various uses of resin as espoused by both Pliny and Vitruvius, see John Sartain, Cosimo Ridolfi and Reinhold Schoener, \textit{On the Antique Painting in Encaustic of Cleopatra, Discovered in 1818} (Florence: G. Gebbie and Company, 1885).

\textsuperscript{121} Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany and Marion True, \textit{History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures} (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003), 149-152.
create an effective thickening adhesive that is still used in a wide variety of construction-related applications today. This is the type of glue that was used on the restoration of the 1506 Vatican Laocoön. If adhesive alone would not suffice, the sculptor or restorer could create a socket-and-tenon joint to connect the two pieces of marble using a pin or dowel of some strong material such as iron. This gave the piece or its extremity the support it needed, compensating for the inherently low tensile strength of the marble. The necessity for doweling can be appreciated in the frequent occurrence of statues discovered without heads or attached parts. Any of these repair techniques required methodical, time-consuming work by skilled craftsmen in a well-equipped shop. Expensive pieces could easily be ruined by improper handling of materials or tools.

Chisels have always been the primary tool for cutting marble. By examining the markings on a wide array of Greek through Neoclassical pieces, the basic types have been identified. The most widely used chisel, referred to by Cavaceppi in his three-volume *Raccolta d’antiche statue, busti, teste cognite* as well as by other contemporary Italian sculptors, was a tooth or claw chisel. It is essentially a shaping or modeling tool that was struck on the end by a mallet. The basic form of its cutting end was a flat chisel with evenly spaced notches cut out of the edge. This was generally used after the roughing tool, most commonly the point chisel, had been used to form the overall profile of the piece. To use the point chisel, its cutting tip was generally placed directly perpendicular to the marble to cut off large pieces of the stone, while the tooth chisel could be held at a higher angle when more stone was to be removed, and at a lower angle for finer detail. This left striations or hatch marks on the surfaces which could later be
elided by a flat chisel and rasp before finishing abrasives such as pumices and emery were applied. These abrasive could selectively leave areas of the stone with a high degree of polish, allowing for a perception of depth to be created by contrast to surfaces left with a matte finish. Difficult or narrow areas such as eyelids or lips were carved with a two-pronged chisel called *dente di cane*, literally dog’s tooth. A flat chisel was used to remove wider areas, in fabric folds for example, which tended to leave an inverted “V” on the surface. The Romans originated many of the iron chisels used from antiquity, through the Renaissance and still utilized today. Based on my own personal observations, which collaborate the opinion of Seymour Howard, Cavaceppi’s restorations show the characteristic markings of all these tools.

Another carving tool, which gained popularity with the Romans, was the bow drill. A chisel-pointed or spiral bit was wound by a strong cord and then spun rapidly by the back and forth motion of a bow that held the cord. The friction of the tip of the bit against the stone created a divot or point in the material being carved. Augers, thought to have been originally invented by Archimedes, were another type of drilling tool used in a rotary fashion for carving out deeper, more precise recesses required for drapery folds, nostrils, curls or pupils. Hardened iron tips came into use around 500 BC, and were later improved upon by the Romans.122

Finally, the marble was painted (if desired) and then covered with a coating of wax and oil in a process referred to by Pliny as *ganosis*, known in English as encaustic

---

waxing. This coating was a sealing agent applied on the surface of the marble to keep the paint from fading or flaking and to soften the natural shininess of the stone to an dull, even surface sheen. It also served as a barrier against the oil and dirt on people’s hands that inevitably found its way onto the surface. This was necessary even before the piece left the shop, as marble workshops were notoriously dusty and dirty. This was a criticism famously and personally leveled at Michelangelo’s shop by Leonardo da Vinci, reportedly the initial reason for an overt animosity between the two.\textsuperscript{123}

In the eighteenth century the workshop itself was a loosely-knit unit of master, journeymen, apprentices, and assistants. To make ends meet, many artists would work for more than one master at a time, often covertly, which later created confusion when trying to assign attribution to pieces without a clear-cut provenance. Sculptural production, as indeed in Cavaceppi’s shop it could fairly be described, involved collaboration among in-house artists and an array of subcontracted artisans to whom much of the work was out-sourced. Subcontracting was actually preferred by most shops during the eighteenth century as it meant that they did not have to pay for the materials or labor until the job was finished, thus giving them, in effect, credit for the period it took the subcontractor to complete his part of the work.\textsuperscript{124} This way of doing business became nearly essential as most patrons did not pay for the piece until it was delivered.


\textsuperscript{124} Scigliano, Michelangelo’s Mountain, 229-30.
Without subcontracting, vast sums of the workshop’s capital could be tied up for months on end. The drawback to outsourcing was that the work could take longer to complete and be of lesser quality as there was less control. Also it was generally more expensive than doing the work in-house. Because of these conflicting pressures, it became important to know which of your clients would pay earnest money up front, which at least paid on time, and which tended to be the slow payers before deciding how and by whom the work was to be done.

The number of artists who trained and worked in Cavaceppi’s studio is unclear, as are their individual identities, since no single list was ever compiled. From various letters, census reports and archival records I have pieced together a partial list, including the fifteen artists who worked initially alongside and later under Cavaceppi.¹²⁵

There is also no complete list of all of the works, original and restorations, produced in Cavaceppi’s studio. Some pieces appear to have been intentionally left undocumented, while some documented pieces have disputed provenance.¹²⁶ A survey of all available data in various holdings would put the total rough number in excess of 500 pieces.¹²⁷ Just in his catalogue alone, Cavaceppi listed 196 restored works. When he wasn’t overseeing or taking part personally in this prodigious production, he spent a lot of his time on well-documented travels; he was one of the last companions to Winckelmann. Cavaceppi had a very large workshop, would have employed and trained a large number

¹²⁵ See Appendix B for a comprehensive list of the known students of Cavaceppi.

¹²⁶ Weiss, 71.

¹²⁷ Howard, “Antiquity Restored”, 106; Picón, 17; The number will likely increase as more works are attributed to him.
of restoration sculptors, and would have had a powerful fountainhead effect on the body of works available for later analysis and appreciation.

Patrons most often shopped directly at artist’s studios. Cavaceppi’s last and largest studio was on the *Via del Babuino*, located in Rome down the street from the Spanish Steps on the *Via del Corso*. In the eighteenth century, the area on and around this section of the *Corso* became a de-facto arts district, with various cultural dignitaries such as Goethe living there for extended periods of time. As documented in his will Cavaceppi bequeathed everything to the *Accademia di San Luca*. Sadly, for the *Accademia* and for future research historians, his wife and his extended family contested the will, and the objects were dispersed into various collections such as the Berlin Museum. At his death he had nearly 1,000 pieces of “ancient marble,” in excess of 8,000 “old master drawings,” boxes of gems, coins and terra cotta models, plaster casts, molds and numerous paintings. These objects formed both a personal collection and a professional resource from which to draw inspiration for sculptural re-workings and, if possible, the requisite parts. The “ancient marbles” in particular must have in fact constituted both the raw materials and the remnants of his life’s work. As was the case for most antiquities circulating during the eighteenth century, they almost certainly came from excavations in and around Ostia, Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli, the environs of Rome itself, and from the holdings of various wealthy families in Rome.

His techniques for reassembling the pieces have been commented on by his only biographer, Seymour Howard. Howard’s observations, which my analysis confirms, are

---

128 Picón, 13.
telling about the clever methods Cavaceppi used to fool the eye of the patron and of future connoisseurs. When he joined ancient pieces of stone to newly cut ones, he smoothed and rounded all the ends of the marble in an attempt to make the additional pieces look as if they originally belonged to the piece. It appears from both visual examination and x-ray that he would dowel, clamp, glue and stain the object together, then, if further obfuscation was called for, re-break it in a different location to draw the eye away from the additions and make it look as if he had only fixed an accidental break.

When he could, he re-used less valuable or less complete pieces of marble from ancient sculptures as raw material for the restoration of others because it better matched the marble in the pieces being restored. Examples of this can be seen in his Relief of the Centaur Nessos Abducting Deianeira, bought in 1768 by Charles Townley. The fragments came from the Roman Palazzo Veropsi and were sold to Cavaceppi by Thomas Jenkins, the most prolific eighteenth-century antique parts dealer of his day. The piece, illustrated on Plate No. 29 of the Raccolta and labeled as Bassirilievo in Inghilterra, was published in volume three of Cavaceppi’s Raccolta. There its restoration was briefly documented, but is important as proof that the patrons could have been aware of at least some of his restoration practices. Appearing in an anonymous drawing hanging prominently over the fireplace at Townley’s house in London, it was dismantled for examination in the mid-1980s. Cavaceppi had evidently taken fragments bought from Jenkins, reworked the figures, and restored them into an inverted Roman funerary stele.
before mounting the entire piece onto a slate backing. This concealed all the machinations involved and made for a more convincingly “original” piece, as the majority of the restoration work would not be prominently visible. While not knowing the complete story, a sophisticated patron such as Townley would have been aware that these were intensively reworked objects.

It was accepted practice during this period for large areas of the surface of a piece to be reworked for a more uniform appearance before finishing with an overall staining of the work. Sculptors and restorers knew well of the problematic story, conveyed by Vasari, of Michelangelo’s 1496 Sleeping Cupid. This sculpture, lost in the seventeenth century, had been passed off in its original form to an unsuspecting buyer as an ancient piece. Michelangelo had buried it in “sour” or acidic earth for a period of time to make the surface appear old. In addition to this technique, it was common practice, beginning in the mid seventeenth-century, to apply tobacco juice or tea to get a homogeneous patina on marble to make it appear old.

Cavaceppi rarely signed his work or made careful record of the techniques used in their preparation. To determine his likely involvement in the restoration of a piece it is necessary to look for the telltale techniques of his studio. One of these was the inclusion of ancient pieces of plinth set into a modern base. Most other sculptors made a new base, but Cavaceppi preferred to insert the old marble into the new. Whether this was for aesthetic, purist or economic reasons is unknown. The base then provides a useful clue,

130 Cook, 50-51.
131 Grossman, 91.
but perhaps the clearest indication that a work was from the studio of Cavaceppi is in the struts. In general, ancient Greek sculptors used struts or support systems sparingly, as they could be distracting and were not usually necessary, especially for bronze sculpture, which was their preferred high-end medium. Roman imitation or adaptation of the Greek prototypes, however, often forced the sculptor, due to the weight of the stone or the unbalanced posture of their figures, to create a tripod for support. An interesting side-effect of the added strut was that it offered an opportunity to reinforce the subject’s identity with iconographic details. In the hands of Roman sculptors, objects such as water jugs, tree stumps, cupids, dolphins and falling drapery all could enhance the understanding of the sculpture while at the same time providing essential stability. In the restoration or recreation of ancient works, Cavaceppi’s studio preferred a particularly identifiable strut shaped like a tree stump. It had numerous uniform wedge shapes aligned in rows, carved as bark curving or peeling upwards, which appear to suggest a palm trunk. Palms were occasionally used in Greco-Roman sculpture, as they were linked iconographically to victory, but the odd peeling back of the bark is distinctively his own. He created a second, similar type of a strut, that of a tree stump appearing to shed its bark, oddly suggestive of a eucalyptus tree. These strut types will be examined further in the discussion of the variants of the Discobolus.

The preceding discussion of the life, influences and work of Cavaceppi followed by an overview of specific materials, methods and shop practices was intended to give a context in which to understand how an eighteenth-century sculptor, and specifically Cavaceppi, would have approached his work. The expectations of the patrons have also
been addressed as an essential and influential part of that milieu. The execution and nature of other works of restoration, such as the Red Faun and the Antinous Relief have been described as prominent case studies that illustrate the eighteenth-century restorer’s craft, mentors and marketplace. These then were the prevailing circumstances at the place and time that the Discobolus was reconstructed – with, as we will see, considerable variation on its original theme.
CHAPTER 4: THE FIVE MAJOR RESTORATIONS OF THE DISCOBOLUS

The preceding chapters have been necessary in order to first, make an argument for the importance of the Discobolus as a seminal piece of Greek art; second, explain its reappearance and repeated use in ancient Rome; and third describe its eighteenth-century restoration in Rome and collection in England. The focus for the latter part has been on Cavaceppi, since I would assert that he was connected in some way to all five major restorations. He and his teacher Pierre-Étienne Monnot are extremely likely to have been directly involved with the first restoration, that of the Endymion. Monnot is clearly identified as the restorer of the second one, the Fallen Warrior, also known as the Uffizi Discobolus. Cavaceppi himself restored the third, the so-called Diomedes and the Palladium, and the fourth or Massimi Discobolus was made in his own workshop. The fifth or Townley Discobolus was done by one of Cavaceppi’s former students. The torch, so to speak, had been passed from teacher, to master, to student. A few words are needed, however, to explain why these Discobolus variants are included for discussion here, apart from simply their common connection to Cavaceppi,

Counting fully restored statuary works, fragmented torsos and images on gems, there are close to twenty ancient representations of Myron’s Discobolus.¹ They are all readily

¹ For a brief discussion of gems with athletic imagery that were held in eighteenth-century British collections, see Dorothy Kent Hill “From Venuti and Winckelmann to Walters,” Apollo Magazine (August 1975): 100-103. For the number of Discoboli, see Howard, “Some Eighteenth-Century Restorations,” 330.
identifiable by the exaggerated twist and torque of the body, which is consistent with the
descriptions by Pliny and other ancient authors. Due to the vicissitudes of time and the
weightiness of marble extremities, only the torso of the *Discobolus* generally has
remained intact. Each displays the same characteristic pose: the trunk of the body is
extremely athletic and leans forward, twisting to the right, with the left shoulder angled
down and the right arm lifting up. This position creates a sense of a spinning motion
stopped in the act, which originally conveyed the moment of maximum kinetic energy
prior to throwing a discus. The un-restored Hadrianic torso, the *Discobolus* found at
Castelporziano in 1906, exemplifies just how easily identifiable this torso is.² What will
be examined in detail are the five major restored sculptural pieces which include at least
the torso of the *Discobolus*. Proceeding in chronological order, the discussion of each
will focus on how they came into being, who restored them, what their function was
within eighteenth-century culture, what their significance is now, and finally what they
contribute to our understanding of Greco-Roman sculpture.

**Once More, With Feeling: Endymion (the Uffizi Discobolus)**

The earliest restored *Discobolus* torso is located in the Uffizi Museum in Florence.
(For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 4.1) Known as the Endymion or
simply the Uffizi *Discobolus*, it has a long, confusing and even harrowing restoration and

² Since this is a discussion on sculpture and restoration, however, and not a catalogue of
all known *Discobolus* fragments and images, neither the un-restored torsos nor the
images on carved gems will be discussed. Both categories are interesting in their own
right, but are outside the scope of this discussion on restoration
archival history. A physical description of the piece, intertwined with the reasons for its sixteenth-century attribution as Endymion, seems to be the place to begin an attempt to unscramble the complicated story.

As the statue appears now, the marble torso is identifiable as originally being that of a *Discobolus*. It has the correct body position, suggesting centrifugal motion that one would expect, but both the head and right arm position are radically different from the description given by Myron. This is due to its inappropriate attribution and subsequent restoration as Endymion.

The life of Endymion was well known during the Greco-Roman period through the works of the poet Sappho and the writers Hesiod, Pausanias and Apollodorus. Although the stories slightly vary, they all generally tell of a young Greek male, whose extreme beauty had attracted the attention of Selene (or Luna to the Romans) the goddess of the moon. Selene became fixated upon the young man and asked Zeus to grant Endymion eternal sleep and eternal youth (variously), in order that she could forever be with him. This story of eternal love amongst the beautiful was so popular that even the evocation of his name – as evidenced in the *Iliad* and *Argonautica* – was enough to suggest extreme male beauty and obsessive romantic passion. This would remain the case throughout the Roman period, and the story would be told with special relish during the reign of Hadrian, with the recasting of the Emperor as Selene, and Antinous as Endymion. I would also argue that this comparison is why Winckelmann was so attached to both

---

3 For an example of how the name invoked eternal love, see Walter Copland Perry, *The Women of Homer* (London: Heinemann, 1898), chapter 5, 50 ff.
figures, and also why the subject matter of Endymion was so often painted during the Neoclassical period. The name of Endymion could be used as a form of homoerotic code.

During the Renaissance period there was an intense rekindling of interest in Endymion among artists, scholars and writers, although this time without any overt homoeroticism. Minor story lines were updated; for example, Selene was now conflated with Diana. Among the cognoscenti in the Medici court, Endymion became the personification of astronomy in general and lunar studies in particular. With the extreme interest during the Renaissance in Neo-Platonism, the meanings of various ancient myths and Christian narratives were often philosophically recast. Raphael’s painting of the School of Athens was a visual representation of this phenomenon. For his part, Endymion was now intellectually re-formed from a desirable but inert love interest into a self-activated man of science. Now not just a personification of youth and desirability, he was also imbued with the preferred qualities of talent and brains – a multi-dimensional figure that any Renaissance man could envy. His persona radically altered, simply put, Endymion had finally grown-up.

Still appropriately depicted as youthful and handsome, the trim and athletic torso of the Discobolus was a logical choice for creating an Endymion. The fragments of the original left arm were restored as crossing the body with the wrist resting on the knee,

---

4 Marie de Medici and Queen Christine of Sweden were referred to as goddesses to their Endymions. See Natalia Agapiou, Endymion au carrefour. La fortune littéraire et artistique du mythe d’Endymion à l’aube de l’ère moderne. Ikonographische Repertorien zur Rezeption des antiken Mythos in Europa, Beilheft IV (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2005), especially Chapter 4.
typical for all *Discoboli*. The right arm, not original to the piece, was attached bent at the elbow and rising up above the face. This positioning of the hands makes Endymion appear to be shielding his eyes from the intense glare of the goddess Selene’s gaze.

The attached head, also not original, is tilted upward and turns towards the extreme right. It appears Neo-attic or atticized in both its style and period of production. The top of the hair is represented as tight waves, ending at both the front of the forehead and the back of the neck as a rolled cap of curls. I observed marks of a drill among the curls and at the corners of the mouth. In my opinion, the face is more typical of an Apollo type than an Alexander, with its overall bland sweetness, pudgy and unlined features, cupid bow mouth and lack of differentiation in its planes.\(^5\) Under the rule of the Roman Emperor Hadrian, this retro-style was in common use; the constituent pieces for this restoration may have been created during that period. The type of marble and technique used are both consistent with this theory.

A confusing aspect of the Endymion statue is that it was restored and subsequently altered between 1585 and 1704, with the focus of the alterations being the base and supporting elements, not the figure of Endymion himself. The Grand Duke Francesco Medici had originally been given the statue by Cardinal Cesi in 1580, with the only restorer listed being a man named Caccini.\(^6\) Repeated attempts to find this name in

\(^5\) For a concise description of this head type, see Mark D. Fullerton, The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary, (New York: E. J. Brill, 1990), 85-9 and 127-165.

various records have yielded nothing to date. Apparently, as early as 1585, there had been a dog standing at the base of the feet of Endymion. According to the descriptions in the Biblioteca Uffizi manuscripts of 1597, 1676, 1704, 1753 and 1769, the Endymion was described as being with a dog. But at some point between 1769 and 1784, the dog was deleted from the work and a tree stump was carved in its place, resulting in its current appearance. The stump, with its odd, loose flesh-like surface, has the same general appearance as the one in the statue of the Red Faun, restored in 1746 by Cavaceppi and discussed earlier. It also appears very similar to the picture of his 1768 White Faun Marble, as can be examined in his Raccolta. The period in which the restoration took place, between 1769 and 1784, was the time in which Cavaceppi was most prolific. He had repeatedly been selected by the Vatican for nearly all of their important restorations. For these reasons, I conclude that he was involved in this restoration as well.

Another curious aspect of this piece is that, while it was always referred to in the official record as the Endymion, it had been moved occasionally to different locations and in at least one documented case, it had been displayed as part of a sculptural group under a different name. In other words, while having one assigned name and attribution,

---

7 See the various references to the Discobolus in Biblioteca Uffizi Ms., 78, 82, 95, 98, 113, 117. Also See Pacini, Gli Uffizi, 11-29, for the wildly different interpretations of the dates.

8 See Pacini, Gli Uffizi, 13.
the **Endymion** was displayed in the location and manner deemed necessary by the curators – with or without the dog.\(^9\)

In 1704 it was listed in the inventory as being placed alone along the east corridor in the Palazzo Uffizi. But in 1784, the Biblioteca Manuscript describes it as being located in “Niobe’s Room.”\(^10\) The original Greek story of Niobe was well known, and served as a contemporary allegory about the deathly power of hubris or excessive pride. As the story goes, Niobe had provoked the wrath of her once good friend, the goddess Leto, by constantly bragging about her fourteen accomplished children. Leto became infuriated by the suggestion that she, a mother of two, the twins Apollo and Artemis, was less fertile and thus by the standards of the time, less important. Apollo and Artemis were called upon to avenge their mother’s honor by killing the children of Niobe, the so-called Niobids, so the story ended upon a decidedly negative note.

At the Uffizi, a room had been specifically set aside to place the statues they owned, which consisted of **Niobe** and thirteen children. But the number of children was specifically to be fourteen, so the museum needed to find an appropriate figure to replace the missing male youth. The requisite statue had to be approximately life sized and posed in such a way as to express fear. The **Endymion** fit this vague description, as the size matched the others and with his hand lifted upward, he could be considered to be fearfully looking up towards the heavens. At this point, the story of Endymion had

\(^9\) Notice that the description in E. Wright, *Some Observations made Travelling through Florence Italy in the years 1720-21 and 1722*, mentions the statue as Endymion, yet does not include the dog.

become so garbled that this statue, a part-time Niobid and part-time Endymion, even made sense. His original love interest, the moon goddess Selene, had become repeatedly confused in literature with Artemis, the goddess of the hunt and moon, who in turn after the Renaissance was called Diana. Artemis had been one of the killers of the Niobids. It all was generally acceptable to those who were now only vaguely familiar with the original story.\(^\text{11}\)

As late as 1784, then, the Endymion statue was required to occasionally serve double duty. While an argument could be made that there may have been more than one statue in the museum collection known as the Endymion, a search of all statues similar in size and characteristics turns up no other piece that could be confused with it, so this analysis seems tenable. Taking all of this together, I would argue that the late sixteenth century is the earliest time period of a known restoration of a Discobolus torso, known as the Endymion. While not originally restored by Cavaceppi, it is plausible that he had a hand in a subsequent alteration.

Finally, adding insult to injury of the Endymion, on May 27, 1993 an explosion occurred outside of the west wing of the Uffizi museum. An unknown group, said to be linked to the Sicilian mafia, placed a bomb in a stolen car and left it parked outside the museum. Blowing debris and glass from large skylights and windows flanking the long

\(^{11}\) To add one last confusing note about an admittedly confusing piece, Seymour Howard, *Antiquity Restored* (Vienna: Rauchdruck Publishing, 1990), 74, claims that the last re-reconstruction of the piece (from Endymion to a generic Niobid) was instigated by the painter Anton Mengs. There is no archival information that I have found linking Mengs to this event. Refer to the official record, G. Mansuelli, *Galleria degli Uffizi: Le Scultore* (Rome, 1958-61) 2v. 1, see 32 f., no 5 and then compare to the Uffizi, no 212, Pacini, *Gli Uffizi*. 
galleries scattered in all directions, severely damaging the interior of the museum. The blast was so intense that it killed five people, including four members of a curator’s family. Three seventeenth-century paintings were destroyed and thirty works were heavily damaged, among them a Son of Niobid and the aforementioned Endymion. The works are in various states of repair at the time of this writing. For the ill-fated Endymion, a lifetime of unusual restoration continues.

The Odd Fabrication at the Capitoline: The Fallen Warrior

It is variously called The Dying Combatant, The Wounded Gladiator, The Fallen Warrior (the most commonly occurring name), or simply the Capitoline Discobolus. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 4.2) This restoration of a torso from a statue that was copied from Myron’s original discus thrower is probably the most fanciful of the five variants discussed here. As was the case with the earlier Endymion, the early history of The Fallen Warrior is frustratingly sketchy. The scholar Anatole Montaiglon states, without explanation, that the torso was in Rome by 1513.\(^\text{12}\) A different, though similarly oblique, reference to it by Ulisse Aldrovandi places it in Rome by the 1520’s – assuming it is the statue he refers to as the torso di gladiator.\(^\text{13}\) However, its first definitive record of existence is in the workshop of Pierre-Étienne Monnot in 1733.

---


\(^\text{13}\) Ibid. The “Aldrovandi” being mentioned is most likely the naturalist, collector, and cousin of Pope Gregory IV, Ulisse Aldrovandi.
Following its restoration, it would be subsequently purchased for the Capitoline Museum by Clement XII in 1734 and given a place of honor in the center of the Capitoline’s main salon in 1737. The placement of The Fallen Warrior there, I will argue, was conspicuously as a pendant for the more famous work The Dying Gaul. In order to appreciate how and why the torso in question, depicting a professional athlete whose coiled energy is about to be unleashed, was refashioned into a despondent warrior who appears to be turning his sword against himself, it is first necessary to address the unusual pose and immense popularity of The Dying Gaul. This Hellenistic work, and to some extent its companion piece, The Gaul and His Wife, would almost certainly have been in the mind’s eye of Monnot as the sculptor undertook the restoration that would become The Fallen Warrior. A brief exploration of The Dying Gaul will also serve to highlight the significantly different trajectories of these two warrior works.

Few pieces of sculpture seem to elicit the same degree of pathos and empathy on the part of the viewer as The Dying Gaul. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 4.3) It is a life-size depiction of a youthful virile warrior who is in the

---

14 For the dates of display, see Penny and Haskell, Taste and the Antique, 227.

15 The figures of the Dying Gaul and Wife are usually agreed to be Roman marble copies of Pergamene originals. See Haskell and Penny on Wolfgang Helbig, 255-6.

16 The back story of the ownership of The Dying Gaul reads like a Byzantine spy novel. The piece was repeatedly pawned by its owners during the seventeenth-century. It was ceded along with other artwork to the French in 1797 as part of the Treaty of Tolentino, and displayed in Paris in 1800. It finally returned to Rome in 1816, the period in which Lord Byron was compiling his poem, Childe Harold. In this work Byron rhapsodizes over the piece in more than four stanzas. For a short summary, see Penny and Haskell, Taste and the Antique, 224.
throes of death. He twists to one side to keep a bleeding stab wound from opening wider, a look of anguished pain on his downturned face. The statue still evokes a strong emotional reaction, due to its primal poignancy – vitality and beauty suddenly confronting death, the manifest image of a timeless Sarpedon. The original audience of The Dying Gaul, Hellenistic in period and specifically Pergamene in culture, would have immediately identified with this reference.

The sculpture itself, like the Discobolus, appears to be a Roman marble copy of an earlier bronze statuary group. Originally The Dying Gaul was probably part of a figural group created to commemorate Pergamum’s victory over the Gauls. It is thought by most scholars to have been dedicated by Attalus I and exhibited circa 230 BC at the Pergamene Akropolis. A detailed analysis of its attribution is not necessary here, but it is important to note that it is now fully accepted as being a warrior from Gaul due to the oval shape of the shield he leans on, the very un-Roman hair style and mustache, and the coiled torc that he wears around his neck.

The statue, along with one of its companion pieces, The Gaul and His Wife, was first recorded in a 1623 inventory of the Ludovisi art collection. (For more information on

---


18 The torc or torque, Latin for twisted, was a distinctively Scythian type of necklace, which was introduced to the Celts circa 500 BC. It became the preferred neckwear of the elite Gauls.

19 Schreiber, Die antiken Bildwerk der Villa Ludovisi, 30.; Penny, 224.
the statue, see Appendix A, 4.4) The two were among a group of sculptures found at the site of the famous Gardens of Sallust, in the northwest section of Rome. Officially both historian and governor of Numidia, Sallust was wealthy enough to fund both of his passions – gardening and sculpture, which he combined in an extravagant manner. He collected high-end objects from throughout the Roman Empire, and placed the statues in the porticoes and vineyards of his gardens, visually defining Epicurean taste. The Emperor Tiberius bought and made additions to Sallust’s villa; the Emperor Nerva died there in 98 AD. By the early sixteenth century the property was in the hands of the Medici family. The later owners, the Ludovisi family, followed imperial precedent by having their villa built there. This location yielded many pieces of ancient Roman art, including The Dying Gaul.20

Restored at least twice to arrive at its current state, the majority of The Dying Gaul statue is original and carved from Greek marble.21 The major restoration was done by the Lombardian Ippolito Buzzi, a sculptor who worked on the entire Ludovisi collection between 1621 and 1625.22 His minor additions consisted of adding new toes and

---

20 For an insightful book on the history of the site, see Kim Hartswick, The Gardens of Sallust (Austin: University of Texas, 2004).

21 Stuart Jones, Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome (Palazzo dei Conservatori, 1926), 338.

22 The Dying Gaul was completely re-examined in 1987 in an attempt to ascertain the number of pieces that were added and the accuracy of the pose. The results were published in Mariana Mattei, ed., Il Galata Capitolino: Uno splendido dono di Attalo (Rome, 1987). An examination of typical period restoration practices like this can be found in History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures, 179-182. Also see B. Palma, I Marmi Ludovisi: Storia della collezione (Rome: 1983), 19-38.
fingertips, and patching the chipped surface areas of the body with grisaille, a marble dust plaster. By the use of pins and clamps the original intact head was reattached, with its distinctive tresses and other features. Sadly, the ends of the thick butter curls are now missing – chipped off by ardent visitors. The current surface of the piece shows evidence of having been reworked more than once. Records indicate that the seventeenth-century restorer Alessandro Algardi re-polished the entire Ludovisi collection with acid and pumice.

The major additions to The Dying Gaul consist of the entire left part of the base, which was done in Luna marble, and the right arm of the Gaul from the shoulder down. The arm was once rumored to be have been made and attached by Michelangelo himself, but this is no longer believed to be the case. After its re-examination in 1987, the position of the arm is now thought to be incorrect. Its current position is angled too far away from his waist in a posture that conveys an inappropriate stability. The original arm is thought to have been angled more steeply inward, giving the figure a more dramatic effect of collapsing down onto the ground. Depicted on the left side of the oval base is a sword, sheath and a long unfurled shoulder strap. On the right side of the base is a curved trumpet. It has been suggested by Jones that at some point in the Roman period

---

23 See note 16, Martellotti, *History of Restoration*. In a conversation with one of the curators at the Capitoline, I was told they still have pieces of curls inadvertently broken off by eighteenth and nineteenth-century visitors. Now guards sit in the room to make sure no one touches the piece.


the statue was placed very low to the ground, as evidenced by a series of geometric cuts in the plinth. While now covered over, the patterns specifically suggest that the plinth was repeatedly used as a playing surface in some type of game; perhaps Roman boys used it for playing marbles.27

While the preceding description of The Dying Gaul may seem tangential, the appearance and popularity of this work has everything to do with why Monnot restored the Discobolus torso in the manner in which he did. The Dying Gaul was an unqualified success. On private display in the Ludovisi collections, it evoked a strong sympathetic response from its audience and was receiving spectacular acclaim. As an artist and businessman Monnot would have been well aware of this phenomenon, so why not try to duplicate this success by creating something with a similar theme, in a similar pose, and by a similar – though considerably more manufactured – means?

The Discobolus torso itself first appears in the written record in 1733, the year the Frenchman Monnot returned to Rome from Germany. With this appealing athletic torso as a starting point, he could have easily chosen to restore it in a standing position depicting any number of different thematic figures. He had just finished his classically inspired marble bath at Kassel, and his in-depth knowledge of classical history and mythology would have given him a virtual pantheon of imagery from which to choose. But instead of creating a standing Apollo or Endymion, he chose to restore the torso as an anonymous warrior kneeling on the ground. This is a somewhat counterintuitive choice, as Monnot would have recognized the taut musculature in the torso as more logically

27 Jones, Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures, 339.
suggestive of a tensely coiled figure or at least one in an upright state of balance. It would likely have been the notable popularity and critical acclaim of The Dying Gaul. I would argue, that persuaded Monnot to intentionally disregard the more obvious and appropriate manner in which to restore the torso, and instead opt for a visually strained but more currently à-la-mode pose.²⁸

The statue he created, The Fallen Warrior, is pyramidal in form. This was a favorite compositional device of both Hellenistic and Baroque sculptors, which is also evident in The Dying Gaul. With The Fallen Warrior, however, the overall effect is visually awkward. The angles of the work do not converge in a natural way, as can be immediately noted by even an untrained eye. The torso – the literal and figurative centerpiece of the work – is prominently placed facing the viewer but appears to consist of three separate and unrelated planes. The chest faces forward but the waist seems distended and too far off to the warrior’s right side; the upper thighs seem to be attached laterally, making the bottom section of the torso appear off-center with the axis of the statue. Areas of the torso also appear to be radically re-cut; the ribs are oddly and markedly defined, making the figure appear almost emaciated, but the arms, chest and thighs are heavily muscular. The aspect of the body is visually inconsistent, appearing to be both well-toned and starving at the same time. These and other more subtle anatomical anomalies register as wrong and alienating to the human eye, and detract from the ability of the statue to emotionally engage the viewer.

²⁸ And it would also not have escaped the Frenchmen Monnot that he and the subject of the statue shared a common Gallic cultural ancestry.
The non-original head is turned impossibly far to the right and also uncomfortably tilted upward, making the object appear to be – as in fact it was – assembled from separate parts. The odd angle of the head is understandable, however, when one realizes that it appears to be a copy by Monnot of the head of the Elder Son, a sculptural figure located to the (viewer’s) right of the Laocoön. The profile of the nose and furrowed brows are markedly similar, and the French artist Le Brun had used this profile in 1668, as the model for his image on a similar theme, Bodily Pain. These images were used for teaching at the French Royal Academy of Art, and can be seen today in the Louvre.29 Thus the features of the head are understandably Hellenistic in flavor, with heavily carved leonine hair, wide brows and furrowed forehead. The classically rendered torso, however, is much more static and idealized in form. The tone and composition of the two parts does not blend; however, the head must have seemed vaguely familiar to some viewers.30

Problematic as well is a prominent accessory object, the round shield on the warrior’s left arm.31 Horizontally it aligns almost perfectly parallel with his body, and its front face rests vertically against a knee-high tree stump. This orderly element is inconsistent with the chaotic moment of impending death that is ostensibly being


30 The marble used for the various parts is white with medium crystals, but the head is noticeably lighter in shade than the rest.

31 It is interesting to notice that around the interior edge of the shield, which faces the viewer, the Frenchman Monnot had put a stylized fleur-de-lis pattern.
depicted. A critical analysis of the logic of the piece might suppose that, at this point with all that he was enduring, the warrior would have tossed the shield aside. It seems rather obviously to be an element of convenience to the sculptor. While it adds little to the credibility of the scene and is an unnatural detraction from the visual composition, the shield creates an extra support system to hold the weight of the right side of the statue and serves to conceal the strut behind it, which would otherwise have been even more incongruous and distracting.

Other compositional details such as the execution of the rectilinear base are questionable as well. The ground surface has a choppy undulation with little relation or explanation in the context of the work. One exacting detail in the base, an acanthus plant growing out of the far edge, seems to be something of an afterthought, perhaps an artistic contextual flourish. The relation of the warrior’s legs to the base has them splayed outward, away from his body and in awkwardly opposing directions. His left knee touches the ground, while his right knee appears to be resting on some kind of plant or oddly undersized tree stump. The carving on the surface of the plant appears more fur-like than bark, reminiscent of the treatment used on the goat in Cavaceppi’s 1744 _Red Faun_. Cavaceppi was working for Monnot in 1733-1734 when _The Fallen Warrior_ was restored and it is not improbable that one of his duties as a capable up-and-coming assistant would have been to make the bases for the pieces being worked in the shop.

The warrior’s right arm is non-original. It was presumably made by Monnot, who attached it in a vertical upward position. This would have been the arm and hand that in Myron’s original work held the discus, but in this fabricated restoration the hand holds a
broken sword or dagger hilt. The warrior appears poised to commit suicide. The apparent angle of the missing sword blade, however, does not relate to the torso in a way that suggests the intention to make contact. This is partly because the arm holding the weapon seems too long and awkwardly twisted. Another significant note is that the blade itself was never actually present on the statue – it was made intentionally to look as if it had broken off at some point in the past. This visual implication, I would contend, was a contrived device to make the statue seem antique, to make this piece appear as if it could be a missing companion to The Dying Gaul from the city of Pergamum. Monnot’s inclusion of a dagger, or at least a piece of one, was also an overt reference to the other major Hellenistic Dying Gaul piece. The male figure in The Gaul and His Wife holds just such a dagger, in just such a suicidal posture after apparently having taken the life of his spouse to spare her being disgraced and dishonored by the victorious enemy. Monnot would very likely have seen both of these dying Gaul pieces. While there is no record that The Dying Gaul and The Gaul and his Wife were ever displayed together, they both were owned by the large extended Ludovisi family who allowed viewing of their collections.\textsuperscript{32}

It makes consummate sense that The Dying Gaul was the inspiration for the Monnot’s restoration of the so-called Fallen Warrior and indeed their common connection extends further. The two works were displayed together in 1737 in a place of honor – the center

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{32} Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, \textit{Taste and the Antique} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 282. The Dying Gaul was displayed in the new Ludovisi Villa until it was bought by Pope Clement XII in 1737. The Dying Gaul and Wife was kept in the Palazzo Grande at the family’s estate on the Pincio until the beginning of the nineteenth century.}
of the main salon of the Capitoline Museum. At least until its removal in 1817, The Fallen Warrior seems to have been treated as a companion piece to The Dying Gaul. Both depict dying nude male figures of classical origin whose wounded bodies are collapsing to the ground. While their tragic themes are alike, as is their media, the two statues differ significantly in technical execution and compositional quality. The overall effect of The Dying Gaul is compellingly sorrowful and convincingly human, while The Fallen Warrior gives the impression of a confused unnatural combination of parts that is difficult to relate to as an integrated composition. The body of Myron’s once proud athlete had been maimed.

There is little evidence concerning its reception by either critics or the public; in fact, The Fallen Warrior seems to have elicited little recorded comment at all. How Monnot himself felt about the work, how it struck his Baroque sensibilities is unknown. It had been his first and only restoration piece, and he would be dead within a year of its completion. The task of reincorporating the next available torso of a Discobolus into a finished sculpture would fall to Monnot’s student, Cavaceppi.

**Diomedes and the Palladium**

As the primary and longstanding Papal restorer, confidante to Albani and traveling companion of Winckelmann, Cavaceppi would have seen both the Uffizi Endymion and the Capitoline Fallen Warrior. One can only imagine what went through his mind, when in 1772 the Scotsman Gavin Hamilton brought him just such a torso and requested his

---

33 Ibid., 227.
restoration services. Hamilton had been excavating sites in and around Rome since 1771 and had been personally involved in the digs at Tor Colombaro, Monte Cagnolo, Ostia, Castel di Guido, and Gabii. He had found and facilitated the restoration of works such as the Petworth Apollo Sauroktonos and A Wounded Amazon, objects still displayed today. In addition, as mentioned earlier, Hamilton had utilized the services of Cavaceppi before.

Upon receiving the torso, Cavaceppi could have considered restoring it in any number of different ways, but he was guided by a rather specific set of concerns and personal stylistic tendencies. His teacher Monnot had worked within the sphere of Bernini, and so had restored The Fallen Warrior torso in a Baroque manner – energy and drama, a precursor, as it were, to Sturm und Drang. But Cavaceppi was much more in tune with the current movement afoot in the 1760s, Neoclassicism.

As much a marketing tool in England as it was a style in France, Neoclassicism, even with its national incarnations, has been defined as the reuse and amalgamation of Greco-Roman aesthetics, but with eighteenth-century moral and political sensibilities. To those longing for “noble simplicity and quiet grandeur” a phrase coined by Winckelmann to express the qualities of Greco-Roman art, the past has always been a siren’s call; a

---


35 There are many standard texts on the various aspects of Neoclassicism: Albert Boime, Art in the Age of Revolution; Hugh Honour, Neoclassicism; Robert Rosenblum, Nineteenth-Century Art; and David Irwin, Neoclassicism. Also very useful on the topic are Viccy Coltman, Fabricating the Antique, and Caroline Clifton-Mogg, The Neoclassical Source Book.
time when everything was better, simpler, and cost less, or so the trope goes. Due to rapid industrialization, gradual colonization and massive shifts in social orders, the eighteenth-century mood was one of general dis-ease.

It is no coincidence that the late eighteenth-century British author and travel writer, Samuel Johnson, is attributed to have penned the catchphrase still commonly used to express the idea that another’s place or time was better than your own – “The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence.” Cheekily written in a satirical context by a man whose political views are difficult to categorize, the phrase could be readily applied to whatever situation was at hand. But to the intellectuals of the Enlightenment, the main source of their current malaise was clear: the rigid control that Christianity held over society. Desiring freedom of religion, expression and assembly led many to long for “the good old days,” which seemed to be found in the pre-Christian past, the so-called “ancient world” – a place familiar to many of them by virtue of their classical educations. The ancient world thus became the go-to fantasy destination, never mind that it was never one place, and that their understanding of it was undifferentiated and idealized; _Et en Arcadia Ego_.

---

36 “We often change a lighter for a greater evil, and wish ourselves restored again to the state from which we thought it desirable to be delivered. But this knowledge, though it is easily gained by the trial, is not always attainable any other way; and that error cannot justly be reproached, which reason could not obviate, nor prudence avoid.” _Johnson: Rambler #63 (October 23, 1750)_

37 This phrase was taken from Virgil’s fifth Eclogue; Nicholas Poussin created two paintings of the same name. Arcadia itself was a mythological never-never land where one never grew old and all was serene; I use the phrase here to suggest that the ancient world had acquired a similar aura.
When the flood of artifacts and subsequent published writings about areas such as Pompeii and Herculaneum began to surge through Europe, Neoclassicism was an all but inevitable phenomenon. It had touched a raw nerve and it signaled change. Neoclassicism soon made artists working in either the contemporary French Rococo or Italian Baroque style seem outdated. All things old were new again, yet not without an overlay of eighteenth-century expectations. It was in this context that the sculptor and entrepreneur Cavaceppi restored the *Discobolus* torso that would become Diomedes and the Palladium.

The only direct reference as to why the torso was restored as Diomedes occurs in a short and fawning letter sent with the statue from the painter turned antiquities dealer, Gavin Hamilton. Written to Lord Lansdowne (Shelburne), the British buyer, Hamilton used circuitous logic to explain the choice of Diomedes, which has the unfortunate effect of obscuring rather than clarifying the attribution. The letter will be addressed in depth later, but my own research provides a clear and credible explanation as to why Diomedes was specifically chosen as a subject. This particular mythical figure was an exceptionally smart and topical choice in the eighteenth century, particularly for artists and restorers who had British buyers in mind.

The British elite, trained as they were in the classics, would have been very familiar with the general outline of his story. The character of Diomedes had serially resurfaced in ancient, medieval and contemporary literature. The earliest known reference came from Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, where Diomedes was depicted as a consummate Greek hero and frequent brother-in-arms to Odysseus, a strong-man archetype who was
intimidated by no one of either gender. While Odysseus was by far the more famous of the two, it was Diomedes who is credited with stealing the sacred Palladium from Troy. The Palladium was an ancient statue or xoanon depicting Athena given specifically to Troy for its protection. It was talismanic; its presence signified the power and protection of Athena. In capturing it, Diomedes symbolically gained its inherent powers. In one version of the story found in the Epic-Cycle, as the pair was on the way back to their ship, Odysseus was overcome by jealousy. Deciding to kill Diomedes so that he could take all the credit for capturing the statue, Odysseus brandished his sword, literally trying to stab his friend Diomedes in the back, as Diomedes ran with the statue in front of him. However, this near fratricide was averted as Diomedes saw a flash of light from the reflection of Odysseus’ sword. Pausing in mid-step, Diomedes looked over his left shoulder in disbelief, a detail which will become important when we later examine the rationale behind Cavaceppi’s Diomedes creation from the Discobolus torso.

Other variations on the theme have the Palladium being re-captured and taken to Rome by Aeneas. To the Greco-Roman mind, the possession of the Palladium denoted

---

38 Diomedes for his part was famous for his audacity in the wounding of the goddess Aphrodite at Troy.

39 A xoanon was the oldest type of cult image, usually made out of wood. For the Epic Cycle in English, see Hugh Evelyn-White, Hesiod: the Homeric Hymns and Homericica (London: Heinemann, 1929).

40 The Epic-cycle or Little Iliad is a set of fragments and poems, which deal in large part with the return home of various Greek warriors. The assembled documents date from the orientalizing and archaic period, 750-480 BC. See Malcolm Davies, Greek Epic Cycle (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2001).

41 For these adaptations in the storyline, see The Library, vol. 1 Apollodorus and Book Five of Virgil’s Aeneid.
divine protection and power, and Diomedes was but one among many who had facilitated this transfer of power from one place to another. However, to the classically trained eighteenth-century mind, educated in use of mythology as metaphor, Diomedes was symbolic of men who could get powerful deeds done with no excuses or questions asked, especially in the face of adversity.

In late medieval England, Diomedes appeared in literary works such as Chaucer’s fourteenth-century Canterbury Tales. Here Diomedes is morphed into a self-aggrandizing and self-absorbed womanizer, a kind of ubermetro-sexual, in the parlance of today. Chaucer may have arrived at this re-packaging by combining two then-popular views of Diomedes: the smarmy depiction of him in the Roman author Ovid’s risqué novel, The Art of Love, (Arms Amatoria) and the other, more courtly Diomedes in the contemporary French tale, The Fountain of Love, (Dit de la Fontaine Amoureuse) by the poet and musician Guillaume de Machaut (1300-1377). Now conflated and overlain


43 In Chaucer’s version, Diomedes flirts shamelessly with all comers, even with the Goddess Aphrodite/Venus before inflicting her with “a wound” on the battlefield. A Freudian reading would reveal the overt eroticism apparent in many Neoclassical works depicting Diomades, as can be seen in paintings by both Ingres and Vein. The more homo-erotic angle can be traced back to Hadrian’s preference for having statues of himself made in the Diomedes pose. For Hadrian see Caroline Vout, “What’s in a Beard? Rethinking Hadrian’s Hellenism” and Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne, eds., Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), Chapter 4, especially 112-13.

with multiple variations of myth, Diomedes was understood to be something of a man’s man.

In the realm of visual-arts in the ancient world, images of Diomedes were rare, but not unknown. The canonical representation was in sculpture, originally made by the Classical Greek sculptor Kresilas. Most famous for his bronze statue of Pericles with the Corinthian helmet, Kresilas was a fifth century contemporary of both Phidias and Polykleitos. His formula for the depiction of Diomedes was straightforward and in accordance with the description given by Homer: Diomedes is portrayed as an athletic figure, a heroic nude, with a pose identical to the Doryphoros of Polykleitos. The only change, for the sake of distinctive identification, is that Kresilas’ Diomedes’ head is looking over his left shoulder where a himation or mantel is draped, his youthful face sporting long sideburns that taper into a wispy beard. It is assumed that he would have held the Palladium in his right hand, the sword in the left, in accordance with the myth.

No full-size statues of Diomedes were known during Cavaceppi’s time, but there were multiple representations of Diomedes stealing the Palladium on both antique and post-antique carved gems, which were prized by collectors and available for reference to artists. The seventeenth-century British collector Earl of Arundel, Thomas Howard had owned one of these, the so-called Felix Gem, which he had acquired from the Flemish...

\footnote{The image appears also on ceramics but is far less canonical in form.}

\footnote{For the best treatment on Kresilas’ Diomedes, see Adolph Furtwangler, \textit{Masterpieces of Greek sculpture} (Chicago: Argonaut Publishers, 1964) 146-156.}
painter and collector Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640). It depicted Diomedes and Odysseus in the act of stealing the Palladium. Over three-hundred versions of this scene are known today in carved gems, at least seventy-eight of which were in full circulation by 1791.

The seventy-eight images of Diomedes stealing the Palladium were included with description and illustration in James Tassie’s massive compendium whose title is almost as long as the work itself, *A Descriptive Catalogue of a General Collection of Ancient and Modern Engraved Gems, Cameos and Intaglios, Taken from the Most Celebrated Cabinets in Europe; and Cast in Coloured Pastes, White Enamel, and Sulphur*. A short version was published in London in 1775; the full two-volume book was printed in color in 1791. The Scotsman James Tassie was a modeler and avid antique gem collector who marketed and sold complete sets of gem impressions, which numbered upwards of fifteen-thousand pieces. The enthusiasm for collecting gems and coins, which had begun during the Renaissance, became an outright mania during the Neoclassical period. Catherine the Great ordered a full set of Tassie’s impressions in 1783 and there were two complete sets in public view, one in Edinburgh, the other in London. Concurrently there were intaglios for sale, some with regal provenance.

---


49 The ceramicist Josiah Wedgwood made his own assortment of gem impressions for sale to collectors. John Flaxwood made many of the illustrations for Wedgwood, which he said were based on the antique ceramics, coins, revetments and “inspiration.”
In 1726 the Earl of Devonshire, William Cavendish, bought from the French court a renowned carved agate cameo with a depiction of Diomedes stealing the Palladium.\textsuperscript{50} The Cavendish family had been avid art collectors for generations. While the Earl had a particular fondness for books, he also bought antiquities. This particular carved intaglio had special cachet as it had once been in the personal collection of the French King, Louis XIV. Upon his death in 1715 it had been inherited by his daughter, the princess Conti, who in turn bequeathed it to her personal physician, Dr. Dodart.\textsuperscript{51} It ultimately ended up in the possession of Pierre Sevin, a famous Parisian maker of scientific instruments. In 1726 his heirs put it up for sale and the Earl of Devonshire immediately bought it.

The carved intaglio, made for wearing as jewelry, was said to have been originally created in the early first century AD by Gnaios and Dioskourides.\textsuperscript{52} The two men were famous gem cutters who worked for Emperor Augustus and are referred to by both Pliny and Suetonius. But while it was sold to Louis XIV as antique, it appears to have been a close copy of the well known Medici Gem.\textsuperscript{53} This too was a famous intaglio that had

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, 6.

\textsuperscript{51} For the provenance see Gems, Selected from the Antique (London: John Murray Publishing, 1804), 34-6.


\textsuperscript{53} The gem owned by William Cavendish is very similar in pose and attribution to the Medici gem, but it seems more Mannerist in feel as he body depicted is rounded and
been in Florence since 1471, and had been cited repeatedly in literature and art. The humanist Niccoli described it, and the workshop of Donatello copied it as one of the eight medallions in the courtyard of the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi. Leonard da Vinci drew it in about 1503.  

It is evident that by the mid eighteenth century artists were looking at hundreds of Greco-Roman images in original, copy and print form. This extensive visibility and desirability, particularly in industrial Britain, leads me to conclude that the artistic elite would have been aware of the image, pose and iconography of Diomedes. The United Kingdom idealized and assimilated Diomedes’ masculine traits making him akin to a James Bond or Sean Connery type. As a popular figure in literature and the arts, it makes sense then that someone would finally put the pieces together (in this case literally) and provide for the collectors what they wanted: an “original” antique statue of Diomedes to take home and display. 

distorted. The inclusion of the signature of Disokourides is another tip-off that this is a copy.


55 For the period’s take on what a Man’s Man was, read the 1795 poem, “A Man’s a Man for a’ that”, by the Scotsman, Robert Burns.
William Petty-Fitz Maurice, Lord Shelburne and later the Marquis of Lansdowne, although born into money and privilege in 1737, was raised in an extremely austere and devoutly Catholic household outside of Dublin. By his own account he felt that he was initially ill-educated and ill-prepared to become part of the ruling elite of Britain. In 1760 he entered the military service under the Protestant King George III (1738-1820), and afterwards engaged in a long and sometimes rocky career in British politics. When his first wife died in 1771 he seemed genuinely bereaved and left for five months of recuperation in Italy. While only there for a short time, Italy resonated with Lansdowne politically and artistically, and held a special bond for him as the patriarchal home of Catholicism.

Lansdowne stopped first in Venice and then moved on for an introduction to Horace Mann, the English ambassador to Florence. Mann welcomed him into his private circle of friends and personally guided him on tours of Pompeii. Two months later he was introduced by Thomas Jenkins to Gavin Hamilton, who showed him around Rome. While there he asked Grand Tourists, expatriates and local artists for decorating ideas; he was having a new home built, the Lansdowne house located on Berkeley Square, London.

His relationship to Hamilton became long-standing, and they exchanged letters concerning art and antiquities. From 1771 to 1775 he bought many things from Hamilton, including sixteen antique statues, twelve antique busts and twelve antique bas-

reliefs. He also commissioned eleven original historical pictures and four landscapes to depict scenes from the Trojan War, at an astounding expense of 6,500 pounds sterling. Lansdowne invested complete trust in the taste and abilities of his artist-consultant. The exact scenes and themes of all the art works were to be chosen by Hamilton, so as to fit within the emerging artistic program of the Lansdowne house. It was just at this period of time that Hamilton found the Discobolus torso. Typical of all the torsos addressed here it was slightly under life-size and fragmentary – this one sans arms, legs and head. Found at Ostia, this torso was sent to Cavaceppi’s workshop for restoration. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 4.5)

The fully restored piece came to Lansdowne preceded by a letter from Hamilton which dates to 1776; it gives the fullest details:

…I have never mentioned to your Lordship one of the finest things I have ever had in my possession, as I was not sure of getting a license to send it out of Rome. Now that I have it safe on board the Felucca for Leghorn, I have ventured to recommend it to your Lordship as something singular and uncommon. It is a Diomedes carrying off the Palladium. Your Lordship when in Rome mentioned to me particularly subjects of this sort as interesting to you, but besides the

57 Ingamells, Dictionary, 852.

58 Ibid., for the amounts paid. Gavin Hamilton was among the earliest artists to take themes he found in Homer and use them for the topics of his canvases. He made many paintings for both Italian and British patrons but they were not generally successful due to his “colouring,” as has been stated previously. He was actually more widely known from engravings produced by the Italian Domenico Cunego. An example of how his art was informed by his own archaeology, or more cynically, how he used the sculptures he sold as the basis for the poses in his own work (a trick of Mengs), see Hamilton’s 1773 painting Death of Achilles. See Irwin, 101, illustration 8. Notice the figure at the far left of the canvas; it has been rendered in the pose of Endymion.

subject, give me leave to add that the subject is first rate, and exactly the size of
the Cincinnatus to which I mean it as a companion, being a Greek hero to match
the Roman. The legs and arms are modern, but restored in perfect harmony with
the rest. He holds the Palladion in one hand, while he defends himself with the
right holding a dagger. Your Lordship will ask me why I suppose this statue to be
a Diomedes. I answer because it would be to the last degree absurd to suppose it
anything else, as I believe your Lordship will easily grant when you see it. Every
view of it is fine and I wish it to be placed so as to be seen all around. With regard
to price, I have put it at £220, but as I have made so many draughts of late, I shall
suspend every view of interest till it arrives and meets your Lordship’s
approbation...The contrast will add beauty to each. Your Lordship will excuse the
liberty I have taken, as my principal motive is to increase your collection with
something entirely new and uncommon.60

The letter implies much, but explains nothing: “it would be to the last degree absurd to
suppose it anything else”. The statement leads one to believe that the assignment of the
Diomedes was based on an educated guess made on the part of the excavator, dealer or
restorer.61 But what did Hamilton mean by “excuse the liberty I have taken”? Did he
mean sending it without prior consent, or having it restored as Diomedes? Lansdowne
had already commissioned artwork from Hamilton which displayed heroic scenes taken
from the Iliad, and a letter that Hamilton wrote to Townley implies that he made the
choice himself.62 It would seem then, that Hamilton acted as the iconographer and

---

60 Lansdowne Catalogue, pp. 94-5, no.27; Smith 1889, 43-44, 77-78, no. 89; Christie, Mason
and Woods 1930, 94-5.

61 Found in a letter from Hamilton to Lansdowne, dated 1776, quoted in Smith, Catalogue
of Ancient Marbles at Lansdowne House, 78; and Coltman, Fabricating the Antique, 235,
note 62

62 The letter is referred to in James Dallaway, Anecdotes of the Arts in England (London,
1800), 29.
assigned the attribution of Diomedes.\textsuperscript{63} Believing that Lansdowne would approve of the subject matter, he had directed that it be restored as such.

The letter does not state the name of the restorer, but beginning in 1760 Hamilton had exclusively used the workshop of Cavaceppi.\textsuperscript{64} An analysis of the piece also leads to the conclusion that he was the restorer.\textsuperscript{65} The marble torso is indeed antique, as Hamilton claimed, appearing in its general style and technique to be Roman. This along with its stated provenance of Ostia, with no more specific location mentioned by Hamilton, places its original creation most likely during the rule of Hadrian (117 to 138 AD).

Hamilton mentioned nothing about the head in his letter to Lansdowne, perhaps tellingly so, because it is not original to the statue. It seems Hellenistic in style, due to the mass of heavily carved curls, full lips and furrowed brow lines cut into the forehead. These are facial features characteristically found in sculptures from around the period of Alexander the Great (356-323 BC). In his first work about Cavaceppi in 1958, Seymour Howard states that the head is Hellenistic in origin, while in an entry for the 2000 Catalogue Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century, he more specifically assigns it to Pergamum, perhaps even the head of a barbarian.\textsuperscript{66}


\textsuperscript{65} Michaelis, Smith, Howard and Picón all agree that Cavaceppi was the restorer.

\textsuperscript{66} Bowron, Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century, 224; and Howard, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, 227.
My concern with calling the head Hellenistic in period is due to some stylistic anomalies, the first being the odd hairstyle. It has an uncharacteristic left-side part which I have never observed in any other Hellenistic sculpture. Center parts are much more typical and can be seen in images of such wide ranging personages as Mithras and Faustina. Looking at it the head closely, it also appears that sections of the curls have been added along each side of the head, as there is a perceptible space or lift. Both the mouth and nose are complete and obvious additions as can be easily detected in their visible seams. The forehead and frown-lines around the eyes are also peculiar. They have been deeply incised, appearing oddly similar to those found in certain imperial portraiture, such as the Emperor Nero (37-68 AD). The pudgy face with its long, curly and tapering side-burns and bulbous chin is also very reminiscent of the face of Hercules from the *Aula Regia*, now at the *Palazzo Farnese*.\(^67\) The point here is not to assign this head of Diomedes to any particular figure or style, but rather to suggest that the head was likely re-cut by Cavaceppi as it seems not to conform consistently to any one specific type or style. The canonical image of Diomedes, as established by Kresilas, has him wearing the kind of side-burns seen here, which were uncommon in Greco-Roman sculpture. This is too much of a coincidence not to be questioned. It would not be surprising to find that the entire head was a deliberate and composite fabrication by Cavaceppi. If you were to assume it to be of ancient origin – be it Hellenistic, Roman or other – it too conveniently matches the expected countenance of Diomedes. And true to

---

\(^67\) This statue is not to be confused with the more famous *Farnese Hercules*, which curiously enough was re-restored in 1787 by a student initially working in the studio of Cavaceppi, Carlo Albacini. See Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, 229.
the necessary storyline, the head is turning looking upwards toward the object in his upraised hand.

The right arm, which extending from this torso would have originally thrown the discus, is oriented upward and attached at a similar angle to the arm on the Endymion. This previous Discobolus restoration was on full view at the Uffizi while the Restoration of the Diomedes was underway. In the case of the Endymion, the arm and upraised hand were ostensibly to protect his eyes from the moonlight, a detail which relates to the mythological storyline. In the case of the Diomedes statue, his arm is also raised upward, but his fingers are curled around a dagger hilt, as if he were warding off the notorious attack of Odysseus. The dagger blade is missing, but the restorer drilled a hole where it would have extended from the hilt to make it appear as though a blade had been attached but had subsequently broken off. The entire right arm, obviously fabricated as part of the restoration, was made intentionally by the restorer to appear antique and, I would argue, with the addition of this drilled hole in the dagger it held as a deliberate and clever deception of the average viewer.

The left arm too is a complete addition. As designed by Myron, the hand would have been open, resting palm-down on his right knee, as part of the discus wind-up. Here, however, while the back of his fingertips touch the knee his hand clutches a columnar image of Athena or Diomedes’ Palladium. This statuette, fully created by the restorer, is an adaptation of the late-classical peplos type. Columnar in shape, she is clearly meant to represent the goddess Athena. She wears a traditional, belted peplos, an Attic helmet and has a round shield attached to her left arm. Her right arm is stretched outward and
upward, holding something that has broken off. In accordance with the traditional iconography of Athena, the missing element would logically have been a representation of Victory alighting or Nike. As with the missing knife, its deliberate omission is intended to help trick the viewer into believing that the statuette, like the statue holding it, is original and antique.

With the right leg of the Athena statuette straight and the left striding forward, the stance and drapery look identical to the Caryatids or carved maidens located on the porch of the Erechtheion on the Acropolis.\(^{68}\) (For more information on the statues, see Appendix A, 4.6) Images of these iconic works were fully accessible to Cavaceppi, not in the original (as he never went to Athens), but in print. Two of Gavin Hamilton’s traveling companions, Stuart and Revett, had been funded in 1748 by the Royal Society of London to study the buildings on the Acropolis from 1751 until 1754. The first publication of their findings on Greek architecture was entitled *The Antiquities of Athens*, and volume one had been released for sale in 1762. Criticized as being haphazardly assembled, a second volume was more painstakingly crafted which received high praise for its attention to detail and copious engravings. It dealt primarily with the buildings on the Acropolis, and included long re-worked sections of the Parthenon and Erechtheion. It was released officially in 1788 but had been available earlier in various separate printings.\(^{69}\) Gavin Hamilton, a friend of Stuart and Revett and interested in

---

\(^{68}\) There are six Caryatids; three are mirror images of the others.

antiques, would have seen various versions of the folios. Sir William Hamilton, the
ambassador to Naples, owned copies and at the same time was also printing his own folio
based of images, *Campi Phlegraei*, 1776.\(^70\) There were ample opportunities for
antiquities dealers, artists, and patrons to see ancient images from which to draw ideas for
the restoration of fragments.

The last major additions to the torso of Diomedes are the legs, which are
unremarkable except for having an awkward stance similar to that of the *Endymion*
statue, and a post support. Cavaceppi left a remnant of the original stump support
attached to the back of the torso and re-created a tree stump, something he had been
doing repetitively on other restorations since his work on the *Red Faun*. The tree stump of
Diomedes is smooth and modeled to stylistically match the general feel of the entire piece
which is firmly in the tradition of the Neoclassical. All lines of this supporting post are
rendered crisply and cleanly, as if meant to be visible in silhouette. It is difficult to
compare it for similarity of style or technique to the stump in the *Endymion* statue, as this
earlier one had been repeatedly re-cut, but both were done in the last third of the
eighteenth century and have the same streamlined, Neoclassical feel. Of the three torsos
discussed so far, Monnot’s *Fallen Warrior* is in this regard out of place with the other
two, as he completely carved away any trace of the engaged tree stump, instead placing
the figure falling to the ground. This tumbling action as mentioned before lends a more
Baroque flavor in comparison with the other works. Although subjected to different

\(^70\) Sir William Hamilton, *Campi Phlegraei: osservazioni sul vulcani delle Due Sicilie,
artistic styles, repair techniques and radically divergent attributions, the torso of the *Discobolus* remains overtly identifiable in each restoration.

Whether or not Lord Lansdowne found “every view of [the Diomedes] fine...” as mentioned earlier in the letter, is unknown. There was no recorded response to Hamilton’s letter aside from Lansdowne evidently having paid the bill. The Diomedes and the Palladium was installed as specified by Hamilton at the Lansdowne home, placed in the far left of three niches in an apsidal wing. The intended Roman companion piece mentioned in Hamilton’s letter, the so-called Cincinnatus, was displayed in the far right niche and is itself another curious fabrication. Its restoration history is beyond the scope of this study; suffice to say, it too is a heavily re-fashioned work, in this case appearing to have begun its existence as a Hermes in the tradition of the Hellenistic sculptor, Lysippos.  

Despite Hamilton’s comment that the pair would represent the best of Greek and Roman heroes, the two had nothing substantive in common; they shared no origin, form or mythological basis. They were tangible proof to the London elite that Lansdowne had real money, and by extension, real power.

---

71 The fragments, restored as “Cincinnatus” by an unnamed sculptor, were found by Hamilton in 1769 at Pantanello. In a 1772 letter to Lansdowne, Hamilton states the selling price at five-hundred pounds sterling. He goes on to comment that he has a companion piece, but cannot yet divulge any details for fear of not getting export documents. This may be the earliest reference to the Diomedes statue. See Rodolfo Lanciani, *New Tales of Old Rome* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1901) 67.

72 A final irony reported here is that in 1930 the Diomedes statue was put up for sale at Christie’s auction house but did not sell, as there were no interested buyers. Returned to the family, it has now been relocated to Bowood, Wilshire, perhaps serving as a mute reminder of the perils of over-restoration.
Home at Last: The Massimi Discobolus in the National Museum of Rome

In examining the Endymion, The Fallen Warrior and Diomedes and the Palladium, all statues built from torsos of the Discobolus, we have seen how essentially very similar fragments could be reconstructed in three different positions and as three entirely different figures. There is no evidence that anyone had seriously challenged the appropriateness of any of these restorations, although it might well have occurred to a perceptive viewer that the central body form of all three appeared to come from one common original statue type.

A major watershed in the interpretation of the torso finally occurred in 1781. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 4.7) In that year another copy of Myron’s torso was found, this time on the grounds of the Villa Palombara on the Esquiline Hill.73 The site of the villa had once been part of the grounds of Nero’s Golden Palace and later Trajan’s bath complex; both of these emperors were known for collecting art. In the eighteenth century the property was one of many owned by the extended and wealthy Massimi family.74 In the case of this torso discovery, unlike

---

73 This restored torso is known today as either the Lancellotti or Massimi Discobolus, named for the family who owned the property. See Francesco Cancellieri Dissertazioni Epistolari di Giovanni Battista Visconti e Filippo Waguer de la Barthe sopra la Statua del Discobolo…con le illustrazioni della medesima publicate da Carlo Fea e Giuseppe Ant. Guattani (Rome, 1806), 1 and 19.

74 By the eighteenth-century, the large Massimi family was one of the wealthiest in Rome. They had multiple residences with small but important collections of art. Cardinal Camillo Massimi had been a discriminating collector, owning works by Diego Velazquez, Nicholas Poussin, Claude Lorraine and Annibale Carracci. His home, in and of itself, was a treasure. Built by Baldassare Peruzzi, it was located directly across the street from Frances Borromini’s San Carlos Quattro Fontane. For an informational discussion of both his...
previous occasions when the restorers generally determined what the fragments were and how they should be repaired, an Italian scholar and antiquarian named Carlo Fea (1753-1836) stepped in and made the crucial connection between the ancient descriptions found in Pliny, Lucian and Quintilian, and the newly found object at hand.

In 1781, the very year that this particular torso was discovered, Carlo Fea had recently been ordained a priest.\(^\text{75}\) Originally having acquired a law degree in 1776, his side interests in archaeology and linguistics had previously caught the attention of the Vatican.\(^\text{76}\) In 1768 Fea had been chosen to succeed Winckelmann as Papal Antiquarian. Winckelmann had been tragically murdered in Trieste on his way back home from Vienna.\(^\text{77}\) Later, in 1783, Fea would also be officially appointed as assistant librarian to the archeologist and conservator of the Capitoline Museum, Ennio Visconti, a function he had been performing de facto for years.\(^\text{78}\) In addition to his professional duties, Fea also privately wrote books on Vitruvius and translated for publication one of Winckelmann’s lesser known works, the *Storia delle Arti del Disegno Presso gli Antichi*, from German to

---


\(^\text{76}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{77}\) In yet another twist of fate, it was Cavaceppi who accompanied Winckelmann on his last trip to Germany.

\(^\text{78}\) Visconti was a member of an eminent family of scholars.
Assigned to oversee the excavations of sections of the Forum and to provide scholarly analysis of the design of the Pantheon and the Colosseum, Fea was exceptionally well qualified in the realms of ancient art and literature.

In 1782 Fea made known his recognition that the newly discovered torso was Myron’s *Discobolus*, and that his identification was based on descriptions he had read in Lucian, *Philopseudes* 18, and Quintilian *Oratoria* II, 13.8.10. Fea is quoted, in an 1809 autobiography of the painter James Barry:

> It is however to be confessed, that it is only by the inspection of this figure, we rightly comprehend Lucian’s meaning, which for want of it, has hitherto been mistaken by the interpreters and commentators; and that a just version of it can now be given.

To put into context what Fea was referring to, we can look back at an excerpt of the quotation by Lucian cited in Chapter 1:

> Narrator- ‘Do you mean the Discus-thrower’ I asked, ‘who is bending forward in the act of throwing, looking back at the hand holding the discus, one leg slightly bent, and seemingly about to rise up as he makes his throw?’

---

79 Fea’s translations were highly praised by the German author Goethe, but sadly his own works, such as *Progetto per una Nouva Edizione dell’Architettura di Vitruvio*, were never published.


81 James Barry, *The Works of James Barry, Esq., Historical Painter* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1809), vol. 1, 481. The painter James Barry was very interested in Olympic sports, as can be seen in his various murals such as *The Victors at Olympia*, 1780. For a short but interesting discussion of Barry as a dedicated classicist, see R. Wark, “The Iconography and Date of James Barry’s Self-portrait in Dublin,” *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 96, no. 614. (May, 1954), 153-5.
The fact that Fea viewed the piece in question in 1782 is confirmed by Barry and other sources, although exactly what stage of restoration it was in at the time is unknown.\textsuperscript{82} It may have been as a relatively unadulterated fragment or Fea may have seen a sculptural work-in-progress, already clearly intended by the restorer to be a discus thrower.\textsuperscript{83}

In his official capacity as a Papal Antiquarian, Fea had the duty and authority to visit studios restoring antique works that might later require export documents.\textsuperscript{84} Rodolfo Lanciani notes that in a 1772 letter to Lansdowne, Hamilton remarked that he had to stay on the good side of Visconti, the man whom Fea worked under at the Capitoline Museum.

In the meantime I give your Lordship the agreeable news that the Cincinnatus is now casing up for Shelburne House, as the Pope has declined the purchase price of 500 pounds, which I demanded, and has accepted two other singular figures,…which I have given them at my own price, being highly necessary to keep Visconti and his companion the sculptor my friends.\textsuperscript{85}

---

\textsuperscript{82} Fea’s attribution was repeated in a wide variety of book, for example, Knight, Penny Cyclopaedia and Barry, The Works of James Barry, 480.

\textsuperscript{83} The director of the current (post-explosion) restoration of the Endymion, Pierra Bocci Pacini cites in his 1994 museum supplement, Il Discobolo degli Uffizi, page 63, that Fea identified the Discololus in a comment to Winckelmann in 1783, however as Winckelmann had died in 1768, I am unsure what to make of this. Pacini states as well that Visconti also had raised the name of Myron in reference to this restoration piece in a letter that he wrote to Cardinal G. Pallotta in 1781. There are, however, no notes as to the source of this information, and I have not been able to confirm this reference elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{84} For the connection between restorers and export licenses, see Christopher Johns, Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe (Berkeley Press: University of California Press, 1998), 36-7.

\textsuperscript{85} See Rodolfo Lanciani, New Tales of Old Rome, 1899-1901.
Since Hamilton in 1782 still exclusively used Cavaceppi’s workshop for his restorations “the sculptor” referred to in the letter above is likely to have been Cavaceppi.\(^{86}\) It was probably while Fea was on a “friendly” professional oversight visit to Cavaceppi’s studio, either accompanying Visconti or on his own, that he would have seen the torso being restored by a student apprentice, Giuseppe Angelini, who began his career as a workshop assistant to Cavaceppi.\(^{87}\) While not well known today, in the mid 1780s Angelini was one of the few rivals of the neoclassical sculptor Antonio Canova.\(^{88}\) They often found themselves vying for the same new sculptural commissions, as they both preferred creating original pieces to restoration work.

Little archival evidence concerning the actual restoration of the Massimi Discobolus torso remains, but according to its official inventory document, it is described as Antonine in period, dating to about the mid-second century AD.\(^{89}\) In shape, size, outline, and general appearance this torso is very similar in appearance to that of the Diomedes and Endymion statues; The Fallen Warrior torso was too radically re-cut by Monnot to make any definitive comparison. Leaving aside the Monnot restored torso, the other three all display the type of musculature and body position that would be expected in an athlete.

---


\(^{88}\) Angelini is most remembered today for his Bust of the engraver Piranesi. Gross, p. 364.

\(^{89}\) National Musem in Rome, *Ministero per i bene culturali e ambientali Direz. Gen. antichita’ e belle arti*, inv. 12671.
throwing the discus, the fifth and final event of the ancient Greek pentathlon. If the viewer concentrates on just the torso section, all three, and even to some extent the body of The Fallen Warrior, conform to the ancient authors’ descriptions of a realistic and dramatic portrayal of motion and energy about to be released. It is indeed a testament to Myron’s original design that this seminal idea is still conveyed through the various copies.

The head of the torso is noted in the original museum document, as well as in comments of other observers, as being intact and looking backward, corresponding to the description of Lucian. The art historian and archaeologist Adolph Furtwangler thoroughly examined various copies of ancient sculpted heads that were generally accepted as being patterned after Myron’s works. These are illustrated in the 1964 edition of his text, Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture. The head on the Discobolus has the same general style and appearance as these other Myron-imitative heads. They all have very

---

90 While most authors find the statue to be a representative of an idealized discus thrower, it is possible that it was made to represent a specific athlete. The names suggested due to their coincidence with Myron’s dates are Timanthes, a winner in 456, Lykinos, a winner in 448, Philippos, or Ladas. See Lucy Myers Wright Mitchell, A History of Ancient Sculpture (New York: Dodd Mead and Company, 1883), 283. Also see Pacini, Gli Uffizi, p. 63. Neither author gives the original source, but I recognize the name Ladas as being taken from Pliny, Book 34.

91 Any more in-depth comparison of the torso discovered in 1781 to the earlier ones would not be well supported by evidence, because, as has been earlier stated, all of them were slightly to extensively re-cut and smoothed as part of their restorations. In point of fact, the Diomedes torso seems ever so slightly leaner than the National Museum Discobolus, but I would find this to be due to the restorer’s work.

92 Furtwangler, 178-181.
lightly carved curls as well as the serene and idealized facial features that were typical of the Transitional or Early Classical style that Myron is thought to have worked in.

One rather obvious but seldom mentioned concern is that among the curls on the top of the head and placed closely together are two prominently raised knobs or bumps. The museum catalogue states that they are “pointing knobs” made by a copyist as a reference when they were using a pointing machine, but the spacing is too close for this to make much sense. 93 Marble statues did sometimes have iconographic accessories added to them, such as helmets, crowns, or wreaths, often attached with metal pins inserted into drilled holes in the marble. For a piece of attached headgear these knobs could have served as contact points to create a more natural-looking relationship between the head and perhaps a laurel or winner’s wreath. However, if that were their purpose the knobs are spaced oddly close together; one knob in that approximate location ought to have sufficed to hold an object such as a laurel. Also complicating that theory, there are no corresponding drill holes – or evidence of holes having been repaired – either at the knobs themselves or elsewhere on the head. Since the statue was restored and lightly patched where necessary, it seems curious that these knobs were not addressed in any way. They seem suggestive of the occasional statues of Hermes or Mercury, which have carved wings growing from their scalp. In any case, I find this and any other anomaly of the head worthy of note, as this is the only head found attached to the torso, and so is considered to be the prototype for all of the others. With regard to this last point there is a faint but perceptible line completely around the neck making the head look as if it may

93 Adriano La Regina, Palazzo Massimo Alle Terme (Milan: Electra, 1998) 130.
at some point have been broken off. In the absence of any other evidence that the head is not original, it seems ill-advised to make too much of this. It is possible that the head was found partially attached or with a significant crack around the neck and had to be re-set, but if so this is not documented.

The left arm of the Massimi Discobolus is a complete restoration. It appears to be a close copy of an arm made by Caccini in the sixteenth century for the Endymion. The right arm, from the shoulder to the wrist, was found broken off but the restorer was able to fill in the voids and reattach it. Small fragments of the hand and discus were also discovered but were not sufficiently complete for Angelini to ascertain their original positions. Instead, the hand and discus were reconstructed based on a Renaissance drawing of an arm holding a discus, which was thought to be of similar size and aspect. The drawing was from the library of the Palazzo Pitti and had originally been collected by the Duke of Tuscany in 1574. The statue that served as inspiration for the drawing is unknown, but seems to be one of the standing types of Discobolus originally made by Naukydes of Argos. Up until the point of this restoration, the standing version of the Discobolus was more familiar than Myron’s so-called stooping type.

94 This is according to the archives shown to me by the archivist at the National Roman Museum, Dr. Mulas

95 Pacini, Gli Uffizi, 71.

96 Ibid.

97 Naukydes of Argos was a sculptor a generation later sculptor than Myron, circa 420-400 BC Copies of the standing type were already in the collections of the King of Spain, Philip IV, by 1634. See Haskell and Penny, 200.

98 Haskell and Penny, Taste and the Antique, 199.
The right leg from the torso to the knee was reattached, but the section from the knee to the ankle is completely post-antique. It appears that Angelini used the calf from either the Endymion of Diomedes as his model, as all three have virtually the same pose and form. The base is completely modern, as is most of the strut. It is of the palm-tree type made by Cavaceppi, as seen before on the Red Faun and Diomedes statues, as well as on various works illustrated in his Raccolta. Angelini would have been trained in the restoration preferences of his teacher Cavaceppi. By the mid 1780s Angelini had ended his direct employment with Cavaceppi and established his own studio, in an attempt to wrest new commissions away from Canova.

Even with this extensive repair work the newly restored Discobolus became immediately famous. Due to its acknowledged recognition by the scholarly Papal Antiquarians Fea and Visconti, word spread that it was the Discobolus copy most faithful to Myron’s original work that had ever been found. The statue became a prized possession of the Massimi family and was jealously guarded. 99 It was placed in its own room in the Palazzo Massimo delle Colonne, but the family did not allow public viewing or even scholarly drawings to be made of it. 100 Near the end of the nineteenth century it was moved to another private Massimi palace located on the Via dei Coronari. Since public access was still denied at this new venue, few people saw, let alone had the opportunity to study, the statue. For generations it was known only through hearsay and second-hand descriptions. When the Massimi Discobolus did finally gain a large public

---

99 Haskell and Penny, Taste and the Antique, 199.

100 Mitchell, A History of Ancient Sculpture, 294.
audience many decades later it would not be without a certain measure of controversy.

But first, to put that in perspective, it is necessary to look at the fifth and final variant of a restored *Discobolus*. How this torso, also heavily restored and with a non-original head facing the wrong direction became what is still today the most familiar and published version of the *Discobolus*, is the subject of next section.

Flawed Perfection: The Townley *Discobolus* in the British Museum

In 1790, at about the same time that Gavin Hamilton found another copy of the *Discobolus* torso, his wealthiest British patron, Charles Townley, had just returned from Italy to his posh home in London. (For more information on the statue, see Appendix A, 4.8) Antiquarian, collector, personal friend to the Ambassador William Hamilton and member of the Society of the Dilettanti, Townley had come from a powerful, political and moneyed Catholic family.\(^{101}\) He had personally amassed an enormous and important collection of books, antiquities and even some modern art, which he proudly displayed at his London home.\(^{102}\)

His preferred residence since 1777 had been No. 7 Park Street. Located only six townhouses away from Queens Square, it was a frequently open to invited guests for art

---

\(^{101}\) The Society of the Dilettanti, formed in London in 1734 by Sir Francis Dashwood, was a dining club for men who had been on the Grand Tour. This group promoted serious scholarship and included such notable members as Sir Joshua Reynolds and Sir William Hamilton. The Society of the Dilettanti was influential in the inception of the English Royal Academy of the Arts in 1768.

\(^{102}\) Ingamells *Dictionary*, 947-8. The dates of his four trips to Italy were 1767-8, 1771-1774, 1777, 1790. Also see the monograph on him by B.F. Cook, *The Townley Marbles* (London: British Museum Publications, 1985).
tours and lectures. Sir Joshua Reynolds, the watercolorist Thomas Patch, statesman Charles Grenville and other notables frequented the famous art gallery which took up the first floor of Townley’s home. A depiction of the gallery was painted by the German neo-classicist Johann Zoffany in 1782. (For more information on the painting, see Appendix A, 4.9) Upon his death in 1808, Townley’s personal collection would be purchased by the British Museum, the legalities of which took six years to settle. Records indicate that they paid an extraordinary price at the time of £20,000, but for that sum the Museum received excellent value, including some of the most famous and rare art to be found on English soil. To display all of the newly acquired antiquities an addition to the British Museum would be built, with objects such as the Townley Vase, bust of Minerva, statue of Hecate, the Townley Venus and the Knucklebone Players filling up at least seven prominent rooms of the Museum Gallery. In an age of obsessive collecting he was unequalled by his peers in sheer quantity, but Townley also had an educated eye for quality. It is curious to discover then that his most prized possession was also perhaps his most puzzling purchase: the Townley or British-Museum Discobolus.

The torso was found in 1791 at Hadrian’s Villa, located eighteen miles outside Rome and known for yielding spectacular finds. The Roman Emperor Hadrian had created a

---

103 The Townley family owned it until 1821. The house is today renumbered as No. 14 Queen Anne’s Gate.

104 Some observers cried foul over the amount paid to his estate as they felt it was excessive; Townley had been on the Board of Trustees of the British Museum since 1791. See Cook, 41.

Hellenic paradise there at his private estate, collecting statues modeled after Greek originals. Three hundred years later Hadrian’s Villa, perceived by the early Christian church to be a manifest exhibition of carnal excess, fell into decay.\textsuperscript{106} The statues that had been placed in niches, walkways and grottoes were broken, buried and in the main, forgotten. In the centuries that followed when significant marble fragments were recovered from there, it was generally either for use as raw material for construction or to be thermally decomposed in kilns for use as calcium-rich fertilizer.\textsuperscript{107} During the Renaissance, however, sites such as these were increasingly excavated for their buried ancient treasures. By the eighteenth century the mania for collecting and restoring antiquities substantially affected the price of ancient marble in any form. Statues were a valuable commodity, in some cases literally worth more than their weight in gold.\textsuperscript{108}

The process of tapping this market was lucrative, albeit complicated, for everyone involved. Local owners would lease their land of archaeological interest to dealers such as Thomas Jenkins or Gavin Hamilton, who in exchange would give them a percentage of the initial selling price of the excavated marble pieces. Next the dealers would turn the

\textsuperscript{106} To understand the vitriolic attitude that the Christian church had towards classical art, read Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. The City of God by Augustine (London: Hardmondsworth Penguin Press, 1972).

\textsuperscript{107} Howard, Lansdowne Herakles, 11.

\textsuperscript{108} Fragments that had been left in basements or magazines also began to be re-examined for their potential value as restoration material. For an informative discussion on the economics of antique marble, see Cornelius Vermeule, European Art and the Classical Past (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964).
fragments over to workshops such as Cavaceppi’s for restoration. The Italian and Papal governments also benefited from the sales and exportation of antiquities as the taxes and document fees were exorbitant. The money exchanged at all levels of the transaction was a strong incentive, but the logistics of even moving such objects were daunting. The complications of crating these heavy and often fragile pieces, coupled with costly shipping fees, were known to drive dealers to extreme measures, and even to tears. Then, when the objects landed on foreign soil, a similar set of corresponding import fees had to be paid on the receiving end. A significant amount of money was changing hands, galvanized by the passion of high-profile collectors such as Charles Townley. This overheated desire for objets d’art continued until the international politics of the late 1790s for all intents and purposes ended the collecting practices of Grand Tourists. Antique sculpture was arguably the greatest natural resource that Italy possessed during this time-period; the cost and occasional “complicated arrangement” made with known and sometimes shadowy individuals were all to be expected as part of exploiting it.

109 Zdravko Barov, the Antiquities Conservator in 1966 at the Getty Museum, notes in his introduction of Howard’s book on the Lansdowne Herakles that Carraran marble was generally used in the eighteenth century. Its appearance is a first step in recognizing post-antique additions. For the procedures and various complications of the movement of objects in this period, see Howard, Lansdowne Herakles, 11.

110 Jenkins was notorious for haggling over business costs, and was accused of staging weeping fits and other acts of duplicity to receive discounts. For an amusing (not to say horrifying) account of his antics, see Howard, Lansdowne Herakles, 12; and Ingamells, Dictionary, 553-556.

111 When France invaded Italy as part of the Napoleonic War in 1794, Grand Tourism was greatly reduced and thus the exportation of objects was abruptly ended.
Thomas Jenkins apparently bought the fragments from a dealer referred to as Count Fede, who according to at least one source had put the torso up for sale at a public auction. In the chain of custody of this particular fragment, Count Fede turns out to be a difficult link to pin down as references to him are either fleeting or garbled. In his 1764 *History of Ancient Art*, Winckelmann mentions only where he lived: “…the country-seat of Count Fede is Adrian’s Villa…” Haskell and Penny refer to him as an “elusive collector and amateur dealer” and “one of the chief excavators of Hadrian’s Villa”. In his article “An Antiquarian Handlist and Beginnings of the Pio-Clementino”, Seymour Howard writes of two men named Giuseppe Fede, and gives the approximate date of death of the younger one as 1777; based on that, neither could be the count in question who sold the torso in 1790. Clarifying to some extent, the gem dealer and scholar Francesco d’ Ficoroni, author of the 1741 *Roma Antica*, identifies “Count Fede” as two separate men: a father and son team who owned sections of the land once part of Hadrian’s Villa. Since the Fedes’ active excavating dates span nearly a century, this also suggests that official references to the two men were confused during their own lifetimes, perhaps even intentionally to help obfuscate responsibility for less than


113 Haskell and Penney, *Taste and the Antique*, 64 and 190-91


scrupulous business and exportation practices. Gabbrielli, who drew and published in 1770 the plans of Hadrian’s Villa, similarly conflates the two in his introduction to _Pianta della Possessione Spettante al Conte Fede_.\(^{116}\) For those reasons primary source material concerning “Count Fede” is dubious. All that can be stated conclusively is that the torso was bought in 1790 by Jenkins, and since its purchase is thirteen years after the recorded death of the younger Fede, it must have been bought from the Fede estate.\(^{117}\)

Archival evidence concerning the condition and procurement of the torso is much more straightforward. It can be gleaned in part from a letter written in 1792 by the purchaser, Townley, to the elder statesmen Lord Lansdowne. Ten years earlier Lansdowne had bought the _Diomedes Stealing the Palladion_, and had apparently now also bought another to-be-restored torso from Jenkins, the _Lansdowne Heracles_. The following letter gives the earliest background of the Townley _Discobolus_ torso:

> The smaller statue with the Discus, which, as your Lordship has decided is to fall to my lot, is not so entire, but the head, tho (sic) broke off, being its own, it will be fully satisfactory to me, as I wish for one good male figure in my little collection, and this not exceeding the size of nature will well suit the space I have for it…\(^{118}\)

The relationship between the collector Townley, the author of the letter, and Lansdowne, to whom he referred to as “your Lordship,” was professional and cordial. One has to wonder what went through Lansdowne’s mind at the point when he realized that, despite

---

\(^{116}\) Also see Haskell and Penny, _Taste and the Antique_, 191, note 31.

\(^{117}\) Count Fede is also said to have discovered a colossal bust of Antinous in 1790, well after the death of the younger Fede in 1777. This is either another case of mistaken identity or a third family member. In sum, this is a problem that still needs to be sorted out. See Murray, 239 (Rome: J Murray Publishers, 1875)

\(^{118}\) Howard, _Lansdowne Heracles_, 13.
the obvious differences in their attributions and iconographic details, the body of Townley’s new Discobolus looked nearly identical to that of his Diomedes Stealing the Palladium. If this were not disconcerting enough to both Lansdowne and Townley, everyone in Rome was currently raving about what they perceived to be the more spectacular work, the Massimi Discobolus. Although that statue was largely sequestered from public view, reports were clear that it had the same stopped-in-mid-motion aspect of the Diomedes and the Townley Discobolus, but its head was said to be both original and looking in the direction described by the ancients. Townley was concerned. Why all the discrepancies in his auspicious new purchase? Was it authentically restored, and if not, who was to blame?

Townley’s Discobolus had been restored by Carlo Albacini, another student of Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. As a young apprentice in his early twenties Albacini had actually lived in the private residence of the Cavaceppi family from 1756 until 1759, and he continued to work in Cavaceppi’s workshop until the mid 1770s. Upon leaving there he had made casts based on antique pieces for Jenkins, and the two appear to have been close personal friends rather than maintaining the strictly business relationship that had been the case between Cavaceppi and Jenkins.


By 1781 Albacini was established his own studio at 67 Vicolo dei Incurabili, located off the trendy Corso.\textsuperscript{121} He immediately began to receive important restoration commissions from various high-profile patrons such as Catherine the Great of Russia (1729-1796); in 1786 King Carlos III of Naples hired him to repair pieces of the Farnese collection.\textsuperscript{122} From the 1770s on, the services of Albacini were highly sought after by certain collectors due to his finishing techniques.\textsuperscript{123} He tended to give the pieces he restored an ultra smooth surface polish and a sugary white finish. This was the look specifically preferred by Townley, and so Albacini was given the job of restoring the torso found at Hadrian’s Villa by Jenkins.

The restoration of the Townley torso took almost four years to complete and was based largely on the Massimi \textit{Discobolus}.\textsuperscript{124} The torso, as to be expected based on the location where it was found, was Hadrianic in period although heavily resurfaced. The right arm of the restoration was entirely a post-antique addition which was copied after the Massimi \textit{Discobolus}, as was the left arm up to the wrist. A slight difference can be observed in the left arms as Albacini extended its length to allow the wrist to rest on the knee. He sculpted the fingers slightly differently, curling inward. Albacini also copied the position and form of both legs and feet from the Massimi \textit{Discobolus}. The strut he chose to restore differently.

\textsuperscript{121} Status Animarum Mss (Archivia del Vicariato Romano); Vaughan, “Albacini and his English Patrons”, 183.

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 184.

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 186.

\textsuperscript{124} It was discovered in 1791 and received in 1794.
As explained earlier, Cavaceppi had added structural integrity and support to the Red Faun by having the figure lean on a strut which was camouflaged as a tree-stump. Cavaceppi had carved the bark to look loose and skin-like, arguably trying to recall Bernini’s successful use of this technique in his Apollo and Daphne. Albacini to some extent also mimicked this aesthetic device, as the Townley Discobolus leans on a smooth tree-stump. By comparison the restorer Angelini had used a variation on that theme for the Massimi Discobolus. He chose to make the strut in the form of a peeling palm-tree. Angelini learned the technique for this type of strut from his teacher Cavaceppi,\textsuperscript{125} who had utilized both types of struts and apparently taught these two variations to his students: Angelini who restored the Massimi Discobolus, and Albacini, restorer of the Townley Discobolus.\textsuperscript{126}

But struts, arms, and legs aside, the most important and obvious difference between the two versions was the position and authenticity of the head: the Massimi Discobolus looked back to his right arm throwing the discus; the Townley Discobolus looked down towards the ground. While the head of the Townley Discobolus does appear to be in the Transitional or Early Classical style of Myron, it was not original to the body, despite the explicit claim of Thomas Jenkins. The head was placed on the torso’s pre-existing neck in such an awkward way that two Adam’s apples can be seen. There is also a perceptibly unnatural elongation of the neck. The view from the back of the statue today provides

\textsuperscript{125} See the various plates in Cavaceppi’s Raccolta.

\textsuperscript{126} Struts were mostly likely chosen by the personal taste of the restorer although iconographically, the palm frond did mean victory, making it seem like the better choice for an athlete.
strong visual evidence that the neck and head section is actually a composite of at least three different pieces. In its newly restored condition, however, in keeping with his usual restorations practices, Albacini would have covered over all cracks, lines and other imperfections with grisaille, and would have additionally lightly plastered the entire surface to give it had a shimmering look.

Even in cases less radical than the addition of a non-original head, Albacini’s motivation for concealing joints, bumps and bulges was clear. He knew that the patron Townley preferred his statues to have this kind of refined finish, and would have also known that Townley had previously found this aspect of Cavaceppi’s restoration work to be less than satisfactory. (For more information, see Appendix A, 4.10) As early as 1774, Townley had privately complained to Jenkins that he was unhappy about the way in which Cavaceppi had finished his works, especially one that he had just received.127 In the restoration of A Victory Sacrificing a Bull, Cavaceppi had used old marble fragments to fill voids, leaving these additions visible on the finished surface – a feature that was characteristic of many of his other restorations as well. Whether he did this to cut costs, because the off-color pieces were of the same approximate age, or to lend an aged patina and authenticity to the piece is unclear, but the end result was the visibility of cracks and areas of varied coloration on the surfaces of many of his pieces.128 Townley vehemently objected to this finishing technique and threatened not to pay for work. Jenkins realized


128 The piece is today located in the British Museum. For a discussion of Cavaceppi’s versus Albacini’s finishing techniques, see Vaughan, 186-7.
that Cavaceppi’s finishing was not to Townley’s liking, so when the torso appeared in 1791, Albacini was the restorer who came to Jenkins mind.\textsuperscript{129}

Throughout his restoration career, Albacini continued to use most of the tricks of the trade that he had learned from years in Cavaceppi’s studio; he ground the edges of broken limbs to create clean areas for attachment, and he assembled pieces of the fragments to make the struts. But in the 1770s he realized that some patrons liked the surface of their statues to be “highly finished.” Whether as a reaction to this preference of his clientele or due to his own personal taste, Albacini began to bleach, pumice and polish the entire top layer of his restorations to a glossy shine. When the object left his hands there was no evidence of cracks, breaks or added pieces.\textsuperscript{130} With such techniques statues appeared flawless and like new, a trend noticeable towards the end of the eighteenth century and clearly preferred by Townley.\textsuperscript{131}

For Jenkins this was just another good reason to employ Albacini for restoration work. He was also known to be more discreet in his business practices, which could help increase the profit margin. As a personal friend of Jenkins, Albacini on occasion would look the other way, not informing Papal authorities such as Fea when statues were sent to Britain without acquiring proper export documentation and paying the requisite fees.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{129} Vaughan, “Albacini and his English Patrons,” 186.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 187; on his questionable practices 190, 193, 195; Howard, “Boxers,” 241.

\textsuperscript{131} Vaughan, “Albacini and his English Patrons,” 186-7 and 193.

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., 188. Also see Ingamells, Dictionary, 553-556 for the sometimes “shady” side of Jenkins’ market practices.
Since Jenkins stood to make more money if he used Albacini’s services, and since Townley specifically requested Albacini as he liked the results better, a happy trio they should have been. However, the air of mutual satisfaction quickly evaporated the moment that the restored *Discobolus* was delivered to the buyer. When Townley saw just what he had paid for, he was less than pleased.

Despite Townley’s positive expectations, as conveyed in the letter quoted earlier, when the *Discobolus* was unveiled, Townley was perplexed at what he saw and became increasingly agitated. He had paid Jenkins twenty percent more for the *Discobolus* than his fellow collector Lansdowne had just paid for his *Hercules*. Both pieces were found at the same place by Jenkins, were of the same general size, and had gone through approximately the same amount of restoration. The increased amount was necessary, according to Jenkins, because of the difficulty in obtaining an export license and the rarity of the piece. But after owning his *Discobolus* for a while and continuously hearing from others that the Massimi version was more accurate, Townley broke with his usual polite decorum and complained. In a 1774 letter to Jenkins he requested

---


134 The price tag for the *Discobolus* was four hundred pound sterling. Stuart Jones, *Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal collections of Rome* (Palazzo dei Conservatori, 1926), 144.

135 The likely restorer of the *Lansdowne Herakles* was Cavaceppi. For a discussion on the relationship between Cavaceppi, his student Albacini and his English patron, see Vaughan, “Albacini and his English Patrons,” 183-197.

136 Howard, *Lansdowne Herakles*, 15. The Pope did not initially want to sell the statue according to Jenkins; the story may be true but seems it seems equally as likely that Jenkins was trying to make a bit more money.
clarification as to why the head was positioned looking downwards instead of back toward the discus.\textsuperscript{137}

Jenkins sent a response letter later that year:

The Head of your Statue was not only found with it, but I believe you will see it is Precisely the Same Vein of Marble, that in Rome, there was never the slightest doubt of its authenticity.\textsuperscript{138}

An exchange of letters between the two was not unusual; Townley was legendary for his extensive and lengthy correspondences.\textsuperscript{139}

Even after this flat denial by Jenkins, Townley was not convinced. Jenkins in turn feared losing such a wealthy client, so he quickly set about calming his patron’s worries, in what turned into a duel of the expert opinions.\textsuperscript{140} Jenkins sent drawings of the four \textit{Discoboli} back to Townley in an attempt to convince him that his was not incorrect, but had been “improved.” The experts employed by the Italian Massimi family wrote stinging criticisms about the scholars defending the Townley \textit{Discobolus}. This continued more or less along national lines until 1809 when the British author, numismatist and member of the Society of the Dilettanti, Richard Payne Knight, finally admitted in print what everyone had whispered in private for years. In his \textit{Specimens of Ancient

\textsuperscript{137} BM GR 1814. 7-4. 543. (Catalogue of Sculpture 250) Townley Collection.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, and reprinted in Jones, \textit{Catalogue}, 144.

\textsuperscript{139} An index of Townley’s correspondence was compiled in 2002. See Susan Hill, \textit{Catalogue of the Townley Archive at the British Museum} (London: British Museum Press 2002).

\textsuperscript{140} See the illustration on page 319, reproduced in Viccy Coltman’s article “Representation, Replication and Collecting in Charles Townley’s Late Eighteenth-century Library,” \textit{Art History}, vol. 29 no. 2, (April, 2006), 304-324.
Sculpture, Knight stated that the head was indeed an addition, although the British Museum still continued to deny the claim until 1861.\textsuperscript{141}

Townley, like all collectors, wanted to believe that he had invested wisely and owned a spectacular and rare piece. As an upper class Briton he had been trained in the classics and was a veteran of the Grand Tour. He was a curator at the British Museum and was considered to be among the elite ranks of exceptionally learned scholars.\textsuperscript{142} He had publically acclaimed the authenticity of his \textit{Discobolus}. He had re-arranged his London town-home at least twice to give the statue a place of honor and had even paid the popular court painter Zoffany an extra fee to add the statue into the foreground of a preexisting work, \textit{Charles Townley’s Library at Seven Park Street, Westminster}.\textsuperscript{143} To realize that he had been deceived by Jenkins and that the Massimi family owned the more authentic work must have been galling indeed. After Townley died in 1809, the British Museum bought his collection and they too became literally invested in the piece. By displaying it without any explanation regarding its questionable restoration, they tacitly extended its authenticity, and greatly popularized this erroneous version of the \textit{Discobolus}.

\textsuperscript{141} See Jones, \textit{Catalogue}, 142.

\textsuperscript{142} In the painting by Zoffany he sits with the type of scholars and arbiters of taste, such as Charles Grenville, that he wished to project himself as.

\textsuperscript{143} The Townley \textit{Discobolus} is located prominently in the left foreground of the painting. Also see the 1794-5 watercolor by William Chambers, \textit{The Townley Collection in the Dining Room at Park Street, Westminster}. It was the image chosen by the British Museum for its Catalogue of the Townley Archive at the British Museum, occasional paper 138, 2002.
A final lamentable circumstance is that while the Massimi *Discobolus* is now considered to be the most accurate copy of Myron’s original discus thrower, it was rarely seen by the public until the 1930s, and when it did appear in public, the dubious context gave it yet another complicated layer of meaning. In 1937 the Massimi *Discobolus* was used as a center piece in the film, *Fest de Voker*, by the Nazi filmmaker Leni Riefenstahl. The film was shown at the opening of the Berlin Olympics and was critically acclaimed. By 1938 Hitler became so infatuated with the statue that he bought it, albeit forcibly, from the Italian government. It was displayed in the Glyptothek, Munich as a tangible symbol of Aryan pride – ostensibly, of their noble heritage. It finally was returned to Rome in 1948 after World War II had ended. It was not publically displayed or reproduced until 1953, when the National Museum of Rome bought and finished re-re-restoring this well-traveled statue.

Reclusiveness on the part of the Massimi family and stubbornness on the part of the British elite served to perpetuate for generations the confusion regarding the accurate depiction of the *Discobolus*. This was made all the more confusing by the existence of the other, more radically varying restorations. The question that they pose for us now is: just what are these things – in relationship to one another and to art history?
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The eighteenth century had witnessed a prolific outpouring in the intellectual fields of endeavor: philosophy (Burke, Diderot, Kant, Rousseau), music (Vivaldi, Bach, Handel, Mozart), aesthetics (Lessing, Crousaz, Comte de Caylus, Winckelmann), literature (Keats, Byron, Shelly) and archaeology (Hoarse, Visconti, Quatremere de Quincy). It ended tumultuously on the battlefields of widespread war. Monarchies were toppled, countries invaded, colonies lost; the upheaval on both ends of the social spectrum was unprecedented, and as the various coalitions grouped and regrouped, instability itself seemed to be the only constant.

Paradoxically, the social and geographical upheaval at the end of the 1700s would result in some positive trends in the scholarship of antiquities in general and sculptural restoration in particular. Albeit unwittingly, Napoleon’s actions brought about the deciphering of Egyptian hieroglyphs through the Rosetta Stone; the Ottoman Turks allowed British scholars to finally experience Greece; and the Parthenon marbles were sold to Lord Elgin in 1801. This is not the place to elaborate on the many controversies surrounding the purchase, restoration or restitution of the Elgin Marbles, but it was due in large part to their reassembly in the British Museum that attitudes towards the methods used in sculptural restoration began to change fundamentally. In 1804, Lord Elgin asked the Neoclassical sculptor and de facto curator of the Vatican museum, Antonio Canova, how he should display the much damaged Parthenon marbles. Canova’s answer was
unequivocal. Do no harm; protect them, but please leave them alone. This shift in attitude over what was the best way to experience and protect ancient art signaled a radical shift in the attitude of sculptors, patrons and collectors.

This study has been an attempt to grapple with the restoration practices of the eighteenth century using the *Discobolus* as a prominent case study. I needed to first explain the significance of Myron’s statue in his own time. While the ancient Greeks were not necessarily accustomed to perceiving a sculptural piece as a “work of art” in the way we would think of it today, the original *Discobolus* must have been wondrous. Myron had rendered in bronze an accurate and elegant depiction of the human form in motion, performing an athletic feat that the people were familiar with, but it had never been shown in quite that way before. The *Discobolus* embodied the best of fifth-century Greek artisanship, art, and philosophy – with its evocation of humanism and *sophrosyne*. The Romans, to some extent in spite of their own chauvinism, appreciated and internalized these and other qualities inherent in Greek art. This is amply evident in the number of copies they made and the voluminous critiques and treatises written on the subject. The Romans were more captivated by the spirit of Greek aesthetics than by its

---


145 The Greek term *sophrosyne* is difficult to precisely define, but generally it connotes order, harmony, balance, and restraint. For a discussion on how it appears in Greek literature, see Helen North, *Sophrosyne: Self-knowledge and Self-restraint in Greek Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966).
literal particulars – an attitude that is rather to their credit. Neither simple copyists nor imitators, the Romans used the intellectual production of others in the way all sophisticated cultures do: as a springboard from which to enhance their understanding of the rest of the world, and their own separate and distinct place in it. They took Greek aesthetics and remolded them, creating their own art form. The Romans were the first people outside of the Discus Thrower’s native place and time to appreciate its appeal, and without them there would have been no marble copies to restore.

I have also tried to emphasize the effect that classical art and literature, both symbolically embedded in Myron’s *Discobolus*, have had on later centuries of Western culture and thought. The Italian Renaissance was one of the most obvious manifestations of this. This movement paved the way for generations of future artists to revisit the rich heritage of their own material cultural. Brunelleschi’s dome on the Florence Cathedral was imitative of the Pantheon, Donatello’s *David* was inspired by the *Doryphoros* of Polykleitos, and Michelangelo’s face of God on the Sistine Chapel ceiling was taken from the Hellenistic *Laocoön*. Imitation has always indeed been the sincerest form of flattery. Then, with world events again taking center stage, specifically the Papacy being embarrassed by the invasion of Rome by fellow Catholic Spanish troops in 1527, the cultural elite retreated further into the past. A desire emerged to collect authentically old objects, not just new things made in the manner of the old.

It is entirely in this context that the first restoration of a torso after Myron’s *Discobolus*, the *Endymion*, occurred. Its threefold restoration from *Endymion* with then without dog, and then to a generic *Son of Niobe*, was in a way an absurd microcosm of an
age wrestling with its own political and religious realignments in a post-Reformation world. The statue was re-restored as need dictated to make it relate to the concerns of the present. Adjustments in interpretation of art and culture have always been necessary to reflect the circumstances of a new period and as a reaction to new scholarship. Much of history is as much a mental construction as a provable actuality.

Monnot’s restoration of the second torso as The Fallen Warrior falls into just such an atmosphere of redress. A Frenchmen working mainly in Germany and Italy, Monnot restored the torso for the Vatican with a connoisseur’s eye, but also a nationalistic wink. He had been trained at the French Royal Academy of Art, where he had studied LeBrun’s treatise, “Méthode pour apprendre a dessiner les passions…” on how to express emotion in the painting of faces. The drawings of faces that epitomized specific emotions were based on classical sculpture, which reinforced the perceived primacy of ancient art. Working in Rome, Monnot had seen the real Laocoön. Why not take this torso, give it a head with the face of the Elder Son of the Laocoön, restore its body as a fallen warrior, and place it at the Capitoline Museum as an implied pendant for the popular Dying Gaul? He could bring an ancient torso back to life (albeit ironically at the moment of death), prove to his peers that he remembered his cultural and academic roots, please his patrons, and make some money. The Fallen Warrior turned out to be Monnot’s only restoration work and the last major piece of work he completed before dying himself.

It should be made clear at this point that neither the Endymion nor The Fallen Warrior were meant to intentionally mislead the viewer, but rather to complete their respective museum’s collections and to bring an interesting ancient fragment back to life. Both
works were done to satisfy the needs and spirit of their times, and were fully consistent with the artistic and curatorial ethics of their day.

Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, the restorer of *Diomede Stealing the Palladium*, is clearly a pivotal figure in the circuitous trajectory of the *Discobolus*. He enters the scene during a markedly different cultural and financial atmosphere, when the politics of religion had somewhat subsided. Rome was in the throes of a slowly declining Papacy while being simultaneously inundated by Grand Tourists of mainly British nationality. These young adults had been conditioned by their extensive classical education to revere the antique. The wealth generated by the English Industrial Revolution provided the youth of the British upper class with the material means to travel widely, devote time to study and to be conspicuous consumers of culture. As a result of these circumstances, the excavation, classification, restoration and sale of antiquities became an attractive venture for entrepreneurial Romans in the eighteenth century. Cavaceppi was born into the epicenter of this; he needed only to look around to see the potential opportunities for an artistically talented, highly skilled and industrious young man. When his efforts to create new sculptural works proved less than successful at pleasing his patrons, Cavaceppi instead turned to the restoration of the antique as a way to make a living.

By today’s standards, the re-cutting, staining and reassembling of various fragments to make one complete work is considered fraudulent and without aesthetic integrity. If those fragments are of inestimable archaeological value, it becomes completely unethical. For better or ill, however, it was the status quo of the profession in the eighteenth century, and, to be fair, the patrons themselves should have been more critical consumers.
In their classical training they had read numerous descriptions of specific ancient works, and Pliny’s letters were often quoted in eighteenth-century travel literature. Still, the creation of a statue such as Diomedes Stealing the Palladium by a sculptor of Cavaceppi’s background and situation for a patron such as Lansdowne, though in some significant ways an unfortunate misadventure, was very much a story of its times.

What I would argue is far less forgivable is the deliberate effort on the part of unscrupulous dealers, the worst of whom was perhaps Thomas Jenkins, to “find” statues suitable for a particular patrons. One could again wag a finger and say caveat emptor, but clearly Jenkins was guilty of deception. While not totally blameless, Cavaceppi’s primary focus was on turning out saleable finished works and on training students. Angelini and Albacini were two accomplished sculptors who were trained in his studio. Angelini’s restoration of the Massimi Discobolus arguably exemplified the more idealistic aspects of his trade. Albacini, despite the smooth unblemished surface of his finished pieces, perhaps exemplified the seamier side of the restorer’s art. This was the case with the Townley Discobolus, when Albacini was influenced by his friend and business partner Jenkins.

Both the Massimi and Townley Discoboli were restored near the end of the eighteenth century and are fundamentally different from the three earlier variants: they depict a

---

discus thrower. In that sense they represent an obvious step forward in faithfulness to the essence of Myron’s original statue and, to a greater or lesser extent, the descriptions of it by the ancient authors, the Massimi Discobolus being the best example. The nature of all five variants can in fact be perceived as tracing incremental progress toward a more enlightened attitude regarding the respectful treatment of ancient artifacts. Understanding Cavaceppi, the central human figure in this march, helps to flesh out the attitudes about patrons, sculpture, collecting, and cultural heritage that characterized the evolving restoration practice, and literally shaped the Discobolus for centuries that would follow him.

One last issue remains to be addressed: how does one conceptualize these various restorations, and then teach them to others? My interest in Greco-Roman art, which ultimately led me to pursue a career in academia, began early and runs deep; but as many a teacher can personally attest, deeply admiring something does not necessarily mean that you can explain it effectively. The Discobolus for me is a case in point. In reality it is not one, but at least five different statues, all creations of a mixed heritage. At their core they share a Greco-Roman inception with varying degrees of eighteenth-century overlay due to a complicated and varied set of restoration histories. Yet as an iconic image, two and a half millennia after it was conceived by Myron, the Discobolus lives on. Its image is on stamps and coins, in print advertisement and television commercials.\(^{147}\) Every four

\(^{147}\) The British Museum Discobolus was recently featured in a televised public service announcement in which the statue falls apart in front of our eyes. The intent is to dramatize the potentially damaging effects of performance-enhancing drugs on an athlete’s body, symbolized by this universally recognized icon of athletic excellence. I
years, in perhaps its most appropriate manifestation, it promotes the Olympics. Why is it still so famous? Whether as a captivating image of an athletic human form in action or as a propagandistic representation of “Aryan perfection,” the question actually seems beside the point. Simply put, people relate to this statue. Even the patron saint of outsiders, Vincent van Gogh, made a point of finding and drawing the *Discobolus* when he visited the British Museum. It would be absurd to exclude such a successful piece of art from textbooks because it lacks artistic integrity.

Its current place in the art history canon, however, has undergone a change or perhaps better stated – a re-envisioning. Some texts still use the Townley (British Museum) version as the canonical *Discobolus*, others the Massimi. I have noted, though, that survey text books published after the 1990s have begun to include both images, or at least a gloss in the text to note that one version is currently thought to be “more correct” than another.\(^{148}\) This is arguably a reaction to a wider discussion which began in the last few decades, due in large part to post-modern theory. Post-modernism started in the 1960s and has as one of its principal spokesmen Robert Venturi, the author of *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, a standard text for “po-mo” theory.\(^{149}\) Whether in architecture, art, literature or music, post-modernism thrives on mimicking earlier styles,

---

\(^{148}\) Typical of the trend for showing both side by side and briefly explaining that there are identity problems, see George Duby and Jean-Luc Daval, eds., *Sculpture: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (Koln Taschen, 1991), 61.

where disassociated parts from various objects and time periods make up a new whole, but assembled with an ironic wink to the audience. Post-modern creations seem initially referential by their inclusion of elements from high culture, yet in the mixing, matching and displacement of the original meaning, the final product is a rather cheeky concoction. No reference is pure, no style above parody; everything is available and nothing is taken too seriously.

This is decidedly not how I would characterize the restorations of the eighteenth century, as every step and action was indeed taken seriously. Those involved were consciously attempting to re-make the original within a prescribed set of aesthetic and cultural guidelines, and bringing a high level of professionalism to the task. The impression is that the dealers or sculptors, even at their most dissembling, looked upon the pieces as commodities. These men understood how rare, valuable and old the objects were. The unwitting parallel to post-modern sensibilities comes not in the attitude of the participants, but in the physical reassembly of the objects – the inclusion of separate unrelated parts to construct a whole, of style grafted onto pre-existing style without context or explanation. Perhaps that helps explain why the surge in interest in restoration history has only occurred in recent decades; an artistic theory finally caught up with eighteenth-century practice. Parsing – that is to say, resolving into component parts – was useful to Grand Tourists studying Latin and is also essential to the appreciation of a post-modern creation in any age.

Through its nonjudgmental acceptance of the parts and the whole, a post-modern attitude may lend us a useful approach to teaching about extensively restored works.
Accept things for what they are, and make no apologies for using them in the way that makes the best sense right now. Relatively unadulterated examples can be used to convey the core aspects of a style or period, but the other, less pure pieces can have a useful role as well. When explaining the fifth-century Greek canon, one can rely on the bronze Artemision Zeus; original and in the main un-restored, it lends itself to the necessary didactic discussion. The Discobulus, on the other hand, though more complex and less reliably authentic, can be extremely illuminating as well. The story of Myron’s much mutated original work, with all its myriad twists and turns, can help break down the barriers of the traditional art-historical stylistic dialogue. It poses intriguing questions about the function of copies and the meaning of antique, of museum studies and commodity, of the relationship between patrons and dealers. Students need the main narrative of art history, but they also need to know that it sometimes reads more like a mystery novel than a textbook. This too is part of understanding art history.
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1.3 Cast of a reconstructed Roman copy after Critius and Nesiotes, The Aristogeiton, located in the National Museum of Naples. To see an image in print, refer to Richter, 98.
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2.1 Roman original, artist unknown, Brutus, located in the Capitoline Museum (Palazzo dei Conservatori). To see an image in print, refer to Diana Kleiner, Roman Sculpture (Yale University Press: New Haven, 1992), 25.

2.2 Roman original, after Pasiteles, Orestes and Electra, located in the National Museum of Naples. To see an image in print, refer to Kleiner, 30.


3.3 G.B. Nolli, Map of Rome. Refer to The Interactive Nolli Map Website sponsored by the University of Oregon, http://nolli.uoregon.edu.

3.5 Pierre Le Gros, St. Thomas, and Pierre-Étienne Monnot, St. Paul, both statues located at the Lateran, Rome. To see images in print, refer to Christopher Johns, Papal Art and Cultural Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 80.

3.6 Original by unknown artist, restored by Cavaceppi and Bianchi, Fauno in Rosso Antico, located in the Capitoline Museum. To see an image in print, refer to Haskell and Penny, 214.


3.8 Carlo Marchionni, architect, The Villa Albani, Rome. To see a photograph in print, refer to Christopher Johns, Papal Art and Cultural Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 207.


4.3 Greek original, artist unknown, The Dying Gaul, located in the Capitoline Museum. To see an image in print, refer to Haskell and Penny, 225.

4.4 Greek original, artist unknown, The Dying Gaul and Wife, located in the National Museum of Rome. To see an image in print, refer to Haskell and Penny, 282.

4.5 Roman copy after Myron (original torso), restored by Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, Diomedes Stealing the Palladium (*Discobolus*), located in the Bowood Collection, Wiltshire, UK. To see an image in print, refer to Edgar Peter Bowron and Joseph Rishel, eds., Art in Rome in the Eighteenth-Century (Philadelphia: Rizzoli International Publications, 2000), 243.

4.6 Greek originals, artist unknown, The Caryatids, located at the British Museum. To see an image in print, refer to Richter, 136.

4.7 Roman copy after Myron (original torso), restored by Giuseppe Angelini, The Massimi Discobolus, located in the National Roman Museum. To see an image in print, refer to Haskell and Penny, 201.


4.9 Johan Zoffany, Charles Townley’s Library, located in the Townley Hall Art and Gallery, Burnely. To see an image in print of the painting, refer to Cook, 31.

4.10 Greek original, restored by Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, Relief of Nessos, located in the British Museum. To see an image in print of the relief sculpture, refer to Cook, 50.
APPENDIX B

THE WORKSHOP OF CAVACEPPI

1. Carlo Monaldi (Papal sculptor, the *Founders of the Orders*)

2. Carlo Albacini (Student who restored the Townley *Discobolus*)

3. Clemente Bianchi

4. Carlo Antonio Napolioni (Friend and possibly one of the men at work in illustration of Cavaceppi’s studio)

5. Andrea Piggiani (Worked primarily on religious and funerary subjects)

6. Pietro Steffetti

7. Giovanni Ferrari

8. Gaetano Veneziano

9. Vincent Pacetti (Later head of the *Accademia di San Luca*, executor of Cavaceppi’s will)

10. Joseph Nollekens (English Neoclassical sculptor)

11. Domenico de Angelis

12. Giovanni Pierantonio

13. Paolo Cavaceppi, (Brother)

14. Constantino Cavaceppi, (Paolo’s son)

15. Francesco Cavaceppi, (Brother, Townley called “most ignorant of sculptors”)
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