

für welches Publikum Serlio die teilweise hybriden Kompositionen entworfen habe, wie Italiener wohl auf die Publikation reagiert hätten?

André Chastel handelte, Ausführungen in der Festschrift für Anthony Blunt (1967) wiederaufnehmend, von Serlios Entwürfen für die „*Casa del Re*“ (Buch VI), die er mit Nachrichten von Claude Perrault und Germain Brice über einen Louvre-Entwurf Serlios, dem jener des Lescot vorgezogen worden sei, in Verbindung brachte und die er auf das in den letzten Jahren Franz' I. akute Problem einer Residenz in Paris beziehen wollte. Wie Chastel zugab, fehlt freilich noch das Glied, welches beide Indizienketten eindeutig verbände. Deutlich wurde aber, wie Serlio mit ungewöhnlichen Projekten die Aufmerksamkeit des Königs zu erregen versuchte, wie die „*variazione seriale*“ aber eine konsequente Auseinandersetzung mit den Bedürfnissen und Möglichkeiten und damit den Erfolg verhinderte. Wie wenig nachvollziehbar andererseits Planungsabläufe sein können, legte Susanne Kühbacher in einer eindringlichen Analyse des Schlosses von Ancy-le-Franc und der drei überlieferten Projektstufen dar. Für die Referentin gab es keinen Zweifel daran, daß dieser Bau bis in die Details von Serlio selbst verantwortet wurde, der sich freilich verschiedentlich mit Interventionen des Bauherrn auseinandersetzen mußte. Paradoxerweise ist dieser in der Disposition wie in der Schärfe der Details so unitalienische Bau „*all'italiana*“ das einzige bekannte, erhaltene Werk des Bologneser Architekten.

Doch dies mag sich noch ändern: Zum Schluß der Veranstaltung wartete François-Charles James noch mit einigen Neuigkeiten hinsichtlich Serlios letzter Schaffensphase in Lyon (1549?—53?) auf. Er konnte aus einem Brief von 1551 einen Korrekturvorschlag Serlios für eine Kirchenfassade erschließen, der zu einer sensationellen dreigeschossigen Fassade geführt hätte; er konnte einen überzeugenden Identifizierungsvorschlag für das (freilich unausgeführte) Schloßprojekt „*Rosmarino*“ vorstellen (La Colette, damals im Besitz des François-Louis d'Agoult, Herr von Sault), konnte Serlios Versuch der Kontaktaufnahme mit dem neuen Kardinalerzbischof von Lyon, François de Tournon (1552), belegen und auf ein Schloß dieses Kirchenfürsten hinweisen, dessen einer Flügel von 1553 durchaus serlianische Züge trägt. Die Schaffenskraft des Architekten war in diesem letzten Moment, da wir ihn fassen können, offenbar noch ungebrochen. Es mag also sein, daß das Kapitel „*Serlio und Frankreich*“ noch überraschende Erweiterungen erfahren wird.

Johannes Erichsen

Forschungsberichte

ANDREA DEL SARTO REVIVED

(mit sechs Abbildungen)

„*Assai puote l'arte in Raffaello, l'ingegno nel Buonarrotto; ma senza dubbio è sovrano Andrea*“ wrote Francesco Bocchi, one of the most sensitive observers in early Art History, in *Le Bellezze della Città di Firenze* published in Florence in 1591 (p. 140). That this enthusiasm was not just a manifestation of 'campanalismo' is shown by the contemporary Emilian art critic Scannelli who characterized Del Sarto as the Florentine

Raphael and says: "Sempre riconoscerà in chiaro, che Andrea nella propria città di Firenze sovrasta ad ogni altro professore et in ogni tempo con le migliori operationi gagreggia co' più sublimi" (*Il microcosmo della pittura*, Cesena 1657, p. 171). In spite of this praise there is a certain irony in the fact that Andrea del Sarto has not qualified for the "status symbol" of an exhibition until this past year which was the fifth centenary of his birth. The reason is that 19th and 20th century society has been out of sympathy with his art until fairly recently.

The pioneering studies leading to his rehabilitation only appeared twenty years ago (S. J. Freedberg, *Andrea del Sarto*, Cambridge, Mass. 1983; J. Shearman, *Andrea del Sarto*, Oxford 1965). The consolidating and academic qualities in Del Sarto's paintings did not suit society's demand for the revolutionary and spontaneous. Indeed Del Sarto was charged with lack of imagination (B. Berenson, *The Drawings of the Florentine Painters*, London, 1903, I, p. 271); of leaving one cold (A. von Reymont, *Andrea del Sarto*, Leipzig 1835, p. XV, note 1); of being superficial and without soul (H. Wölfflin, *Die klassische Kunst*, Berlin 1899, p. 149). Ironic also is that much of this criticism seems to originate in Vasari's laudatory epithet "pittore senza errori" which in the romantic era became a term of reproach. The most explicit statement in this trend is Mrs. Guinness' characterization of Del Sarto: "He courted no rivalry, he employed no tricks, he feared no imputations of want of originality, but went direct to his goal, attaining, as was, alas, inevitable with his want of poetic idealism, the fault of *faultlessness*" (H. Guinness, *Andrea del Sarto*, London 1901, p. 44).

But the pendulum of taste has swung back as was clearly manifested by the celebrations of last year. The main events were the two exhibitions held in the cities with the largest extant groups of works by Andrea del Sarto, Florence and Paris, and the publication of extensive scholarly catalogues (*Andrea del Sarto 1486—1530. Dipinti e disegni a Firenze*, Florence, Palazzo Pitti 8 novembre 1986 — 1 marzo 1987; *Homage à Andrea del Sarto, 88e exposition du Cabinet des Dessins*, Musée du Louvre 23 octobre 1986—26 janvier 1987). In Florence the hitherto inaccessible fresco cycles in the *Chostro dello Scalzo*, the *Refettorio di San Salvi* and the *Villa Medicea* at Poggio a Caiano were opened to the public, and the exhibitions were complemented with a conference organized by the *Fondazione Longhi* (*Novità su Andrea del Sarto*, Florence, January 29th—30th 1987).

The year was anticipated by an anthology of 43 colour reproductions of drawings by Andrea del Sarto introduced and commented on by Annamaria Petrioli Tofani, (*Andrea del Sarto, Disegni*, Florence 1985, edited by La Nuova Italia). The book is admirably written with new interpretations well balanced with summaries of current knowledge, but the price of the book has been effected by the pretentious lay-out to such a degree that it will undoubtedly be an impediment to a broad diffusion. As a consolation to pennyless amateurs and students, however, the book will appear eventually in a more reasonably priced pocketbook edition. Since the reproductions make the book so expensive, a few words of criticism should be allowed. In the reproductions of black chalk and red chalk drawings the contrast between the paper and the medium is too sharp as in plate I, where the yellow stains are far too emphasized and where a certain flat vulgarity replaces the atmospheric and poetic character of the original. On the whole,

however, the reproductions provide relatively true images. This is not the case with the reproductions of drawings in more complicated techniques like the *Adoration of the Magi* in the Uffizi (Pl. XXIV) in black chalk, pen, brown wash and white heightening. The wash is reproduced as a dull beige as opposed to the richly varied burnt ocre of the original. The contrast between the black chalk and the wash is exaggerated, and the oxydized spots in the white heightening are much too conspicuous. At the same time, the contrast between the wash and the white heightening is subdued. All this causes a disruption of the unity between certain techniques and the conjunction of others. In comparison with the original, the reproduction shows a complete distortion of the colouristic balance.

The celebrations also brought about an inexpensive small monograph by Serena Padovani (*Andrea del Sarto*, Scala, Florence 1986) available in four languages and lavishly illustrated in colour. It is a model of popular writing on art. The only complaint would be that the author is not concerned with Del Sarto's portraits (the only reproduced item in this genre is the Uffizi *Self Portrait* painted on a slab).

To complete the picture, it should be mentioned that the British Museum payed homage to Del Sarto by displaying nine of his most magnificent drawings in the splendid exhibition of Florentine Drawings early in the year (Nicholas Turner, *Florentine Drawings of the Sixteenth Century*, London 1986) and that a private collector payed his respects to Andrea by acquiring the especially fine, but rather damaged, study for the head of St. John the Baptist from the Locko Park Collection for the sum of 150.000 US. Dollars (*Old Master Drawings*, Sotheby's New York, January 4, 1987, lot 32).

It was very fortunate that the Florentine exhibition coincided with the exhibition of Fra Bartolommeo drawings in the Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe of the Uffizi (Chris Fischer, *Disegni di Fra Bartolommeo e della sua scuola*, Florence 1986) and with the *Seicento Fiorentino* exhibition in Palazzo Strozzi (*Il Seicento Fiorentino. Arte a Firenze da Ferdinando I a Cosimo III*, Florence 1987). The former made it possible to compare the two most accomplished artists of the Florentine High Renaissance, bringing into relief some of Del Sarto's characteristics: His ability to draw from real life and capture in his studies the most fleeting of human expressions as well as his lack of ability for abstraction, for grandeur and idealized sentimentality, which are the prevailing elements in his Domenican colleague's *œuvre*. The *Seicento Fiorentino* exhibition demonstrated that Del Sarto's works not only appealed to an exclusive circle of art critics but had an enormous importance for the Florentine Reformers, the Anti-Mannerists of the end of the sixteenth century such as Santi di Tito, Ludovico Cigoli, Bernardino Poccetti and Jacopo da Empoli as well as for the next generation of painters such as Matteo Rosselli, Francesco Curradi, Baldassare Volterrano and Carlo Dolci. Even sculptors like Antonio Novelli and Orazio Mochi found inspiration in his works. What Raphael meant to the Bolognese and Roman artists, Del Sarto exemplified for the painters of the *Seicento Fiorentino*.

Both exhibitions were ideal in their unpretentious conceptions. The Louvre showed works exclusively chosen from French collections (3 paintings and about 75 drawings). A small number of artists like Jacopo Sansovino, Franciabigio, Bachiacca and Pontormo illustrated Del Sarto's role as *capomaestro* of the Ss. Annunziata school. The Pitti

exhibition displayed only works from Florentine collections (25 paintings and 110 drawings) for the good reason that Florence houses by far the major part of the artist's *œuvre*. Loans from foreign collections would not have added much to the image and would in many cases have been refused since most of Del Sarto's paintings are on wood and thus extremely fragile. All resources were concentrated on cleaning the Florentine paintings and drawings so as to present the public with a harmonious ensemble. The decision to show only works by Andrea and not to let him drown in works by inferior artists in his school can not be praised enough as one left the show with a very clear idea of his art. Let us hope that future exhibitions will follow the example of this most successful *mostra*.

At the Louvre the drawings were displayed in a rich variety of beautiful old frames, a pleasant tradition which always adds to the intimacy of the exhibitions at the Cabinet des Dessins. It is to be hoped that this practice will be continued despite the timeconsuming task it must take to cut new and individual passepartouts for every exhibition.

The architects of the Florentine exhibition, Antonio Goduli, Mauro Linari and Maria Cristina Valenti, did their job with excellent skill. Each painting had appropriate wall- and roomspace, and the arrangement followed a sensible sequence. The design was a problem of exceptional complexity, first because the ball-room and the neighbouring rooms in which the exhibition took place are almost unadaptable because of their pomposity and lavish frescoes and second because it was a principal objective of the exhibition that groups of preparatory drawings should be at hand for comparison with the corresponding paintings. This caused a lighting-problem since it is generally accepted that drawings should be exhibited under restricted light. In the whitewashed ball-room, the *Sala Bianca*, the drawings were seen in the restricted light of the ambience while extra spotlights were projected on the paintings. Other rooms were kept dark, and the light on the objects was made stronger so that they seemed to benefit from the contrast. By playing with these two lighting systems, the architects presented the visitor with a stimulating variety of ambiences on his way through the exhibition. The didactic panels were very clear, and it was a good idea to bring photographs and plans of the buildings for which the paintings were created since this is particularly important for the appreciation of Del Sarto's works and a reason why his frescoes enjoyed a greater fame than his paintings. One should recall Roger Fry's statement that Del Sarto "can only be judged rightly by fresco" (*Letters of Roger Fry*, ed. Denys Sutton, London 1972, I, p. 141). The panels, however, should be a guide for the average visitor, and not as here, addressed to a narrow circle of specialists. Basic information such as an approximate dating was lacking in most cases, whereas there were relatively long passages dedicated to the provenance of the paintings and their whereabouts at different periods in various Medici-palaces.

Twenty years ago in reviewing Shearman's *Andrea del Sarto*, Cecil Gould wrote that "if it were possible to clean... the Pitti Sarto's, where the visitor has very bad light as well as filthy varnish to contend with, and hang them in a good light, an entirely different impression of the artist would emerge" (*Apollo* LXXXIII, 1966, p. 156). This statement was illustrated well by the Florentine exhibition. Nearly all the paintings were freed

from layers of darkened varnish added through the centuries in order to obtain a unifying tone and to cover up gaps in the surfaces of the paintings, so that they would fit harmoniously into the ambience of a baroque gallery. The presentation of so many cleaned paintings was both a breathtaking aesthetic pleasure and an opportunity for acquiring much new knowledge. First of all the cleaning accentuated Del Sarto's extraordinary sensitivity and skill in rendering landscape, light and atmosphere. It is first seen in the palpable landscape backgrounds of the *Noli me tangere* of about 1510 (Pitti cat. III) and the *Annunciation* which was probably painted two years later (Pitti cat. IV). It develops into the dominating substance which unifies figures and setting in the two panels depicting the *Stories of Joseph* of 1515, although I have the feeling that they are less atmospheric now than when they were painted. A certain change of colour seems to have disturbed the balance so that some of the figures, especially those dressed in orange-red and yellow seem less tactile and to a certain extent isolated from the surrounding ambience. After 1515 the rendering of landscape is dissolved into the ragged clouds of a thunderstorm gathering over the Saints of the *Disputa on the Trinity* (Pitti cat. XIII) and after 1523 Del Sarto reaches the total abstraction of pure atmosphere in the *Gambassi Madonna* (Pitti cat. XIX), the wonderfully sensual *St. John the Baptist* (Pitti cat. XVI) and the splendid *Passerini Assumption* (Pitti cat. XXI).

Since Del Sarto's interest in depicting these phenomena goes back to his earliest paintings, it must originate in his training. Shearman, on the evidence of the *Anonimo Magliabecchiano*, points to Raffaellino del Garbo as Del Sarto's teacher. But to judge from Raffaellino's paintings it seems impossible that he should have encouraged his pupil in this field. Vasari, in this case, seems to provide a more trustworthy testimony. His life on Del Sarto is so detailed and precise that one would suspect it was based on a 'Libro di ricordanze'. He mentions a certain "grosso e plebeo" Florentine painter Gian Barile as his first teacher and the eccentric Piero di Cosimo as his second master. Piero "gli pose grandissimo amore" when he saw how Andrea developed in "maneggiare i colori" and there can be no doubt that Petrioli Tofani is right in stressing Piero di Cosimo as the main source of inspiration for Del Sarto's mastering of space, light and atmosphere. The Joseph panels, in their restored splendor provide a clear evidence since the first comparisons they bring to mind are Piero di Cosimo's *Madonna and Saints* and his *Andromeda* in the Uffizi. Further evidence could be added by the fact that the same qualities are found in the early paintings by his colleague, Fra Bartolommeo, such as the *Noli me tangere* in the Louvre and in the many landscape drawings which were, by the way, attributed to Del Sarto by their former owner Nicolò Gabburri (Carmen Gronau, *Catalogue of Drawings of Landscapes and Trees by Fra Bartolommeo*, Sotheby's London 1957). We know for certain that Fra Bartolommeo was trained in the workshop of Cosimo Roselli under the guidance of Piero di Cosimo, so it is most likely that Piero influenced both painters in the same direction.

It seems as if an interest in the rendering of atmosphere would at this time automatically lead to the study of Perugino's Umbrian lyricism. Perugino, who had evidently put up a branch of his workshop in Florence in the 1490ies, became a dominating model for Fra Bartolommeo around 1503 and his influence on Andrea del Sarto is clearly manifested in the beautiful compositional drawing for an Adoration of

the Magi of uncertain date (Pitti cat. 6). The landscape as well as the transparency of the spidary and angular figures are so reminiscent of the Umbrian painter that the drawing was attributed to an anonymous Umbrian master at the beginning of this century.

The cleaning also revealed several hitherto hidden details. In the *Madonna of the Harpies* (Pitti cat. XII) the "fumo di nuvoli trasparenti sopra il casamento" of which Vasari speaks (G. Vasari, *Le Vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architetti*, ed. G. Milanesi, Florence 1880, V. p. 20) came to light again and have permitted Antonio Natali to bring a new and thoroughly convincing interpretation of the iconography of the painting. The activated stormy sky and the strong highlights of the *Disputa on the Trinity* make us realize that a severe discussion is going on here. Details like the goat on the crest of the hill and the ducks in the pond of the *Joseph Stories* (Pitti cat. X—XI) reveal Del Sarto as a charming story-teller, a quality which was only hinted at in the fresco depicting the *Tribute of Caesar* in Poggio a Caiano and in the studies for the dogs in this fresco, displayed in the Paris exhibition (Louvre cat. 30).

The cleaning also brought to light many pentimenti, some visible with the naked eye others only in reflectographs. Most of them are minor corrections confirming the current view of Del Sarto as an extremely methodical artist who worked out his compositions in great detail on paper before he started to work on the actual painting. It happened, however, that circumstances forced him to change this method as in the case of St. Michael the Archangel in the *Vallombrosa Altarpiece* (Pitti cat. XXII). The final version depicts the saint with a long drapery cast over his right shoulder hanging down his back and draped obliquely over his breast and left arm falling to the ground in the rear behind the sword. The reflectographs show that in the underlying drawing transferred from the cartoon the drapery was a long and narrow piece of material draped over the angel's left shoulder falling in a reversed manner (Pitti cat. p. 349 fig. 8). Four drawings allow us to follow Del Sarto's work on this figure. In the first very sketchy pen and ink drawing for the composition the drapery of our figure is only hinted at (Pitti cat. 81). Then in a second and more thorough study the drapery is highly elaborated (Pitti cat. 83) and later used for the cartoon and transferred to the panel. A sketch in the exhibition in Paris probably represents the first idea for changing the figure at this advanced stage (Louvre cat. 57). It was followed up by an elaborated drawing in the Pierpont Morgan Library (Shearman *op. cit.* fig. 156 b) which served as the model for changing the already sketched in figure on the panel. The reason for this "ripensamento" at the last hour is not clear, but such changes are by no means isolated phenomena. Similarly Fra Bartolommeo is very methodical in his working procedure but he is known to have made significant changes in the final stages of his pictures. It can be seen that the cartoons for the two saints in *God the Father with the Saints Mary Magdalen and Catherine of Siena*, now in the Museo di Villa Guinigi in Lucca, are totally different from the painting (Fischer, *Op. cit.* cat. 42 and 43). There are as in the case of Del Sarto's Archangel, conserved two sets of studies for the Saints, one leading up to the cartoons, the other for the final painted version.

The Pitti exhibition affirmed the lesson learned from the cleaning of the Sistine Chapel, that we must be very cautious in judging uncleaned paintings. Overpainting and

old restorations can change their aspect totally. This is, however, not yet a canon applied to drawings. They are commonly considered to be unchanged, or in extreme cases, to have suffered corrosion. The Louvre exhibition, however, made it clear that we should also be on guard against old additions made in order to freshen up deteriorated or faded drawings. The problem, which is not discussed in Dominique Cordellier's catalogue was kindly pointed out to me by Mme. Monbeig Goguel. As she is about to publish an article dedicated to this theme, I shall not delve deeply into the matter but only mention that many of the sheets originating from the collection of Jabach and purchased by the Cabinet des Dessins in 1671 have retraced outlines and added highlights. The most marked example in the show was the completely reworked and heavily restored cartonnetto for the *Tribute of Caesar* (Louvre cat. 28), a less conspicuous example the partly retraced early cartonnetto for a *Sacra Conversazione* (Louvre cat. 6).

Among the relatively few drawings which were proposed for inclusion in Del Sarto's *œuvre*, the most convincing were a group of three sheets with copies of figures from Del Sarto's friend Baccio Bandinelli's *Massacre of the Innocents* etched by Marco Dente (Pitti cat. 49—51). The black chalk fragment of a cartoon in the same exhibition, proposed as a preparatory study for St Francis in the *Disputa on the Trinity* (Pitti cat. 25) failed to convince, in spite of the old ascription to Andrea on the back. Neither the size nor the pose correspond to the painting. The rather cautious handling of the chalk and the uncanny sideways glance out of the picture is a strong case for Berenson's attribution to Giovanni Antonio Sogliani who, as a pupil of the anachronistically old fashioned Lorenzo di Credi, was open to many influences. Sogliani is mostly thought of as a follower of Fra Bartolommeo, which is probably why he was not included in the Paris exhibition. The imprint of Andrea del Sarto appears however, to be very well illustrated in the *Last Supper* commissioned in 1531 by the *Compagnia dei Neri* in Anghiari, based on Del Sarto's fresco in San Salvi.

The attribution to Del Sarto of the red chalk *Head of a Man* in the Paris exhibition, belonging to the Musée Bonnat (Louvre cat. 39) also seemed somewhat far fetched though the verso has a head corresponding to that of St. Mary Magdalen in the *Luco Pietà*. The drawing was attributed to Piero di Cosimo, an attribution often made in the past for anything eccentric (A scholarly survey of Piero di Cosimo's activity as a draughtsman remains to be done). The impressive frontality and the powerful, sharp modeling of the man's features are very comparable to the drawing of the same subject in the Musée des Beaux-Arts at Lille (A. Châtelet, *Disegni di Raffaello e di altri italiani del Museo di Lille*, Florence 1971, no. 20, fig. 14). The Lille drawing has carried attributions as varied as Mantegna, Bramantino, Bramante and Anonymous Florentine artist. In my opinion the two drawings are by the same artist whose Florentine origin is indicated by the head on the verso of the Bayonne sheet, which, to judge from its dryness, is a copy, maybe from the drawing shown in the Florentine exhibition (Pitti cat. 65). Their statuesque monumentality is, however, an impediment to an attribution to Andrea del Sarto, and William Griswold's proposal to me that they may be by Ridolfo Ghirlandaio seems very likely indeed. They certainly have undeniable similarities to certain faces in Ridolfo's *St. Zenobius* panels in the Museum of San Salvi in Florence.

The growing interest in early study of the artist was reflected in both catalogues by essays on copies after Andrea del Sarto. These are often of great importance, especially if they depict lost works, and I should like to draw attention to an unpublished doublesided sheet in the J. F. Willumsen Museum in Frederikssund, Denmark, which throws some light on Del Sarto's preparatory work for the fresco of the *Last Supper* in the convent of San Salvi (Inv. GS. 634. mm. 219 X 164; red chalk on white paper). The recto is a somewhat simplified copy after a study for the head of the second Apostle from the left shown in the exhibition in Florence (Pitti cat. 77), the verso is a drawing of a seated nude youth comparable to Del Sarto's other figure studies for the same painting (*Abb. 4*). It is probably a copy after a lost study for the Apostle sitting at the left end of the table and thus reflect an early stage in the preparations. In the Willumsen drawing the figure is depicted with slanting legs, leaning forwards on his outstretched left arm. The right arm is the weakest point, so the model for this drawing was probably followed up by the fine study for the Apostle's right arm (*Abb. 5a*) seen in the Pitti exhibition, cat. 75) in which the indicated attitude of the figure is identical with the Willumsen copy. The final painted version shows the Apostle sitting in a more upright position with his arm bent and legs pulled further up.

Petrioli Tofani rightly stresses Del Sarto's dependence on the living model to which he perpetually returns for control throughout the various stages of the working process. This attitude is quite different from Raphael or Fra Bartolommeo to mention the temperamentally best comparable artists of his époque. They leave the living model at a fairly early stage in the work and rely to a much greater extent on their conceptual images.

Like many other artists Andrea del Sarto used his pupils, collaborators and friends as models. I should like to propose that the head of St. Francis in the *Madonna of the Harpies* of 1517 in fact represents Pontormo. He had been Del Sarto's pupil for a couple of years until about the middle of 1514 but, as he painted the *Visitation* fresco in the chiostrino between 1514 and 16 he evidently still frequented the Ss. Annunziata milieu in the years following. Pontormo's portrait is idealized beyond recognition in the painting but is clearly recognizable in three preparatory drawings for the Saint's head which could be seen in the exhibitions. One of them had never been published before and belongs to the Musée Atger in Montpellier (*Abb. 5b*; Louvre cat. 17); another, very much like it is sketched in on the same sheet as a study for St. Francis' drapery and belongs to the Uffizi (Pitti cat. 20). The third, a more idealized and elaborated study, belongs to the Louvre (Louvre cat. 18). The likenesses of Pontormo have been systematically investigated (L. Berti, *Semblanze di Pontormo*, Empoli 1957; J. Cox Rearick, *The Drawings of Pontormo*, New York 1981, p. 112, note 16) but these drawings have not been identified. The big eyes, the broad nose and the soft overall character confirm Vasari's statement that Pontormo "ebbe di bellissimi tratti" and do compare well to Pontormo's approximately contemporary self portraits: The study in the Uffizi (*Abb. 5c*; Cox Rearick, *Op. cit.* cat. 16, fig. 23), and the man to the left in the Pitti *Adoration of the Magi*, as well as to the much later self portraits in the British Museum (Cox Rearick, *Op. cit.* cat. 253, fig. 241), and in the Santa Felicita *Deposition*

for which there exists a drawing in the Uffizi (Cox Rearick, *Op. cit.* cat. 277, fig. 263) dated respectively ca. 1526—27.

A doublesided sheet in Berlin is discussed in Petrioli Tofani's anthology (Pl. XIX). The recto shows two studies for the *Tribute to Caesar*. One of them is a head of a bearded man in profile to the right. It served for the figure kneeling before Caesar and is commonly accepted as a drawing from a bust of Homer. The verso shows the head of a fat man in profile to the left and a man with his hands on his chin (*Abb. 6a*). The latter reappears in the Scalzo *Presentation of the Baptist's Head to Herod*. Shearman interpreted the fat man as a study for a person in the crowd behind Caesar in the Poggio a Caiano fresco, whereas Freedberg and Petrioli Tofani seem more convincing in suggesting that it is a study for the figure on the extreme right in the Scalzo *Banquet of Herod*. The head has been described as a derivation from a bust or medal of Vitellius but the fact that it is bent slightly forwards is a realistic observation which suggests that it was drawn after a living model. Nor does the small ear correspond to portraits of the emperor. The whole physiognomy, however, is very comparable to a figure in Fra Bartolommeo's *Madonna della Misericordia* in the Museo di Villa Guinigi in Lucca (*Abb. 6b*) so, it is very likely that both painters used the same model. Fra Bartolommeo's painting is dated 1515. Del Sarto's *Tribute to Caesar* was in progress in 1520—21 and his *Banquet of Herod* was paid for in 1522.

The Berlin drawing, like the rest of Andrea's art, embodies a fifteenth century realism and grace which pulsates beneath the polish and calculation of classical convention. It thus exemplifies the enduring merit of Andrea del Sarto's art which Florence and Paris gave us the opportunity to understand better and admire more.

Chris Fischer

Rezensionen

DETLEF HEIKAMP, *Mediceische Glaskunst*. Florenz, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz 1986. 423 Seiten Text, davon 16 Seiten Anmerkungen, 29 Seiten ital. Résumé und 109 Seiten Anhang. 4 Farbtafeln, 211 Schwarzweiß-Abbildungen.

Mit diesem in einer Auflage von 300 Exemplaren gedruckten Buch, dessen Inhalt auch als Heft 1/2 des XXX. Bandes der *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* erschienen ist, stellt sich Detlef Heikamp die Aufgabe, die bislang unterbewertete Glaskunst am Hofe der Medici stärker in das Blickfeld der kunstgeschichtlichen Forschung zu rücken. Gestützt auf grundlegende Vorarbeiten von Guido Taddei und Luigi Zecchin und bereichert durch neues, ergänzendes Material entstand eine umfassende Darstellung, deren besonderes Verdienst die bislang fehlende, gründliche Auswertung der Glasvorzeichnungen in den Uffizien ist. Zu Hunderten erhalten, bieten sie eine einmalige Gelegenheit, höfische Kunst und Kultur im Spiegel ihrer Glasschöpfungen darzustellen. Vor allem die Bestände aus dem 17. Jahrhundert waren bislang kaum bearbeitet. Im Anhang sind sämtliche Zeichnungen und alle dem Autor bekannt gewordenen, unmittelbar oder mittelbar darauf bezüglichen Dokumente zusammengefaßt und kommentiert.